COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

* * * * * * * * * *

PUBLIC HEARING

IN RE: HB 2018: TAX-EXEMPT PROPERTY

MUNICIPAL ASSISTANCE FUND

* * * * * * * * * * *

BEFORE: ROBERT L. FREEMAN, Chairman

Adam Harris and Bob Mensch, Members

Eddie Day Pashinski, Host

HEARING: Wednesday, February 20, 2008

Commencing at 10:20 a.m.

LOCATION: Wilkes-Barre City Hall

40 East Market Street

Wilkes-Barre, PA

WITNESSES: Christopher Doherty, Thomas Leighton,

Todd Vanderheid, David Ross

Reporter: Charles Leifer

Any reproduction of this transcript is prohibited without authorization by the certifying agency

		2	?
1	I N D E X		
2			
3	OPENING REMARKS		
4	By Representative Freeman	3 – 7	
5	By Representative Pashinski	7 – 8	
6	TESTIMONY		
7	By Mayor Doherty 8	- 23	
8	By Mayor Leighton 23	- 44	
9	By Mr. Vanderheid 44	- 74	
10	By Mr. Ross 74	- 91	
11	CERTIFICATE	93	
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

PROCEEDINGS

2 -----

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

I guess we can get started. Good morning, everyone. I am State Representative Bob Freeman, Chairman of the House Local Government Committee, and what I'd like to start off is asking everyone to please identify themselves. We'll just work our way around the room.

MR. GRELL:

Don Grell, from the Republican staff of the committee.

REPRESENTATIVE HARRIS:

Adam Harris, I live in Juniata. I represent Juniata, Mifflin and Snyder Counties.

MS. RITTMEIER:

I'm Amy Rittmeier.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

I'm state representative Bob Freeman,

20 Chairman of the committee.

1

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI:

State Representative Eddie Day Pashinski,

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

We do anticipate other members arriving

periodically during the course of the hearing, so they'll probably join us later. First, let me thank the mayor and council for letting us use their chambers today and also for this beautiful City Hall. It's the first time I've been in Wilkes-Barre City Hall. We appreciate your hospitality.

2

3

6

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Today the hearing of the House Local Government Committee will concentrate on House Bill 2018, my legislation to establish a Tax-exempt Property Municipal Assistance Fund. This proposal provides state funding to those municipalities in 12 Pennsylvania that have a significantly high proportion of tax-exempt properties.

Across our Commonwealth communities large and small, urban and rural, city, borough and townships alike, contain a considerable percentage of tax-exempt properties. While these tax-exempt properties represent the presence of important governmental institutions, institutions of higher learning, and not-for-profit medical facilities, that all contribute to the quality of life of the community, they do not contribute to the tax base in those communities because they are tax-exempt.

Practically all of our county seats, our college towns, and communities with major not-forprofit medical facilities have higher percentages of tax-exempt properties than other communities, and this deprives them of tax revenues. The vast majority of these tax-exempt entities are regional assets and it's the host community that is left with a reduced tax base and strain on local services as a result of their presence within these communities.

The fiscal distress that many of our cities and boroughs find themselves in today is not the result of poor fiscal management or lack of effort on their part to try to lure new development into their communities. Reports by both the Brookings Institute institutions and the Pennsylvania Economy League all point to increasing fiscal distress for our cities, our boroughs and those inner ring suburbs, the older suburbs of our communities.

The presence of significant numbers of tax-exempt properties within their borders can greatly contribute to this fiscal distress due to the limited tax base it creates. One has only to look at the communities that are listed under the Act 47 the financially distressed municipality program, to realize the truth. Most of the Act 47 communities contain tax-exempt property levels of anywhere from 20 to 30 percent of their overall assessed value. No

wonder these communities are failing, when you have to try and provide essential services from such an eroded tax base. House Bill 2018 seeks to remedy the situation by providing state funding to compensate those communities that have 17 percent or more of their total assessed value of property classified as tax-exempt.

Under legislation the revenue for this program would come from the dedication of the current 18 percent Johnstown Flood Act that is levied on the sale of liquor and wine in Pennsylvania. It generates approximately \$240 million a year. It should be noted that no single municipality in this program will receive more than ten percent of the revenue in order to make sure that all the communities across Pennsylvania that are grappling with this problem will receive a decent bit of compensation for the tax-exempt properties.

Here in the community of Wilkes-Barre it's estimated that over 20 percent of the total accessed value of property is tax-exempt, 20 percent. One out of every five properties is tax-exempt. That gives them a handicap trying to provide essential public services. Without this infusion of much-needed funds many of our state's high tax-exempt property

communities face the very real prospect of failing as they fall deeper and deeper into financial distress due to an eroded tax base.

In 1936 the legislature enacted the 18 percent Johnstown Flood Tax to provide a much needed relief of revitalization to a community devastated by a natural disaster. The revenues from that tax are now needed to come to the assistance of the communities across Pennsylvania that are overwhelmed with flood of tax-exempt properties. With this legislation we can stabilize hundreds of needy communities across our Commonwealth and ensure their success for many, many years to come.

So before we get into our testimony I would like to turn to a legislator from Wilkes-Barre, Representative Ed Pashinski.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI:

Thank you very much. I'd like to welcome you and the members of the committee to our lovely city. We're very proud of Wilkes-Barre and the good work of the mayor and the council, what they have done. And I think that Representative Freeman has a very innovative way in order to try to help our cities that have this tax base that is exempt. So it's our pleasure to welcome you here, as well as the members

of the committee, and hopefully we'll have some others joining us. I believe Minority Chairman Saylor has had a problem getting here, so he's not coming, but I think a couple of others will be here as well. In any case, I thank those of you for coming out today and offering your testimony. And then we need your support to try to get the rest of the members of our house on board with this.

So without further ado, let's move forward.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

Thanks everyone for their patience with today's schedule. The first person to testify will be the Mayor of Wilkes-Barre, Tom Leighton.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

If it's okay, the Mayor had another obligation.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

I'd be happy to take the Mayor of Scranton first. It's nice to see the two mayors from the two cities of the region cooperate so nicely.

MAYOR DOHERTY:

Thank you very much, Representative 24 Freeman, Representative Pashinski, Representative Harris. Welcome to northeastern Pennsylvania.

is really an important issue for cities across the I just spent the past year as president of 3 Pennsylvania League of Cities and Municipalities, and on Monday this week we met with 12 mayors to discuss the issues that we just talked about. Cities are the core of any community, in any county and we obviously observe not only our government offices, county offices, federal offices in Scranton --- we have the federal courthouse for this district. But we also 10 take care of the educational centers, University of 11 Scranton, the community college, and this is 12 duplicated everywhere throughout the state.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In the cities, we welcome those who are the most disadvantaged, whether they're the immigrants or whether they are people who do not have funds for their own home and they look to have subsidized housing, so they could get themselves back on their feet. That's a cost we carry ourselves. More importantly when you do those things you also incur the costs of public safety, whether it's increase the size of the fire department or police department, things that are needed, that are necessary to make a difference in people's lives, but more importantly make a difference in the region's lives because regions are defined by their cities.

Luzerne County is defined by WilkesBarre, Lackawanna County is defined by Scranton, what
people think of that community, what they think of
that county. So as you said, over the years cities
have taken on a greater burden and they have less
funds to be able to meet those challenges.

I think this proposal, House Bill 2018, is an example of how the state can share and spread its resources to the betterment of the whole state.

Now, if you think of how this actually started, one community in our state was severely challenged and the state decided we were going to step up and help Johnstown.

Obviously, we met that need, and over time the tax has stayed but it hasn't been used for other projects. Now we're saying, here's what we're using for specific project and the project is our city. I think you defined it perfectly. Cities, how are they challenged? Well, one way to look at that is to say, all right, what is your percentage of non-taxable properties? And when you have a city like Scranton, it's 35 percent non-taxable properties in our downtown. What do we absorb with that? Well, you know, University of Scranton has 7,000 kids who are at the school. It's a phenomenal educational

institution. It brings great things to our city, but
when you have 7,000 kids and you're downtown you're
challenged with the police department on the weekends.
You're challenged with off-campus housing, which
usually is substandard. And your fire department is
called upon.

Looking at our Housing Authority, we have 7,000 units in the City of Scranton. What are the challenges that come with that? Well, sometimes it's public safety. It's through the challenges of the people who live there or they come to visit and that's more than you'll see out in the suburbs.

More importantly, you see challenges in Children and Youth. Many people who live in subsidized housing are not a two-parent household. It's usually a mother with two or three children. That's a tax on your communities, how you take care of it, whether it's through your educational system.

This proposal you have would help us address it. Would it solve our problems? No. But it brings to the forefront the challenge we face every day as citizens. You know, when Governor Rendell came in five years ago, he talked about helping cities and he has stepped up. He's really made great progress in doing that, but if we are going to succeed as a state

we will need to be a state that has helped our cities flourish. If you live out in the eastern half of Pennsylvania you're seeing population growth. You see it in Luzerne County. In Lackawanna County, for the first time in 70 years our population has grown. This is going to continue for the next 10 to 15 years because New York is just spreading westward.

Well, now is our time to grow. If we're going to be successful and take advantage of it, we've got to pave our streets; we've got to keep our streets safe; we've got to take care of those who can't take care of themselves because during this time of growth we will define ourselves for the next 50 years. Are you a city that's safe? Are you a city that takes care of those who can't take care of themselves? And the reason you do that isn't so much about today, it's about 30 years from now.

