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BILLS 160170, 160171, 160172, 160173, 160174, 160175, 160176, 160508, and 160509
RESOLUTION 160180

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Good afternoon, folks. We're going to start. Can I have everyone's attention. Thank you all very much.

To our friends and citizens in the audience, sorry for the delay, but it's kind of the function around here. We always have unforeseen incidents that pop up, but we will try to move this as expeditiously as possible.

First of all, I would like to say for the record there apparently has been some information that was put out through mass media and regular traditional media and other that there will be a vote on sugar tax or sugar tax-related activity today. That is not the case. I have no idea where that rumor or that information came from. It was never on the agenda to move sugar tax out today. So for those of you that are anticipating such a vote, that is not scheduled for today. It will happen pretty soon, but not today.
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So thank you all for your
cooperation. We obviously welcome you regardless of why you decided to come down here. We really enjoy you being here.

This is a public hearing on the Committee of the Whole regarding Bills No. 160170, 160171, 160172, 160173, 160174, 160175, 160176, and Resolution No. 160180. And there will be testimony from the Administration on Bill No. 160508 and 160509. Thank you very much.

Mr. Stitt, please read the titles of the bills and resolution.

THE CLERK: Bill No. 160170, an ordinance to adopt a Capital Program for the six Fiscal Years 2017 through 2022 inclusive.

Bill No. 160171, an ordinance to adopt a Fiscal 2017 Capital Budget.

Bill No. 160172, an ordinance adopting the Operating Budget for Fiscal Year 2017.

Bill No. 160173, an ordinance
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amending Section 19-1806 of The
Philadelphia Code, entitled
"Authorization of Realty Use and
Occupancy Tax," to further authorize the Board of Education of the School District of Philadelphia to impose a tax on the use or occupancy of real estate within the School District of Philadelphia, under certain terms and conditions.

Bill No. 160174, an ordinance
amending Section 19-1801 of The
Philadelphia Code, entitled
"Authorization of Tax," to further authorize the Board of Education of the School District of Philadelphia to impose a tax on real estate within the City of Philadelphia, all under certain terms and conditions.

Bill No. 160175, an ordinance
amending Chapter 19-1500 of The Philadelphia Code, entitled "Wage and Net Profits Tax," by revising certain tax rates, under certain terms and conditions.
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Bill No. 160176, an ordinance amending Title 19 of The Philadelphia Code, entitled "Finance, Taxes and Collections," by adding a new Chapter 19-4100, entitled "Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Tax," under certain terms and conditions.

Bill No. 160508, an ordinance amending Title 19 of The Philadelphia Code, entitled "Finance, Taxes and Collections," by adding a new Chapter 19-4100, entitled "Non-reusable Beverage Container Tax," under certain terms and conditions.

Bill No. 160509, an ordinance authorizing the transfer in appropriations for Fiscal Year 2017 from the General Fund, the Mayor - Office of Community Schools and Universal Pre-K to the General Fund, the Director of Finance - Contribution to School District, under certain terms and conditions.

Resolution 160180, resolution

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc. providing for the approval by the Council of the City of Philadelphia of a Revised Five Year Financial Plan for the City of Philadelphia covering Fiscal Years 2017 through 2021, and incorporating proposed changes with respect to Fiscal Year 2016, which is to be submitted by the Mayor to the Pennsylvania Intergovernmental Cooperation Authority (the "Authority") pursuant to the Intergovernmental Cooperation Agreement, authorized by an ordinance of this Council approved by the Mayor on January 3, 1992 (Bill No. 1563-A), by and between the City and the Authority.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Mr. Stitt.
Today we continue the public
hearing of the Committee of the Whole to consider the bills read by the Clerk that constitute proposed operating and capital spending measures for Fiscal 2017, a Capital Program, and a forward-looking Capital Plan for Fiscal 2017 through
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First, we will hear testimony
from the Administration regarding a
proposed amendment to the Fiscal Year 2017 Capital Budget and the Fiscal Year 2017 through Fiscal Year 2022 Capital Program.

Mr. Stitt, can you please call
the name of the first witness.
THE CLERK: Anna Wallace.
(Witness approached witness
table.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you. How are you?
MS. ADAMS: Hi. Good
afternoon, Council President Clarke and members of the Committee. My name is

Anna Adams and I'm the City's Budget
Director. I'm here today to offer amendments to Bill Nos. 160170 and 160171, the proposed FY17 to '22 Capital Program and the FY17 Capital Budget, respectively.