Now, I've talked about this whole immigration thing. If you treat people who are the least fortunate in your community well and you allow their children to become well educated, to become successful, thirty (30) years from now the mayor of Wilkes-Barre will probably not look like Mayor Leighton or the Mayor of Scranton, like me. In all likelihood he'll be Hispanic. They're going to

remember how they were treated, and the reason is not because they will treat for retribution somehow but because we want everyone to be treated well, because in 30 years there'll be another wave of immigrants.

And we don't know who those people are, and we want them to be treated well because we want their children to become the next leaders of our community, and you do that by having services and taking care of those people, and that's why this bill is so important.

You know, we face challenges every day here and we need --- the bottom line. If you look at all the Act 47 cities, Scranton's been Act 47 since 1992. No, you get in, you never get out, and the reason is because the tax base is diluted, and we're living with things, contracts that were decided 30 years ago, pensions, health care, which we are obligated to take care of and will take care of, but as we go through this transitional period we need help.

And I think this is very important and this is a bill that would allow us to share. You're sharing across the state so you're helping our communities and the differential is how many taxexempt properties do you have? And based on that percentage we'll help you out, so I think it's a

tremendous proposal. I'm in complete support of it.

I know the League is very supportive of it, having

spent this past year as president. We'll do

everything we can to see this come to fruition, and

anything you need from us, we will do, and I will do

personally.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

Mayor Doherty, thank you for testimony.

Do you have time for a few questions, possibly?

MAYOR DOHERTY:

I'll be glad to take questions.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

First, thank you for your testimony and your support for the legislation and I think your points are very well taken. I should note, too, particularly for members of the press, although the cities of our Commonwealth are the most acutely affected by high tax-exempt properties, the legislation actually would apply to any municipality, whether it be a borough, a city, or a township that has 17 percent or more of its tax base as tax-exempt. So we really have tried to reach out with this legislation to all the communities that are affected.

MAYOR DOHERTY:

And I think you bring up an interesting

point. Those communities that are the outer rim, outside of the city, they're just trailing the cities by ten years. So the problems we're experiencing today they will see. So by addressing it now you maybe can stop that process.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

I did have one question. In our research we were able to isolate the tax-exempts for many municipalities, but Scranton was tough to find.

MAYOR DOHERTY:

Yeah. The League did come to us and we did provide that information. It's 35 percent.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

Thirty-five (35) percent. So a third of your property is tax-exempt.

MAYOR DOHERTY:

We are obviously the county seat, but we have the northeast federal district, so we have the federal courthouse. As I said, we have three colleges in our downtown, substantial housing that's subsidized, and we have three hospitals in our hill section, so just like everything else --- Scranton's 125 years old. Everything was established in this city, so your education, your hospitals and your rule of law is in your cities. Like I said, 35 percent in

16 1 Scranton. 2 CHAIRMAN FREEMAN: 3 Any other questions for the Mayor? Representative Harris? 5 REPRESENTATIVE HARRIS: 6 Just very quickly. Do you assess the city wage tax? 8 MAYOR DOHERTY: 9 Yes, we do. 10 REPRESENTATIVE HARRIS: 11 And how much is that? 12 MAYOR DOHERTY: 13 Two point four (2.4) percent and the 14 school district assesses one percent, so 3.4 percent 15 is what is charged to the residents of Scranton. 16 REPRESENTATIVE HARRIS: 17 Roughly how much does your 2.4 percent 18 bring? 19 MAYOR DOHERTY: 20 About \$19 million. 21 REPRESENTATIVE HARRIS: 22 Do you know off hand how much you would 23 get from this legislation? 24 MAYOR DOHERTY: 25 Actually in excess of a million dollars,

\$1.3, \$1.4. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE HARRIS:

Very good. Thanks for being here.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

Representative Pashinski?

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI:

Again, thank you, Mayor, for being here. I'm just wondering since 35 percent is a very high number of non-taxable properties, that obviously played a major role in making you qualify for Act 47 status.

MAYOR DOHERTY:

Right.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI:

How long did that process take? Because you said 1992.

MAYOR DOHERTY:

The city went distressed, yeah. I mean, here's the challenge. We basically run a structural deficit in the area of \$5 million a year and that's 21 based on --- 80 percent of our costs are employee salary, health care --- and actually we pay more on retiree health care than we do for the active employees today So we're living with agreements that were made in the previous administration, but I'm sure that's duplicated throughout the state. My situation isn't any different.

Our challenge is that we have limitations that other cities do not have. I do not have flexibility as to how many people can work in my fire or police departments. I live under a contract from before I became mayor. So that's how we're still in recovery, in the recovery plan, and I think the recovery plan is a whole other issue and I've testified before the House before on that is that it needs more teeth.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI:

If this were to pass ---

MAYOR DOHERTY:

Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI:

--- would this help you get out of Act

18 47?

1

2

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MAYOR DOHERTY:

It would and I'll tell you why. Because we've structured three areas of costs. One is that we will reduce our employees in the area of about \$2.4 million, but we also believe that we have to increase what people pay so tax increase --- we just increase taxes last year. Frankly I don't have a problem with

The cities aren't willing to invest in 1 it. themselves, why would anybody else? And it has worked for us, but this would shore things up. Because it 3 isn't enough just to balance your books. As we all know, you've got to pave the streets, you got to fix the parks. You have to make your city attractive so more people will move to your city, so you increase your property values. You know it's all a domino effect. You do that, your crime is reduced because 10 people are investing more and you see more people in 11 your downtown. You don't do it, the opposite occurs. 12 Your crime does increase, people --- you have flight, 13 there are less people in the community, so it would 14 make a major difference. And it also makes a 15 statement about the city. It says we are here to take 16 care to the best of our ability.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI:

Good. Thank you.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

Just one last point before we let you go. Yesterday we heard testimony from the Mayors of Allentown and Bethlehem, and they are very grateful for the help non-profits donate to capital projects but capital projects don't necessarily help you in the day-to-day operation of the police force, fire

protection, code enforcement, all the day-to-day things that you need to do to keep your city safe, clean, attractive and in a position to be able to attract development to build up over time.

MAYOR DOHERTY:

3

5

6

11

12

15

19

25

Absolutely. And I think you've hit a really key point. States or the federal government or state government often give grants to cities for capital projects. The challenge to the city is once 10 you invest those capital dollars you have to maintain it. You know, we're doing an \$80 million flood project in our city. It's going to cost us \$300,000 a 13 year to maintain the levies, and I went to our 14 representatives and our state senators and I said, okay, you gave me \$80 million, don't you think you 16 want to give \$300,000 so I could make sure the levies 17 are taken care of for the next hundred years? 18 waste the investment? The same thing. You got money for a park or a new police headquarters, you've up-20 fronted x amount of dollars. Wouldn't you want to put 21 in ten percent or five percent to make sure it's 22 maintained so that investment that the taxpayers have 23 made is maintained for a long time, so it's not wasted 24 so that's another reason.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

Don Grell from Republican staff has a question.

MAYOR DOHERTY:

Sure.

MR. GRELL:

One of the things we heard yesterday was the assessments on tax-exempt property aren't very good, so it tends to understate the tax-exemptions. You say 35 percent. Do you have a feel if that's really kind of a soft number? Do you have a gut feeling of whether that's ---?

MAYOR DOHERTY:

Oh, I'm sure it's a soft number. Our county, like Luzerne County, hasn't done a reassessment in 30 years, and in that time I'm sure we've added --- well, the University of Scranton probably has spread like six core blocks in that time period. That's a good thing for us because obviously it's a great school, but that's a lot of houses off the market. Our federal courthouse has tripled in size in the last ten years. The courthouse has taken over a whole city downtown block. It's a nice thing. People work there. But that's prime real estate.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

That's a good point. In fact, it was

made about Lafayette College in the City of Easton.

MAYOR DOHERTY:

Yeah.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

A lot of money in physical clean-up of the campus. I think they probably invested \$20 million over the course of the last couple years just a handful of buildings are getting total assessed value and it's probably minimal compared to what it should be as far as accurate assessed value.

MAYOR DOHERTY:

Yeah, I think it's really important because we would then get an understanding of what burdens the cities are carrying, you know. We're the home for everybody. If you're in trouble you got to go to the court system. You need Children and Youth. If you want an education you're going to the university, not outside the city, and if you're sick you're going to the hospital, so you're in the city.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

They're all great assets, they're really regional assets.

MAYOR DOHERTY:

Exactly. Yeah, exactly.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

And for regional assets the host community shouldn't have to shoulder all the burden of maintaining and so on. Thank you, sir. Any other testimony or questions?

MAYOR DOHERTY:

Thank you for allowing me to speak. Mayor Leighton, tell him to check his e-mail.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

Our next testifier is Mayor Tom Leighton of Wilkes-Barre. Thank you for your hospitality here today.

MAYOR LEIGHTON:

Thank you for your time today. As the Mayor of the City of Wilkes-Barre I believe that this new bill, and the subsequent creation of the Tax-Exempt Property Municipal Assistance Act, will benefit our community through the generation of additional funds. Over 20 percent of the assessed parcels in the City of Wilkes-Barre are not taxable, the key word there assessed parcels that are not taxable. The unfortunate part is over 50 percent, actually 54 percent, of the total number of parcels in Wilkes-Barre, which include government buildings like the one we're sitting in here today, churches, synagogues, parking garages, just to name a few, are tax-exempt.

This high percentage puts us at a financial disadvantage. While properties are not generating revenues for the City of Wilkes-Barre, they bring people into our city, and we are expected to provide services such as fire, police, ambulance to those people and also maintain infrastructure in neighborhoods where these non-taxable properties are located.

Since taking office maintaining fiscal responsibility has been a cornerstone of my administration. You may not be aware of this, but when I took office in 2004, I inherited \$10.8 million of unpaid bills that were due to many different vendors of all sizes, large vendors, small vendors, many that were basically on the verge of bankruptcy because of the money that the City of Wilkes-Barre had owed them.

We immediately went out and sought unfunded debt, and paid the debts off and are currently paying down a ten-year note of that unfunded debt. Without a solid financial foundation the City of Wilkes-Barre's future would be unsteady. Each year we are committed to creating a balanced budget so that we can continue on a positive path for the future. And I must add, each year becomes more and more difficult

as we are continuing to rise at a pace that the revenue does not keep up with.

Like many other mid-sized cities

nationwide our financial climate has been difficult

and is a continuous battle every day. The additional

funds we could receive as a result of this

legislation, estimated upwards of \$100,000 based on

that 20 percent number, would be very beneficial. We

could use that to support existing city services,

expand the infrastructure and upgrades which has been

deteriorating over the years and also develop new

projects through the City of Wilkes-Barre.

A lot has been accomplished over the last couple of years as a result of the state aid that we discussed previously with Mayor Doherty. The Governor in the state House has been extremely helpful with our capital projects.

I'd like to take a moment to acknowledge the generosity of our non-profits who contribute payment in lieu of taxes. I don't want that going out there saying that non-profits don't cooperate. We've had tremendous support from our non-profits, not all of them, but the bigger ones. Upon taking office in 2004 I paid a polite visit to the CEOs and presidents to the non-profits such as two local hospitals, our

two local colleges, King's College and Wilkes 2 University, and explained to them the need for them to 3 step up to the plate to help us help them with their employees, you know, the City of Wilkes-Barre. one of them turned me down. They all either increased or doubled their PILOTs, payment in lieu of taxes. So I want that on the record that we've had great support. While we can use more, they stepped right up to help me move the city forward, and they definitely 10 saw --- they definitely saw a difference in the last 11 four years.

With Wilkes-Barre's progress over the last four years people have a renewed interest in the city and the innovative opportunities it presents.

There was just an article either yesterday or in Monday's paper. I'm not sure if you saw that, but of all the surrounding communities in this area, Wilkes-Barre was the only city that saw an increase in their housing prices. Wilkes-Barre has just experienced an eight percent increase in property values, which that's something that I and the administration are very proud of.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If you read about our past, people were leaving the city. Our population was decreasing, which ultimately affects our federal funding. People

now are moving back into the City of Wilkes-Barre.

They have a renewed interest in relocating in the City of Wilkes-Barre. As a result of hard work by City

Council, my administration, who I think very, very highly of, we've made some very difficult decisions over the last four years.

With the help of the former EMS tax, now local service tax, we were able to hire 21 new police officers to fight the battle of crime. That is a substantial amount. We went from 72 to 93 in two years, 2005 and 2006. In fact, it was not easy. Difficult decisions had to be made. We went from five firehouses down to three, but while doing that we improved the fire department by purchasing \$1 million of new equipment. Three new engines, two new ambulances, building a firehouse which replaced one that we had closed. So we sat down, we strategized how we could have better fire protection while reducing staffing and reducing fire stations, and we strategically placed the new firehouse in an area --we placed two, but that was not a popular decision as you can imagine and ---.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

While it was not the popular thing to do it was the right thing to do and we had to do it financially, but at no time did I ever feel that I, as

the Mayor, was jeopardizing the public safety. So we cut staffing in City Hall and that has allowed us to hire 21 new police officers.

Also, through the Governor's fight on crime, he provided us with a \$200,000 grant, which allowed me to hire additional police officers. In order to keep up with that grant, the rules and regs that come with that grant, within the next several weeks we'll be hiring four new police officers to replace those who had retired. So it's not a matter of the mayor and the city hiring 21 new officers over a two- or three-year period and now it's going to go back down. We're going to maintain that level of staffing until we win the war on crime and drugs that has infiltrated through our city, and I can't say enough about the professional services.

On the flip side, we have over 100,000 people, the fourth largest downtown workforce in the state of Pennsylvania come into our city 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. Those people expect professional services. Those people want an ambulance if they need it. Those people want a police officer and their employers want a police officer in our downtown walking the beat, which we have reinstituted since I became mayor.

1 I must also mention we have made an 2 improvement this year, which allows us to have two 3 police officers on top of the people, the officers that are walking the beat in the City of Wilkes-Barre. The presence of police officers has enabled us to go out and market our town. I can honestly say in 2004, I was knocking on people's door asking them to open a I was asking people to invest in downtown. business. People now are coming to the City of Wilkes-Barre and 10 knocking on our door and knocking on the Chamber's 11 door because they know what's going on in the City of 12 Wilkes-Barre.

It's just like the stock market, you buy low, you sell high. In 2004 there was many, many properties for sale. For sale signs were all over downtown Wilkes-Barre. Now it's harder to find property because out of town investors saw what happened, came in and bought the properties. Now, local investors are coming in and investing in downtown Wilkes-Barre.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

With that said, there's a cost to providing security. There's a cost of providing ambulance services. There's a cost to providing infrastructure, and that is what --- that's where we're struggling. As I stated earlier our expenses

are going up. Our revenues are straight, and every penny that we can get in would be help.

3

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I had an opportunity just last week to testify before a congressional subcommittee hearing in Washington on the bond insurance debacle. The bond insurance market is a mess. I don't know if you follow that or if you know what's going on, but projects are ongoing money going down to the City of Wilkes-Barre that we worked on up until three years ago. Projects we're working on now for the future will have --- could be adversely affected because of 12 the cost of obtaining bond insurance and more importantly getting that credit rating.

Without a good credit rating you pay higher interest rates. Without a good credit rating you pay higher bond insurance. The basis points on our first bond was 300 base points, which is a lot. Well, if your closing costs or your fees are increased, you're going to have to scale back on the project.

So we're being hit from all sides. mean, four years ago we did not have a bond rating. We did not have a credit rating. Now, we have a triple B credit rating on the bonds. That can be affected because our insurer, AMBAC, is on the verge of bankruptcy, and they're struggling now because of what happened in the sub prime market.

So what people don't understand is that trickles down to the guy watching the six o'clock news with his family after dinner. Because if we can't do these projects like the \$25 million intermodal transportation garage that's being built a hundred yards from here, That takes away your construction workers. They're not going to have work to do. It takes away your architects, your engineers, your utilities.

You know, the public does not understand what's going on in New York City on Wall Street.

Ultimately it's going to have a trickle-down effect into the City of Wilkes-Barre, the City of Scranton and all of the cities that we represent because work will not be there on the construction side. So we're getting hit all over and anything --- any help that you could give us is greatly appreciated.

I must also mention that part of the non-profits that are not in that 20 percent of the assessed parcels are also doing great things. We have two hospitals in the City of Wilkes-Barre. Not many cities like Wilkes-Barre have two hospitals, Wyoming Valley Healthcare, which is better known as Wilkes-

Barre General Hospital is undergoing a \$90 million trauma center investment.

1

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On the flipside they had to take a lot of property just like Chris had mentioned. When you expand, you take properties off the tax rolls. So they're doing a \$90 million expansion, which is a phenomenal project that they're doing in the City of Wilkes-Barre.

Geisinger, which is a smaller one --they bought Mercy Hospital, they're doing a \$15 million expansion, but in doing so they're buying properties and they're taking them off of the tax roll. King's and Wilkes, two great schools, two great four-year --- I'm a graduate of King's, so I have to mention that --- they're expanding. Wilkes has gone down South Main Street and has taken over our former call center. They invested \$15 million but in doing so they also bought a 14-story luxury apartment complex across the street that had high rent tenants, senior citizens, business people living there. Their ultimate goal now is that that become a dormitory. That's a \$40,000 hit on the city side in property taxes. So while they're expanding on Main Street, which is great, and I commend them, but we lost \$40,000, which is a substantial hit to the tax base.

On top of that you have the Blue Cross or Red Cross,
the Salvation Army. I could go on with the nonprofits that are getting great assets to the City of
Wilkes-Barre, but they're not contributing to the tax
base. So that's the end of my presentation. If you
have any questions, fire away. Anything I can do to
help you on this bill ---.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you. Your support is appreciated.

MAYOR LEIGHTON:

I was down in Harrisburg lobbying for service tax because we desperately needed it in the past. I'm not happy with the new rule, but that's for another day.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

But thank you for your testimony and support for the legislation. Are there questions from the members?

REPRESENTATIVE HARRIS:

Sure. The last thing you mentioned, the local services tax, how much does that additionally bring in for you?

MAYOR LEIGHTON:

About \$1.3.

REPRESENTATIVE HARRIS:

You have a similar wage tax?
MAYOR LEIGHTON:

1

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The total wage tax is 2.85. However, we get \$2.35 out of that, which generates approximately \$10 million a year. And quite honestly, my main profession is a real estate insurance broker and my office is on the other side of Public Square, so I moved from one side of Public Square, and I saw in my real estate profession why people were not coming to the City of Wilkes-Barre. This is before I was the mayor, a three-term councilman. They point to that 2.85 wage tax and in the surrounding communities one to two percent, Kingston is two percent, Ashley one, and I firmly believe as a lifelong resident that that 2.85 tax helps us provide professional services such as the ambulance with great regard, and we have to educate the public and I would never say anything negatively about any volunteer services because they do a great job.

I don't know if in your community if you have volunteers or have a paid full time fire department, paramedic service like we do. You know, the chief is always e-mailing me. We just bought two new machines, which just last week saved the life of a 50-year-old man who suffered a heart attack. Without

that machine the man would be dead. Not to say that he wouldn't survive in one of our surrounding communities, but our guys just do a fabulous job.

of paying one percent or two percent, unless you're making a couple hundred thousand dollars a year it comes down to pennies, and you really have to educate the public about that. But the bulk of that wage tax goes to provide for our professional services, which each year would cost more, along with the healthcare benefits. It's getting to the point where is it and how are we going to afford it?