On behalf of the
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From a technical basis, the amounts within the Division of Aviation contain carry-forward amounts that are too high and are proposed to be reduced to match their current progress on spending these funds. The Water Department's federal and state funds are proposed to be adjusted to reflect the most recent grant awards from federal and state entities. The Water Department is in the process of receiving state-sponsored grants in the form of Multimodal Trust Fund grants and federal grants from the Federal Highway Administration in partnership with the Streets Department. The amendment also moves certain titles "OGOVO," "FO," and "SO" funding sources from the budget
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From a programmatic basis, the amendment moves $\$ 1.3$ million worth of funding within the Streets Department from streets reconstruction to $\$ 850,000$ for critical roof and window replacements within the Traffic Operations Center, $\$ 200,000$ for traffic control equipment, and \$250,000 for street lighting improvements.

The amendment also removes $\$ 500,000$ in planning funds within the City Commissioners' funding budget in FY17 and '18 intended for the launch of the new voting machines in FY19, which are deemed no longer necessary. An additional $\$ 500,000$ is proposed to be added to the Commerce Department for Penns Landing improvements. One million dollars in total City funds will leverage PennDOT funds and funding from the

William Penn Foundation for a study
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called the Preliminary Engineering
Project, which will be managed by the Delaware River Waterfront Corporation, or DRWC. The study will analyze potential development and improvement options for the Penns Landing area over I-95 from approximately $I-676$ interchange south to Washington Avenue. The Administration's ITEF line will use $\$ 500,000$ to support the remainder of the project to ensure that the general obligation-supported Capital Budget remains neutral.

These changes impact the overall FY17 budget with a decrease of 407,094,954 due to the reduction of the carry-forward lines within the Division of Aviation. By proposing these changes to the FY17 budget, the amendment will also decrease the FY17 to '22 Capital Program by the same amount.

I respectfully ask that the Committee consider and adopt these proposed amendments.

Thank you for the opportunity
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to appear before you this afternoon, and I'm happy to answer any questions that you may have.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you very much, Ms. Wallace.
Do we have any questions from
members for Ms. Wallace on the Capital
Program?
(No response.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Okay. Thank you very much for your testimony.

MS. ADAMS: Thank you.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: So
next up we'll have Mr. Dubow and
Mr. Tulante to testify on the container tax bill.
(Witnesses approached witness
table.)
SOLICITOR TULANTE: Good
afternoon, Council President Clarke --
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Could you hold on one second, please. (Brief pause.)
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COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Folks, we're going to -- real briefly, let me explain what we're going to do. We have a series of bills that are on the Calendar where there's absolutely no controversy, which is pretty good. So because we have a timeline in terms of passing our budget, we're going to go into a public meeting. We're going to move those bills to start the process of moving towards final passage, just to kind of give you a sense of what we're doing.

So it's basically real estate taxes. We're assuming that nobody wants us to raise real estate taxes. U\&O, which is a business tax, the assumption is nobody wants us to raise that. Capital Program is pretty consistent with our plan. And wage tax, the assumption is that people want us to continue to lower that.

So we're going to move those non-controversial bills. So at this
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And the Chair recognizes
Councilman Henon for the purpose of making a motion to move those bills out of Committee.

COUNCILMAN HENON: Thank you, Mr. President. I move that Bill No. 160170, 160171, 160173, 160174, 160175 be voted out of Committee with a favorable recommendation.
(Duly seconded.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Councilman, make a motion with suspension of the rules.

COUNCILMAN HENON: You want to suspend the rules?

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Yes.
COUNCILMAN HENON: Okay. We're going to vote them out with a suspension of the rules as to be heard at --
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COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: You know what, we have to adopt the amendment for the Capital.

Oh, okay. It's my fault. I'm not reading my script. It's okay. It's my fault. I got a little bit too much going on right now.

So we are still in the public
meeting. Councilman Henon, now that we're in the public meeting, I recognize the Councilmember for a motion on the amendment to Bill No. 160170.

COUNCILMAN HENON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do offer an amendment to Bill No. 160170. A copy of the amendment has been circulated to all members of the Committee, and I move the adoption of the amendment be approved.
(Duly seconded.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you. It's been moved and properly seconded that the amendment to Bill No. 160170 be approved.

All those in favor say aye.
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Those opposed?
(No response.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: The ayes have it. Bill No. 160170 has been amended.

And the Chair recognizes Councilmember Henon for a motion on Bill No. 160170, as amended.

COUNCILMAN HENON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move that Bill No. 160170, as amended, be reported from this Committee with a favorable recommendation and further move that the rules of Council be suspended as to permit first reading of this bill at our next Council session.
(Duly seconded.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you. It has been moved and properly seconded that Bill No. 160170, as amended, be reported from this Committee with a favorable recommendation
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All those in favor say aye.
(Aye.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Those opposed?
(No response.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: The
ayes have it and the motion carries. Bill No. 160170, as amended, will be reported from this Committee with a favorable recommendation and request that the rules of Council be suspended so as to permit first reading at the next session of Council.

The Chair now recognizes Councilmember Henon for a motion on the amendment to Bill No. 160171.