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

And it should be noted in most municipalities in Pennsylvania have real estate taxes. Wage tax helps to supplement that, that in case of wage tax the amount levied goes back to the person's place of residence.

MAYOR LEIGHTON:

That's correct.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

So, you know, a lot of facilities that are non-profit such as the hospitals you mentioned and the colleges, the people who work at those facilities but live in surrounding townships, you're not

realizing that wage tax money. That's going to those other townships.

MAYOR LEIGHTON:

We do not get anything out of the people that live a hundred yards on the other side of the bridge, and I pointed this out.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

They work here but they pay out there.

MAYOR LEIGHTON:

I was heavily criticized because we were trying to rebuild downtown, and downtown was just a ghost town. No lights, no businesses, empty storefronts, office space.

We had to try to make the people start to believe in the City of Wilkes-Barre, and we had to try to make improvements and invest in the city. But what you mentioned is absolutely true when it comes to the business community. I was heavily criticized because we were trying to rebuild the town and recruit businesses, companies to move into these offices surrounding Public Square and recruit restaurants and delis, and when we instituted ---. We were the first community in the state because we acted on it right away because we needed it desperately. We presented it to city council and we had a hundred percent

support there and we got --- I believe we were the first city to pass the wage tax, the first in the state.

But I was criticized and I had an opportunity to speak to many business groups at lunches, and just like I'm sitting here in front of you, I told them point blank, you spend more time awake in the City of Wilkes-Barre because you're working here and you're spending a minimum of 40 hours working here. And take into consideration the time you spend before you get here to the time after and you add up the hours that you're in your home. Your best chance of survival if you get ill, have a heart attack is for it to happen while you're working.

And again, I'm not degrading the volunteers because most of this community that work in the downtown live in suburban and rural areas that do not have full-time services. Your best chance of survival having a heart attack is to have it while you're at work. I've seen it first hand; I've seen the ambulance work on people that had heart attacks in the downtown and they save a tremendous amount of people. I have nothing but the highest respect for their services.

Once I painted that picture, they thought

a dollar a week isn't so bad, and has not adversely
affected the marketing of downtown. And our occupancy
rate --- what's the occupancy rate of 84 or 85
compared to a large amount of vacant space just three
or four years ago.

REPRESENTATIVE HARRIS:

If I could just follow up quickly. You mentioned you were very successful at the payment in lieu of taxes, but that's completely voluntarily; correct?

MAYOR LEIGHTON:

Voluntarily.

REPRESENTATIVE HARRIS:

So they can discontinue that?

MAYOR LEIGHTON:

Discontinue, yes. But they want --- when I convince them or talk to them about it they want a commitment from me that I'm going to be fiscally responsible. And I told them back in 2004 my goal, my vision was to hire more police officers, clean our streets better and make sure that their employees felt safe. One of the things that they were concerned with --- and I even spoke with a CEO back in 2003 even before I became Mayor. They were very concerned because their employees come to work at this time of

year in the dark and they leave in the dark, and a lot of them were afraid to go out on their lunch hour, which meant they spent whole work days without getting a breath of fresh air and be productive in the afternoon.

So they were very concerned and now those people walk around Public Square. I don't know what kind of towns you live in or you patronize. Four years ago there was nobody walking around, and now people are walking our streets, movie theaters, restaurants. There are now things for people to do and see.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I just want to recognize that we've been joined by Representative Mensch.

MAYOR LEIGHTON:

Nice to meet you. Thank you for coming in and welcome.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

Don, do you have any questions?

MR. GRELL:

Sure, if you don't mind. I think what we've heard from Mayor Doherty and I think what you're saying is you have easier access to capital money than operating money, so if you had this revenue from this

tax how would you use the money?

MAYOR LEIGHTON:

apply it to our infrastructure maintenance and to continue to provide the service that we are at the level. People never want to see something taken away from them, so it's getting harder and harder to clean the streets, to pave the streets, to provide police and fire protection and ambulance protection. It would just continue, and as I said our revenue is a straight line, but our expenses keep growing. And that's why I testified at the congressional subcommittee last week is that increase doing capital projects, cleaning the streets. So this would allow us to continue to provide the services, continue to maintain the infrastructure, while not passing that on to taxpayers.

And he mentioned, too, about the wage tax of some people here that work in the city and live outside of the city and don't contribute. We have a large elderly population that we get nothing out of it as far as wage taxes. They're retired and they want to be able to enjoy their properties the way they enjoyed it while they were working. So again, it gets tougher and tougher each year.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

Representative Pashinski?

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI:

Yeah. For the record I do want to compliment the Mayor because I've been a resident of Wilkes-Barre now for nearly 38 years, so I've seen it go through various transitions, and the Mayor really has done an outstanding job of turning the city around. It's wonderful to see people especially on the weekends and in the evenings. We have parking on both sides of the street, and it's jammed. People are on the streets again. They're going to the restaurants, the movie theaters. It's coming back now. My question is, how close to the margin between the amount of money you bring in as opposed to the expense side of the budget?

MAYOR LEIGHTON:

Well, we like to say it's equal. That is the one thing I was committed to when I became mayor, was fiscal responsibility. Upon taking office I was forced in my first 45 days to raise taxes 20 mills. There were 53 mills and 73 mills, so a substantial increase. I emphasized they had not been raised in the previous two mayors' administrations, a term of sixteen years.

So the City of Wilkes-Barre over the last 16 to 18 years was operating on revenues from the 1980s. Not only did I raise property taxes, I raised every fee, every single fee across the board. We had fees that were not raised from the 1960s. We went around and we compared with other towns in our area, other towns of similar size, we were charging substantially less and that is how we fell behind, and I inherited a \$19 million debt. The city could not complete its functions.

The former administration was running the city on a credit line, and I will not do that, so more fiscal responsibility. We cut staffing at city hall, cut staffing at other services and I can say the only department that's seen an increase is the police department. That's what we needed. We were losing our city. We were losing our city to crime and drugs and I was not going to allow that to continue on my watch. I bit the bullet. I made very unpopular and difficult decisions, increased that department by 21 officers I believe we've seen a substantial increase in police visibility. Crime is down. It may sound funny but we're now addressing the nuisance crimes, getting the riff-raff off the streets.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

What's your overall budget?

MAYOR LEIGHTON:

\$37 million.

1

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI:

And the other reason that I mention that is because, you know, the cost of everything has gone up so dramatically. Construction costs, gasoline, a 36 percent increase. How do you maintain, you know, a budget to be able to deal with those kinds of increases?

MAYOR LEIGHTON:

12 It's been very difficult and don't 13 forget, Representative Pashinski, in three years out 14 of my first four years we had flooding that devastated 15 the southern part and northern part, doing millions 16 and millions of dollars worth of damage. You know, 17 the public thinks everything is covered and refundable 18 by the federal and state, FEMA and PEMA. 19 important part is --- the keyword there is the 20 eligible items are covered; not everything is 21 eligible. So we were faced with putting a lot of 22 money into it and the Valentine's Day storm of a year 23 ago, which I still have nightmares over cost Wilkes-24 Barre \$700,000 to clean up. We do not have \$700,000 25 and we all say, put a little money aside for a rainy

day. It was a very unpleasant week, and we got through it, but we did the best we could under the circumstances. I just hope we never see a snowstorm of that caliber under my watch.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

Any other questions? If not we thank you for your testimony.

MAYOR LEIGHTON:

Thank you. If I can help, please ask.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

Thank you.

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

MAYOR LEIGHTON:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

We should also note for the record that we have testimony, written testimony, by the County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania. Our next testifier will be Todd Vonderheid, Director of Strategy for 10,000 Friends of Pennsylvania. Welcome. Good to see you again.

MR. VONDERHEID:

Thank you. Good morning. I'll start by 23 thanking everybody for coming to Wilkes-Barre today. 24 I've broken one of my iron rules. I never prepare testimony because I like different strains of thought, 1 but I have a two and a half year old and six month old, and so my brain doesn't function at all anymore. I'm forced to actually provide written testimony so I'll begin again.

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Good morning. Welcome to Wilkes-Barre. Especially I'd like to start by thanking Representative Chairman Freeman as well as Chairman Saylor who couldn't be here today and the entire committee for taking time from your schedules to come to Wilkes-Barre and hear from Pennsylvanians who share your concern about the future of local government, its role in our lives, and perhaps more importantly its capacity to fill those roles.

I come before you today representing, you do, a variety of interests that often find themselves in opposition, but on this issue of fairness to local governments, I find that those interests speak with a common voice.

First and foremost, I'm a husband and a father of two who've choosen to make Wilkes-Barre their home, one of Pennsylvania's oldest communities. Second, I'm a recovering elected official having served 42 months, that was plenty, as a majority commissioner in Luzerne County overseeing a \$230 million budget and managing over 1,700 employees.

Third, I am presently the president and
CEO of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Business
and Industry, a business advocacy, economic, community
and workforce development organization, representing
1,200 businesses and perhaps more important, that
organization has developed 5,000 acres of industrial
land and four mixed-use buildings in downtown WilkesBarre.

And finally, I am and remain the Director of Strategy for the Campaign to Renew Pennsylvania, an initiative of 10,000 Friends working to make Pennsylvania's communities more economically competitive through targeted public investment, sustainable development and local government reform.

The issue of local governance and tax reforms has been discussed for over a hundred years in Pennsylvania. In fact, in 1906 my organization's predecessor, the Greater Wilkes-Barre Board of Trade proclaimed that the fragmented system of local government was one of the most critical issues facing our region. Well, it's been over a hundred years, and here we sit.

I'm testifying today because the issues that result from this distress have particularly corrosive effects upon our region's economic progress.

When a community declines, people of means depart, businesses follow, schools decline, taxes go up, crime ensues, the adjacent landscape is abused. No one moves in because of these things, and taxes go up again, and the cycle continues and continues.

Poor or declining communities don't have the resources to invest in their schools, parks and neighborhoods, so why do we think that the private sector would do so, regardless of the subsidy?

Municipal distress is a bottom line business issue and communities can't bricks and mortar themselves out of it. In fact, in downtown Wilkes-Barre in eight we've had an investment of just shy of \$100 million in four years. The total taxable revenue from that \$100 million pays for less than three full-time cops. Not enough to patrol the district where the investment was made.

As I'll discuss in a few minutes, our system of local government is broken and failure to contribute --- our local government is broken and that failure is contributing to many of our Commonwealth's ills. It was just over a year ago that I met with Representative Freeman to discuss the plight of Pennsylvania's older and core communities, and he mentioned a concept that has become House Bill 2018.

I want to commend the Chairman and the committee for tackling this difficult issue and recognizing, perhaps most importantly, that tax-exempt parcels are not the enemy of local government, but rather as the two Mayors who preceded me today discussed, they are the institutions whose value is difficult to measure in terms of property taxes paid to any single jurisdiction.

The philosophical belief behind House Bill 2018 is groundbreaking, I think, because it acknowledges that the benefits from tax-exempt institutions are regional in nature and the cost of those services, those institutions should not be restricted to municipal boundaries or geography they're located in.

Parks, places of worship, hospitals, government centers, colleges, universities, stadiums and arenas serve and add value, not to individual municipalities, but to regions, and in some cases to the entire Commonwealth or the nation. It is that broader base of citizen benefiting from those services and those amenities, therefore, which should share the costs of delivering the most basic, but most important services to those tax-exempt regional assets.

Within two blocks from where we sit are

campuses of Wilkes-Barre University and King's

College. To even the most parochial eye those two

institutions benefit all of northeastern Pennsylvania.

However, all of northeastern Pennsylvania does not

share in the cost to provide services to those

campuses, only the City of Wilkes-Barre bears that

cost.

In fact, the central business district in which you now sit today contains 658 tax parcels. Of that, 362 or 55 percent are tax-exempt. You can imagine how difficult it is, even if it's possible, as the Mayor just described, to provide mandated services to a district where more than one half of the properties generate little to no revenue to pay for those services.

any municipality in Pennsylvania, were a private business, it would be bankrupt or would have closed a long time ago. This is one of Pennsylvania's dirty little secrets. While we as elected and civic leaders talk about regionalism, partnership and cooperation, we require by state law that local governments raise revenue and provide service within little boxes, with no regard for the realities of the marketplace, the environment or social concerns such as crime.

The intent of House Bill 2018 is consistent with my belief that Pennsylvanians are connected to one another in fundamental ways.

Municipal boundaries cannot overcome those realities, nor can they override the responsibility that comes with those connections.

Now on to the practical implications of the proposed legislation. First, I believe that House Bill 2018 is an important step in leveling the playing field between municipalities and supporting the cost of services to important regional amenities and institutions which serve far beyond the boundaries of their host municipalities.

I do believe the Commonwealth has a responsibility to take revenues from a broader tax base and share it with host municipalities and counties, particularly, because it is the outdated laws of the Commonwealth, which mandate an unbalanced set of taxing authorities based on artificial classifications of local government without regard for market realities, local needs or priorities.

My point is this, that while I strongly support House Bill 2018, and I think it goes a long way toward more fairly distributing the cost of services to communities, I believe just as strongly

the entire system of local government and service
delivery in Pennsylvania is broken. And it is the
laws of that broken system, many of which are decades
old, which are forcing Pennsylvania's counties and
municipalities into fiscal distress, and which
moreover are making our state economically
uncompetitive in the global economy.

You only need to review, as

Representative Freeman already mentioned this morning,

the Pennsylvania Economy League report examining the

fiscal health of communities since 1970 to see what

lies in store for even today's more prosperous

municipalities. The report found that over 1,100, or

almost half of the Commonwealth's municipalities are

in worse financial condition than they were in 1970.

boundaries from our cities, to boroughs, to first class townships and sooner or later that decline will spread to townships of the second class. The League's report made clear to all who read it that because our outdated state laws require counties and communities to provide certain services within artificial boundaries and to raise revenue mostly from regressive sources like property tax, within those same artificial boundaries, it is the Commonwealth itself

that reinforces those little boxes I discussed. And we all know that those little boxes exacerbate our weaknesses and diminish our strengths.

While I understand that this is a terribly complex issue, and that House Bill 2018 also is a well-intentioned effort to address the core problems with our broken system, I urge you to do two things.

First, send House Bill 2018 to the floor for full debate because if House Bill 2018 becomes law you will set a precedent regarding municipal interconnectedness upon which future legislation can build.

Second, look to the recent report of the State Planning Board. One of your members, Representative Steil, worked and helped to craft that and you're all familiar with it. This report gives us a roadmap to local governance reform that will make our communities more sustainable and less dependent on fleeting largesse of federal and state governments.

The Planning Board's recommendations include some key findings. Enable counties to either contract to provide police and fire services on a county-wide and raise revenue to do so. Allow tax base sharing among municipalities to support regional

assets. Improve the existing Intergovernmental Cooperation law so that when issues arise there are communities that are already working together and there's a process to resolve those issues.

Refine the Municipal Planning Code to ensure that there's planning consistency between local and county comprehensive plans and zoning. As the Mayor said, we've had over \$50 million of public infrastructure damage in Luzerne County in four years because of storm water, strictly because of storm water falling from one community that does not believe or is not required to be connected to those who live below it.

Create a statewide health and pension plan for municipal employees. Certainly that's now being discussed through Representative DePasquale's House Bill 568.

On behalf of the constituencies that I'm representing here today I want to thank the committee for the opportunity to address you and I look forward to your questions.

Before I close I'd like to leave you with some food for thought. Recently the Campaign to Renew Pennsylvania and 10,000 Friends commissioned two statewide surveys to gauge voter sentiment of

municipal services, planning and development issues.

While it's not surprising that voters support common sense solutions, it is particularly important to note that they do not share the opinion of many elected officials that functional municipal cooperation will result in governmental Armageddon.

For example, 95 percent of voters in Pennsylvania believe that governments should be required to work together on efforts that include transportation and protection of open spaces. Sixtyfour (64) percent believe that communities should be encouraged to pool resources to deliver local services like police and fire. A wide majority, 84 percent, believe that regional police departments should be formed, and perhaps most importantly, 67 percent think that suburban communities should financially support regional amenities housed in the older communities that have spawned those same suburbs.

Pennsylvanians believe they're connected, only our laws require them to be disconnected. So as you can see, Pennsylvanians, as usual, are way ahead of their elected and civic leaders. They want those who are in a position to lead to do so by advancing the efforts to make our communities more sustainable. If we choose to do nothing and wait until our

municipal pensions are bankrupt or until many
communities have less than a cruiser full of full-time
police officers --- in fact, in Luzerne County, 29
police departments have less than three full-time
officers --- we will have no one to blame but
ourselves.

The timing is right for reform. House Bill 2018 in a good start, but structural and systemic change is required. Let us free our local officials from the outdated state laws that practically preclude cooperative decisions that could control costs, improve services and give us the resources necessary to build a brighter future.

If we don't, another generation of community leaders will be forced to wear the same chains we have forged for the ones that exist today. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

Thank you very much for your testimony and for your support of House Bill 2018. Are there any questions from the members? Representative Mensch?

REPRESENTATIVE MENSCH:

Todd, good to see you.

MR. VONDERHEID:

Good to see you again.

REPRESENTATIVE MENSCH:

I recall you being at the office and we talked about the regional planning and we talked about economic development. It was either one or the other. A couple of points, if I may. You may remember I used to have an office in Plains.

MR. VONDERHEID:

Yes, I do.

REPRESENTATIVE MENSCH:

I spent a couple days a month out there.

12 I've noticed a significant change in the city.

MR. VONDERHEID:

It really is changing.

REPRESENTATIVE MENSCH:

Yeah.

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. VONDERHEID:

Very exciting.

REPRESENTATIVE MENSCH:

It was a nice tour of the downtown. When you're talking about reforming the municipal planning code to ensure consistency between local and county comprehensive plans, one of the things that you and I talked about was how we have four --- had four, now we have five regional planning groups in western Luzerne

County.

Right.

REPRESENTATIVE MENSCH:

MR. VONDERHEID:

We're crossing borders. We're bringing in Bucks County now. We're bringing in --- the 5th includes parts of Montgomery and also Chester County. So we're beginning to do some intercounty. Is that possible up here? Have you tried?

MR. VONDERHEID:

We actually --- we had a groundbreaking effort at a bi-county open space plan at the end of June of 2003 and we've just begun to work on a bi-county comp plan. So Luzerne and Lackawanna Counties we really believe are one marketplace with the same common issues and resources. We're trying to plan flexibly. The work --- we've included dozens and dozens of the 105 or so municipalities in those two counties. We've include those officials in the process. We hope that it can spur an ability to make those things work together.