COUNCILMAN HENON: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. I offer an amendment to Bill No. 160171. A copy of the amendment has been circulated to all members of the
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Committee, and I move for the adoption of the amendment.
(Duly seconded.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you. It has been moved and properly seconded that the amendment to Bill No. 160171 be adopted.

All those in favor will signify
by saying aye.
(Aye.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Those opposed?
(No response.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: The ayes have it. Bill No. 160171 has been amended.

The Chair again recognizes
Councilmember Henon for a motion on 160171, as amended.

COUNCILMAN HENON: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. I move that Bill No.
160171, as amended, be reported from this
Committees with a favorable
recommendation and further move that the
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rules of Council be suspended as to permit first reading of this bill at our next Council session.
(Duly seconded.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you. It's been moved and properly seconded that Bill No. 160171, as amended, be reported from this Committee with a favorable recommendation with a suspension of the rules.

All in favor of this motion say
aye.
(Aye.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Those opposed?
(No response.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: The
ayes have it and the motion carries. Bill No. 160171, as amended, will be reported from this Committee with a favorable recommendation and a request that the rules of Council be suspended to permit first reading at the next session of Council.
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The Chair now recognizes
Councilmember Henon for a motion on Bill No. 160173.

COUNCILMAN HENON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move that Bill No. 160173 be reported from this Committee with a favorable recommendation and further move that the rules of Council be suspended to permit first reading of this bill at our next Council session.
(Duly seconded.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you. It's been moved and properly seconded that Bill No. 160173 be reported from this Committee with a favorable recommendation and further moved that the rules of Council be suspended so as to permit first reading of this bill at the next session of Council.

All those in favor say aye.
(Aye.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Those opposed?
(No response.)
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COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: The ayes have it and the motion carries. Bill No. 160173 will be reported from this Committee with a favorable recommendation and a request that the rules of Council be suspended to permit first reading at the next session of Council.

The Chair now recognizes
Councilman Henon one more time for a motion on Bill No. 160174.

COUNCILMAN HENON: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. I move that Bill No. 160174 be reported from this Committee with a favorable recommendation and further move that the rules of Council be suspended to permit first reading of this bill at our next Council session.
(Duly seconded.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you. It's been moved and properly seconded that Bill No. 160174 be reported from this Committee with a favorable recommendation and further moved that the
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All those in favor of the motion will signify by saying aye.
(Aye.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Those opposed?
(No response.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: The
ayes have it and the motion carries.
Bill No. 160174 will be reported from
this Committee with a favorable
recommendation and a request that the
rules of Council be suspended to permit
first reading at the next session of Council.

The Chair recognizes
Councilmember Henon for a motion on Bill No. 160175.

COUNCILMAN HENON: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. I move that Bill No.
160175 be reported from this Committee with a favorable recommendation and
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further move that the rules of Council be suspended to permit first reading of this bill at our next Council session.
(Duly seconded.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you. It has been moved and properly seconded that Bill No. 160175 be reported from this Committee with a favorable recommendation and further moved that the rules of Council be suspended to permit first reading of this bill at the next session of Council.

All those in favor say aye.
(Aye.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Those opposed?
(No response.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: The
ayes have it and the motion carries.
Bill No. 160175 will be reported from
this Committee with a favorable
recommendation and a request that the
rules of Council be suspended to permit
first reading at the next session of
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Council.
We have concluded the public meeting. We will now go back into the public hearing, where we will hear testimony on Bill No. 160508. We are reserving June 8 th as a date for public testimony in regards to the newly introduced bills. If you wish to testify on these bills, please go visit Council's website and call the Chief Clerk for further instructions or you can obviously call your Councilmember.

Mr. Stitt, can you please call
the name of the first witness on this bill.

THE CLERK: The City Solicitor.
SOLICITOR TULANTE: Good
afternoon, Council President Clarke, members of the Committee of the Whole -COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Hold on.

Before we take the testimony, the Chair recognizes Councilwoman Reynolds Brown.
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Mr. President. I do have opening remarks on this container bill, if $I$ may. COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:

Absolutely.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: I need to say good afternoon to my colleagues and all of those who have joined us this afternoon out of your demanding work schedules to hear how we continue to figure out how we fund universal quality pre-K, how we fund community schools, and how we rebuild our rec, libraries, and parks with a guarantee of the inclusion and participation of MBE and WBEs. This afternoon continues that friendly debate.

Your opening remarks bear
repeating in that we need to apologize for the inaccurate info on social media which indicated that we might be voting on these bills today. This afternoon we are calling on my colleagues to not vote on the proposed bills, but simply to hear and listen to the testimony as the
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homework and the discussion continues.
I remain strong in my belief that the ideas up for consideration are all on the table, for my experience tells me when we have multiple ideas on the table, we typically end up with better outcomes for the citizens of our city. And so I am asking my colleagues to do as you always do, maintain an open mind, ask the relevant questions related to this bill, and carefully consider this option, along with Mayor Kenney's proposal, as we stack these two options together and seek to win a win-win scenario.