We have about seven or eight multimunicipal planning efforts going on right now.
Unfortunately only one of them includes a third-class
city. Most of them, as you've talked about in your

district, planning efforts going on in like places, or 1 2 at least places who believe they are like places, 3 small boroughs and second class townships for the most part. In Lackawanna County there are 11 municipalities as well as --- and in that 11 most of them are townships of second class except the Borough of Dunmore and the City of Scranton. And we think that is a huge step in the right direction. They feel there is an interconnectedness between those places, 10 and so it's happening. Certainly the benefits that 11 you created through the original changes I believe in 12 2001, to the MBC. When were those changes made? 13 CHAIRMAN FREEMAN: 14 Oh, in 2000. 15 MR. VONDERHEID: 16 2000. Certainly you've gone a long way 17 with the work that you're doing and all of the --- but it's the level of inconsistency that's still allowed, 18 19 that certainly has contributed to our storm water 20 damage and ---. 21 CHAIRMAN FREEMAN: 22 And which is addressed in Representative 23 Steil's bill. 24 REPRESENTATIVE MENSCH:

When you say our system of local

25

government, our means the state.

MR. VONDERHEID:

Our state, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE MENSCH:

In your endeavors 10,000 Friends, have you thought about or have you done any contrasting to surrounding states, how Pennsylvania compares?

MR. VONDERHEID:

We have. We found actually that working with Brookings and some of the other things around the country we found actually that there are more destructive commonalities between New York,

Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan and it's probably consistent of those things actually that the consistency is with the problems, and the fragmentations are one of the reasons why we have had the economic issues we also have.

There are commonalities of economic realities and commonalities of structure. When you look to the South, the Pacific Northwest, those communities in effect learned from us and came after us and set up systems of government that were much more fluid, much more responsive to appropriately distributing the costs of the service over a district. And they are being beating the pants out of us

economically. We all know that and we wake up every day and hope that our children and neighbors don't wind up moving to Portland, or California, or Texas or the South or the Southeast. I think that we finally have to come to the realization that we can have functional reform. I don't care --- as former county commissioner I don't care how many mayors are in the parade. I care how many fire chiefs or police chiefs there are. That's what matters.

REPRESENTATIVE MENSCH:

The essential services?

MR. VONDERHEID:

The essential services.

REPRESENTATIVE MENSCH:

One last question. Yesterday we were in Easton and heard from the mayors of Allentown and Easton and Bethlehem and something I hadn't really thought about before, but I've been thinking about that ever since I left the building yesterday. Is the migration that is happening from the cities into the townships --- and they cited one in particular. They will have the same problems and you say the same thing here in your testimony. So maybe it's a two-part question. One, I'm curious of your insights into what's happening with this migration, and secondly, is

that the same phenomenon that we're experiencing here in Wilkes-Barre and Scranton and other areas?

MR. VONDERHEID:

2

3

4

13

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Well, I'll start off with the second piece. We actually experienced that issue of urban abandonment, in the core valleys before it happened anyplace else. In 1972, long before there were the issues of urban decline in Allentown and Easton and many small cities. We weren't experiencing any of 10 those here, but we had a natural disaster and 14 feet 11 of water in the building we sit in today. That was 12 the first when people just said, they lived on a hill, but people who didn't live on the hill ran to the 14 hills and they just ran first and that created this gap in the marketplace right away. And then we 16 started to experience the other cyclic issues and they 17 were real issues, so and that is an issue for us. It's the urbanized core and so that's certainly what we're experiencing. But to the first point you're talking about.

And one of the county commissioners in Lehigh County lives in Lower Macungie.

REPRESENTATIVE MENSCH:

Percy Dougherty.

MR. VONDERHEID:

Percy who is a great advocate for regional cooperation, complains constantly, almost ad nauseam about the fact that there are no laws and no rules in the municipality that he lives in and no police to protect it.

So certainly it's a phenomenon that's taking place, but to me I think in Pennsylvania we have this kind of Teddy Roosevelt sense of rugged individualism. You know, we think that we are of means we can leave all of the costs behind and go someplace else. Go to the Midwest or go wherever it may be. That's wonderful to a degree, but the assumption that you can leave somebody else behind and not be connected to them is unrealistic.

And because, in fact, you both benefit from them and impact them, and so we have to be connected. I said to somebody this morning that the stadium in Lackawanna County is a lousy nine miles from where we sit right now has added to my quality of life, has increased this region's competitive advantage to attract and retain industry and create jobs, and I don't pay a penny to make sure the ladder truck to put out a fire and I don't pay a penny for the cops that service that complex. I don't pay a penny to the arena that a lot us, in fact, helped

1 build less than a mile from where we sit right now. Ι don't pay a single penny. That's a problem. really is.

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In fact, with the structure that we have because of EFT versus PFT in my neighborhood and in all of the City of Wilkes-Barre my wife and I, two working earning people. We pay for police and fire for my parents and retirees, in fact, for some folks who have greater needs than I'll ever have in my life. But because their needs don't come on a W-2, they don't pay, we pay for their services. So young families are disproportionately burdened to pay for those services in the current broken system. My basic issue is the cost of services isn't distributed the way it should be. That's the real issue. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

Thank you. Representative Pashinski? REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI:

It's a perfect seque to where I was going with this. Don't you think there's a way that we can have these tax-exempt businesses and institutions and so on take a slight piece of that responsibility? looking at it all when we start to name some of the tax-exempt areas --- as the Mayor pointed out earlier, he went to various tax-exempt institutions and asked

1 for help and they recognized the need and they were able to help out financially. Do you feel that the time is right now to relook that aspect of it all and engage in a conversation with them to find a means that might be conducive for them to participate financially in this regionalization of responsibility?

MR. VONDERHEID:

3

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Well, I think that everybody has a duty That's my best way to answer and so in many ways the large institutions that the Mayor discussed we want to have almost gladly --- again, assuming that the money is going to be spent correctly --- have stepped up and in fact, the business improvement district the city we need help design, and just implemented the last year.

I talked about 55 percent of those parcels are tax-exempt, that we derive about --- the district derives about \$175,000 from taxable parcels in June. We derived \$100,000 from contributions PILOTs from those tax-exempt entities. So in fact, in some instances they're paying more than they would if they were taxed, to participate and care for the program, put police, additional police and cleaning services and marketing services on the street.

So those who can I think in many ways

are. It's the value that, both tangible and intrinsic value that those amenities create. The arena authority, that you know well could not write a check comparable to the cost of services or its assessed value to Wilkes-Barre Township and could not write that check nor could the state nor will Riverfront Parks nor Kirby Park, which is a gift to the city for a hundred years, ever be able to carry the costs of its services.

But the fact that somebody who lives on Third Ave in Kingston, which is closer to Riverfront Park than I am, doesn't pay for it, but I do even though they're in it as often as I am. That's the disconnect. And so, yes, entities, institutions, usually the hospitals and schools, during good times, they just right now our colleges the small schools in all of our communities in Pennsylvania are doing well because of the population inside that 18 to 20 demographic. In five years college presidents tell me that that's going to be down and the budget is going to get tight again.

So today I'm thankful for that. Tomorrow?

I'd rather not write that check and have great

institutions filled with young people learning. When

the Mayor talks about losing \$40,000 because Wilkes

took a building, we think \$40,000? What is \$40,000? It tells you how tight the municipal budget it. That \$40,000 matters.

Now, I and you now walk on that street where there are a hundred young people walking out of the building every day, bagels, coffee, go to restaurants across the street and we love it. It's enriched our cities and made other people interested in investing. It is illustrative of how difficult it is when you're looking for \$40,000 when you can take a hundred people and more and put them on the streets.

things of great value. It almost forces us --- it just makes us think in boxes, and that's the burden. So yes. So institutions with means should contribute to the cost of services, but that shouldn't --- that focus on --- to me the focus is on more appropriately sharing the value of those, having everybody who benefits pay to support it.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

As a follow-up to Representative

Pashinski, I think one of the benefits of this

legislation is that it moves the contentiousness that

sometimes happen when you're dealing with non-profits

ponying up somehow to help out the community. It

sounds like you've had great success in this community with your better endowed with non-profits.

MR. VONDERHEID:

In which times?

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

In good times.

MR. VONDERHEID:

In times when there was leadership they

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

Yeah.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

trusted.

MR. VONDERHEID:

But that honestly would go away with leadership that they didn't trust. As Representative Harris said before, they could go away.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

But when they can see that their resources have been given to the community and used well, that's all-important. Representative Ross has made a very good point, too that not all non-profits are created equal. You have the universities or notfor-profit medical facilities but you also have a Salvation Army or you have a shelter or you have, as 24 you mentioned, properties that really are public assets such as the park system, all of which could not be expected to come up to the plate and provide some sort of payment in lieu of taxes.

MR. VONDERHEID:

2

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

I actually mentioned that we are a non-profit, but we own real estate and this is a (c)(6) and pays taxes. Actually a (c)(4) and pays property taxes, designed specifically because we thought we should. An example is we run and developed taken a former facility with 60,000 square feet and it began with 12 start up businesses, but now it's just 12 and one that's graduated, and now it has 125 employees. It is probably the most successful small city incubator in the state, if not in the country. Wonderfully done.

We pay property taxes, fully occupied, fully functional and that is a --- we're willing to try to do that, but every day as our resources get tighter, it gets much harder to subsidize and maintain success, and that value is worth so much more than the \$150,000 we lose, so much more than that, but there are no ways to bail us out.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

Let me touch on something else. 24 mentioned in your testimony the need for greater cooperation and I agree with you a hundred percent on the part of municipalities sharing services and finding other ways to create regional partnerships of these issues.

We have an odd structure of local government in Pennsylvania in that --- as you mentioned, unlike the south or the west where counties are active participants in municipal functions, here the county is really sort of marginalized to human services, court services and a very limited number of specific local government responsibilities. All the others, police, fire, the local municipality has that responsibility.

You, obviously, are a very progressive—
thinking former county commissioner and we've seen
reports from beyond our region of having the county
play an active role in helping. In your conversations
with other county commissioners, during your tenure in
office, did you see or come across activity on the
part of commissioners to weigh into these issues or
did they say, no, that's not my responsibility?

MR. VONDERHEID:

Well, I think that there is an intellectual interest, and a lot of folks who --- yeah. I think that many of them are like we were, struggling so hard to provide the mandated services in

the existing frame, you know, in a tax averse state,
in a tax averse general assembly. Nobody cared.

Everybody knows that. But to say to the county
commissioners, do something else without the revenue
stream to support it, I think it's something that they
can't get to the do without the revenue.

In fact, in the work many of us have been doing through 10,000 Friends sitting at the table with all municipal associates, that's one of the barriers that we can't get to the do without knowing how to pay for it and that's really crippling.

I do think though that there's probably a difference, which is why there would be people who were able to --- if you were able to enable counties to deliver hard service, police, fire or deliver or contract through to provide services on a countywide basis. But not every, not all 67 counties would believe that's a priority, or choose to do so. But I think that the second class, two-As, three and four would probably would be very interested in that opportunity.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

What do we need to do at the state level to create that environment? You did mention some very enlightened commissioners who obviously see the

problem we're addressing. I think I really don't speak for the other members here, but I think there 3 tends to be a rather hesitance on part of many county commissioners even in the second and third class counties that say, you know what, we're going to draw up a plan to have regional police force and it's almost like walking into a hornet's nest. You know you're going to experience resistance from all the police chiefs and from local forces, even some well-10 intentioned council members or supervisors are going to say, we don't want to lose local control. We don't 11 12 want to give up our prerogatives. How do we create 13 that atmosphere?

MR. VONDERHEID:

Well, what I'd say is in the counties, you are the first and last part of the criminal justice system. You call 9-1-1 ---

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

Sure.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. VONDERHEID:

adjudicating and housing, the impact of the criminal system. In the middle, the piece that actually reduces the cost on the back end, is we police our streets correctly and deploy our resources correctly.

We have no impact on that. In Luzerne County, we have \$230 million annual budget. Of that about a hundred is human services, so \$130 million general fund to operate with. \$90 million of that goes to the criminal justice part, our prison and court system. So there's \$40 million to do everything else, and the county has 325,000 people on the second largest piece of geography in the Commonwealth.

effective, and that that \$90 million could be appropriately spent or used, if there was cohesive system to reduce crime, and as I said, we had 52 police departments Luzerne County, so if 20 municipalities choose to allow the State Police to service their needs --- whether they do that effectively or not is another conversation, but they don't pay a fee for that service any more so than anybody else does. But of those 52, 29 have less than three people in a full-time police department.

There are some municipalities that we've been working with who are declining to participate in regional efforts who have an eight percent closure rate on cases, and while I don't mean to denigrate those folks, there are Girl Scout troops who can have eight percent closure rates. They are simply making

citations. They don't have the ability to actually close cases because there's two cops.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

What are populations? 4,000, 5,000?

MR. VONDERHEID:

We have one of the greatest populations of boroughs. We have a couple first class first class townships, Plains, Hanover, but most of them are boroughs. Literally the entire west side, we have 14, or 15 boroughs. All of which, ten years ago had ten cops. Today they have two.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

They probably have substantially higher populations?

MR. VONDERHEID:

Absolutely higher populations. Today they all share the same part-timers, same part-time cops who make \$8 an hour to go up and down the west side and east side of this river every day and they're not actually sure what municipality they're in.

People from suburban Philadelphia, they look at me and they don't know what I'm talking about.

You got to go to the Mon Valley. I think you got to come to coal country, and you got to understood that we actually for the first time in 77

years, we have two years of consistent growth in our population. The Eastern seaboard is moving to us as certainly you've experienced in the Lehigh Valley We're not prepared to deal with it. We're not prepared to grow correctly, because the system won't let us do it.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Very good. Any further questions from the staff members? If not we thank you very much for your testimony.

MR. VONDERHEID:

Thank you for coming, everybody.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

Thank you. Our final testifier is David Ross. Take your time to get yourself situated, but whenever you're ready, come up to the podium.

In addition to Mr. Ross' testimony, we also have testimony from the Pennsylvania Alliance that we'll pass out to the membership. The gentleman before you is Dave Ross, the Public Policy Officer of Pennsylvania Association of Non-profit Organizations. We thank you for coming, and feel free to proceed with your testimony.

MR. ROSS:

Thank you, Chairman Freeman, Chairman

Pashinski, and members of the House Local Government
Committee, Representative Harris. I'm here today and
I presume that my testimony will be a little bit
different than others' testimonies. My purpose here
is that we support this Bill, HB 2018, because we
think it's a wonderful idea.

It takes pressure off the charitable nonprofit community in a way that will help to smooth the
relationships between charities and the communities
they serve. I represent the PANO, the Pennsylvania
Association of Non-profit Organizations. We're a
statewide membership organization serving the
charitable non-profit community. We have over 700
members and many of your members have members, so we
have a very broad reach.

And I can't speak directly to each one of your districts or your particular city, but what I can speak to is that this bill will have broad statewide implications that I think, I believe, will allow the non-profit community and the local governments to better work together. The idea of PILOTs, payments in lieu of taxes by charities has been a problem for the charitable community, has been an issue, for many years.

Act 55 is the Institutions of Purely

1 Public Charities Act. Act 55 is the Act that governs how charities operate and how we qualify for taxexemptions. There's five core criteria that charities 3 we have to meet, advance the charitable purpose, donate or render gratuitously a substantial portion of its services, benefit a substantial and indefinite class of persons who are legitimate subjects of charity, and relieves --- and this is one of the more important ones, and I say that because it's the reason 10 I'm here. Relieves the government of some of its 11 burden.

The purpose of Act 55 in 1997 --- many of you may have been a part of that, but its purpose was to clarify what non-profits have to do to benefit the community, to serve the community and receive taxexemptions for that purpose. All these five criteria must be met.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Act 55 prevented a great deal of litigation after its passage. In fact, the litigation of which caused the bill to be --- to actually be drafted and eventually become the law. The point being that there are clear standards in place of why charities receive tax exemptions.

And the charitable non-profit community 25 is very broad. It reaches --- I'm sorry, it is

1 hospitals, colleges, human services, arts and culture, and each one of these various types of non-profits, types of 501(c)(3)s impact the local community differently, but they have an economic benefit.

3

5

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

So once you combine the fact that charities relieve government's burden, serve the local community, serve a function that government either is unable to provide or is no longer willing to provide, combine that with the fact that non-profits as a structural type of entity can perform the services that they provide differently, economically, than say 12 the same services provided by a government agency directly, it's a little bit more efficient; it's a little less expensive for non-profits to serve that function.

If non-profits don't have the resources they need to accomplish their missions to serve the community they either have to eliminate those services, cut back on the services, or do more with less. Either way, the services --- either the quality suffers or the amount of services suffers.

PILOTs deplete charitable resources and 23 those services still have to be provided by somebody. To someone, by someone. Those services, many of them, are either --- some of them are essential government

functions; some are not. But those that are not are important government functions, are important community functions.

All of that aside, with respect to the arts community, with respect to colleges and universities, with respect to hospitals, most municipalities look at those non-profits as kind of a double-edged sword.

But what I am suggesting is that if we can eliminate them if we can eliminate this inherent conflict between local governments and the 501(c)(3) charitable non-profit community we can focus on that which we do well. We can focus on the benefit. We can focus on the services that we provide. We're both doing the same thing from different directions, from different sides, going to the same place.

And the reason that there is a perception, that there are so many non-profits in so many of our distressed urban communities is because they serve that constituency and they don't pick up and move when the neighborhood changes. They stay and continue to serve that community.

There's also something in my written statement about how non-profit arts particularly --- because that information has already been researched

--- can serve as an economic engine for growth and many of you may have been involved in projects like that, but non-profits as a whole are a significant employer, and those employees pay taxes.

Many non-profits pay taxes on various aspects of what they do, and it is an economic benefit to having them in your community. The problem is not that there's too many charities and too many non-profits. The problem is that there's not enough employers, so how can we work together to improve the quality of life in our communities so that it attracts those employers?

Will the employers want to come into a community that doesn't have social services, that does not have adequate hospitals, that does not have research facilities attached to those hospitals, or colleges, universities, arts venues? Who's going to want to relocate there?

So my point is we're both working the same purpose, we're both working towards the same goal just from two different directions and this bill, HB 2018, has the ability to bring both parties to the table, to bring both sides to the table, remove the tension and allow us better to work together.

PILOTs are being paid by charities all

over the state, all across the state, millions upon millions of dollars and whether that's helpful in the long run or not, is hard to say, but in my opinion personally I am of the belief that it's not --- that PILOTs are not necessarily --- they're not --- they deplete charitable resources.

Charities and the broader non-profit community receive government funds and requesting PILOTs from non-profits, only to then provide grants later, just moves the same money around in circles. More people have to handle it; more the administrative costs. This bill streamlines that process. I mean, the money is going to the same place anyway. The state provides grants to the 501(c)(3) communities, the (c)(3) community provides those services.

Well, they also provide PILOTs; many of them pay PILOTs to the local communities. If the state would just pay for PILOTs those state and local communities the administrative costs on all of that, less litigation, less anxiety about, you know, whether the charity's going to be able to meet its budget, whether they have to hire more attorneys for --- the list just goes on and on.

So my point is that this bill streamlines that whole process and prevents all of that ill will.

So that's my seven minutes, and I think this bill has something that can actually make a difference, and that's it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

We thank you for your testimony, and for your support of the legislation. I think --- you know, one of the things I was trying to achieve in this legislation, too, was to ease that tension between not-for-profit organizations and municipalities. And you'll be pleased to know that just about every local official who has testified before us either today or yesterday noted that they recognize the importance of those non-profits, whether it's a college, whether it's a hospital, whether it's other charitable organizations or government entities, the county.

They know the importance of it, they want to maintain it within their borders. They recognize and quality of life kind of factor, but also recognizing that with this legislation, that those are truly regional assets and it shouldn't be up to the local host municipality to shoulder all the burdens of providing services with an eroded tax base as a result. I think this legislation really does get at the issue without creating tensions that we see every

time the issue of PILOTs comes up. Are there questions in terms of that? Representative Mensch.

REPRESENTATIVE MENSCH:

hair, I'm a brand new legislator. I'm not as familiar with Act 55 as I might be. I've been Chairman of the Medical Association and their PILOT to me is alien as a concept. I didn't realize until yesterday that there were actually payments in lieu of. With a 501(c)(3) granting, why would anyone then decide to pay a PILOT? Is it a corporate conscience, a community conscience?

MR. ROSS:

Yes. There is actually a couple of reasons. One is in a sense of community, a sense that they're part of the community. They don't want to see the community ailing like that, but another part of it is pressure, and whether it's good public policy or bad public policy, pressure is there.

REPRESENTATIVE MENSCH:

Would it be primarily medical institutions and universities, colleges?

MR. ROSS:

I'd have to say that it's --- probably
the majority of it is colleges, universities and some

kind of broad coalition of charities. And as far as
the broad coalition charities they typically don't
have a lot of property. As far as whether it's --- if
we're looking at how much property they hold and
whether a couple million dollars here and there or a
couple hundred thousand dollars here and there is
going to make a difference in the community, the
question is what's the opportunity cost of those
dollars?

What else could those dollars have gone for differently and when are you going to have to pay for those services, whether it be this year or five years from now, when the reason is if in fact there was no youth services of some sort. At some point the bill has to be paid and the question is, is it better to leave that money in the charitable non-profit community for services or is it better to handle a short term need?

As far as what types of organizations are paying PILOTs, yes, you're in. It's hospitals and colleges. The broad charitable community has not contributed as much but predominately because they don't own the property. They do own some. It's not as large, but keep in mind --- and I'm sure you realize this, the reason they're holding --- the reason they

1 have property is they're typically using that property 2 to provide the services they provide, typically, and 3 taxing that property that is potentially, less opportunity for the growth and development of that regional asset. So with respect to a hospital, if you take their property away you don't have much left. Wе have a lot of employees who have some great intellectual assets, but without the hospital building they can't provide the service.

REPRESENTATIVE MENSCH:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

To your broader point, when you were talking about universities and helping with the revitalization of the community and they push the inner city out, if that's the right description, but at the same time they rehabilitate that entire area. Crime goes down, certain other services, the arts community, other services have come in and of course, new businesses. So it's really a renaissance that's been fueled by the universities that are beginning to take back old properties while expanding the 21 universities. So I understand your point. I understand it's not happening every time, but that's a good example.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

Representative Pashinski.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI:

Yeah. I wanted to pursue that just a little further. Do you think there ever is a time though, when a certain institution like certain universities --- University of Pennsylvania has done a marvelous job, but they have a \$4 billion endowment, you know. I mean, they're extremely well-financed and they're more than solid.

But the fact is that most of the cities are experiencing shortfalls in those kinds of services, and during this time of need is what we're all struggling with. If the money were available, it wouldn't be an issue. Is there --- would you say there's a various stratus classifications where some non-profits just work on such a shoestring that they could never even consider a PILOT as opposed to, say, Blue Cross, which is a non-profit up here?

It's hard to balance that one out when you got a \$460 million surplus. And I think, you know, they're are good neighbor. They want to help out and they're a tremendous asset to the area. So they're probably one of the largest employers locally. It's just a matter of the cities need some help. It's a way that they can offer that help without a government band-aid, so it serves a number of

purposes. But my question is, do think there might be different layers of stratus where a PILOT would be appropriate and where a PILOT would not be?

MR. ROSS:

I think the answer to that question I have to go back to Act 55. Act 55 provides that PILOTs are voluntary. Voluntary agreements are core to what lead to the passage of that bill as well as its enumerated requirements. As far as strata, as far as --- I don't know if there really --- if there could be a bright line rule or a threshold.

I would say that Act 55 has a \$10 million threshold, and where a particular burden shifts but that's with respect to using the federal tax-exemption and that has to be assumed --- it's actually a technical minor aspect of it. But I think it does have to do with the size, the scope and those voluntary agreements.

But once again I don't --- I mean, what is the budgets of most Pennsylvania --- small

Pennsylvania cities, third class cities? And then when they start looking to their non-profit community, how much are they getting out of that? And then if we consider what the value of that is, not just in dollars but what those dollars would have otherwise

paid for, it's a value judgment. It has to do with whether the community can do without something else and whether there's other ways to fund that.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI:

Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MENSCH:

If the medical association decides that it wants to do a PILOT, is it a one-time or does it become a binding agreement? How does that work?

MR. ROSS:

There's the Pittsburgh Public Service

Fund, which is over the course of three or five years.

In Philadelphia they've had some kind of arrangement
now for many years. I don't know what the current
status of that is, but I can say that most PILOTs are
being paid individually, independently, individually
and not a matter of public record, because there's
another aspect to this. And that's as a donor, would
you want to know that the donation that you just made
is just going to be turned back over to the same
institution that you would otherwise pay taxes to?

It's a matter of donors' choices. Why they're
donating to charities as opposed to paying taxes on
those charitable dollars.

REPRESENTATIVE MENSCH:

If this House Bill were enacted tomorrow, and Act 55 still governed your constituency, what do you think will be the behavior and attitude with the future potential for PILOTs?

MR. ROSS:

2.4

Being that this bill does not speak to the other half of the PILOTs issue, the charitable presence, I don't see that it will prevent charities from entering further agreements, further PILOT agreements, but it certainly would abate some of the need.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

it been your experience, dealing with not-for-profit organizations, that typically the kind of support they would give to a PILOT is usually tied to either a) infrastructure within their surrounding environs or, two (sic), some kind of tangible connection to the mission of the institution, and that they're more willing to engage in this kind of PILOTs if they can show their trustees or their donor base that this actually enhances the operation of the facility?

MR. ROSS:

I'm not sure of the mission part. It's a tough sell.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

At least in terms of infrastructure.

MR. ROSS:

Yeah. Infrastructure, yes. Many colleges and universities throughout Pennsylvania, for example, do provide their own security or police type of service. They do have their own community services. That is not to say that they don't tap into the community services of the local government, services in the larger community, but that goes back to the fact that they're an economic hub, if you will. But to answer your question ---.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

You can get that information for us if you have any.

MR. ROSS:

Okay. I'll look ---.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

It just strikes me in terms of Lafayette College, they've shown great willingness to work with the City of Easton on a variety of things that they feel will enhance the attractiveness of the college. For instance, they work in partnership with the county and the city to try to improve the corridor that leads to the campus, because they recognize that that's the

1 first thing that hits families as they're coming to take a tour. So if that corridor is a dilapidated, blighted, part of the city, they recognize that's not good for the college. So they're willing to make those kinds of PILOT investments in those kinds of ventures, because it's mutually beneficial. would assume that's where a lot of the PILOTs find their basis.

MR. ROSS:

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm not sure I can actually say that most of the PILOTs that I've seen at least have been more about the local government asking for PILOTs and expecting the entire non-profit community to pay accordingly. Yeah. I mean, I know there's a lot of separate agreements between particular colleges or particular hospitals that are that exact scenario. Although recently in Lancaster, I believe it was, the city government was asking for PILOTs to do 25 percent of what would otherwise be due in property taxes by these non-profits, which is a significant request.

The non-profit community had a major problem with that for many reasons, but some nonprofits actually did work with the city on PILOTs and one --- I heard that one was actually paying substantially more than it otherwise would have had to pay, simply because they felt that it was their civic responsibility.

Now, you're also talking about a type of institution that is based on civic responsibility, is based on serving the community so you're --- so, yeah, I would think that PILOTs do have something to do with their infrastructure needs or their ties to the community, but ultimately it comes down to the resources they have available.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

Are there any further questions? Seeing none, we thank you very much for your testimony and the support your organization has to this legislation. We appreciate it. We are the end of our testifiers. I would, however, like to turn to Representative Pashinski. Any closing comments?

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI:

Just once again, thank you,

Representative Freeman and the members of the Local Government committee for coming to Wilkes-Barre and sharing your expertise and have our mayor, our sister city, Scranton, could come to testify.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

Suburb of Wilkes-Barre.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI:

The suburb of Wilkes-Barre. Don't say that when he's here. But we do think of ourselves regionally and we are very pleased that they took the time to come up here and share this very important piece of legislation. We hope certainly we can address it and get it passed. It will certainly be helpful to Wilkes-Barre and to Scranton. I thank you very much. And also thank you to all the testifiers for coming out today.

CHAIRMAN FREEMAN:

I would like to thank all the testifiers, the members who are present, and staff as well and again, thank our host community, the City of Wilkes-Barre and Representative Pashinski for assisting us. This concludes our hearing for today. Our next hearing is scheduled for February 28th in the Borough of Gettysburg, a community where almost 80 of its properties are tax-exempt. And we have a hearing set for Pittsburgh as well. So this concludes the hearing and thanks everyone and this hearing is adjourned.

* * * * * * *

HEARING CONCLUDED AT 12:30 P.M.

24 * * * * * * *