In the words of Councilwoman Maria Quinones-Sanchez, often she says this does not have to be an either/or. We can actually end up with an "and," a win-win for everybody.

Thank you, Mr. President.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilwoman.
Please proceed with your
testimony.

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc. SOLICITOR TULANTE: Yes. Good afternoon, Council President Clarke and members of the Committee of the Whole. I've been asked by Councilmember Reynolds Brown to present brief testimony on the Bill No. 160508. That's the non-reusable beverage container tax. And my testimony is very brief because for the same reasons in which I testified to Council before regarding the sugar-sweetened beverage tax, I believe strongly that Council has authority to enact this measure. We've considered some of the same potential arguments; that is, sales tax, uniformity, and having reviewed them and looking at the legislation, we're very comfortable that Council has this authority and if there's any challenge, that we'll be ready for it.

I'm happy to take any
questions, but with the blessing of Councilmember Reynolds Brown's staff, I prepared an opinion and she's waived any privilege with respect to that, and so
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I'm happy to testify regarding any aspect to that opinion.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Mr. Tulante.
Mr. Dubow, you guys are not
testifying?
MR. DUBOW: I am.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: On
this measure?
MR. DUBOW: Yes.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Please proceed.
MR. DUBOW: Good afternoon,
Council President Clarke, members of the Committee. I'm Rob Dubow, the Director of Finance. I'm joined at the table by Mr. Tulante and Mr. Feder and close to the table by --

SOLICITOR TULANTE: This is
Richie Feder. I apologize.
MR. DUBOW: -- Anna Adams, our
Budget Director, and Frank Breslin, the Revenue Commissioner.
As Mr. Tulante explained, Bill
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160508 would authorize the imposition of
a 15-cent-per-container tax on non-reusable beverage containers. The bill would tax all containers, with the exception of those that contain alcohol, baby formula, any product the primary ingredient of which is milk, and any non-dairy milk substitute. The proceeds of the tax are intended to provide sufficient resources to fund expanded pre-K, community schools, and substantial new investments in park, recreation, and library facilities.

On behalf of the Mayor, I
acknowledge the difficult task of
determining how to generate the funding necessary for those crucial programs. The Mayor appreciates in particular the efforts of Councilwoman Blondell Reynolds Brown in crafting and proposing the bill before us. To that end, we have given
the bill serious analysis and consideration. The Administration does have significant reservations, and for
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the reasons I'll detail in this testimony, we can't lend our support to the bill.

A key concern we have with the
legislation is that it's not projected to provide sufficient funding to appropriately fund these programs or provide any opportunity to provide the additional dollars to the Pension Fund. The projections for the amount in the bill would -- the projections for the amount in the bill would produce totally slightly over $\$ 61$ million for a full year. In contrast, when fully implemented, the total cost of the three programs would be $\$ 89$ million. The shortfall in funding for the three key programs created by the passage of this legislation as opposed to passage of the sugary drinks tax would leave a hole of over $\$ 27$ million and require the programs to be cut by about 30 percent. That would likely mean some combination or fewer pre-K slots, less support for

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc. providers to become high-quality providers, fewer community schools, and reduced investment in park, recreation, and school facilities, and no contribution to pensions. That's an outcome the Administration can't support. We're also concerned about the aggressive nature of the tax. It applies to virtually all containers, making it very difficult to avoid. Of the 61 million in projected revenue, for example, about 16 and a half million would come from bottled water. Unlike the sugar-sweetened beverage tax, which would leave healthier options on tax, the container tax would be imposed at the same level on all containers regardless of health or size. Thus, a small juice box or bottle of water would be subject to the same tax as a 2 liter bottle of soda.

The Administration believes
it's critical to provide sufficient
recurring funding to pre-K, community
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schools, and rebuilding community
infrastructure. We believe the sugary
drinks tax is the best and fairest way for providing that revenue.

That concludes my testimony, and we'd be happy to answer any questions you might have.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you very much, Mr. Dubow. I just had one quick question. So in your fourth paragraph, you talk about the key concern of the legislation not providing sufficient funding to appropriately fund the programs. So basically you're saying unless you get whatever 3 cents will bring, 3 cents per ounce will bring, you will not be able to provide sufficient revenue to fund all of the programs?

MR. DUBOW: So what we're saying is that at $\$ 27$ million below what we project --

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: No.
I asked you very specific. Are you
saying that anything short of 3 cents per
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MR. DUBOW: I think anything
that generates less than $\$ 90$ million would not sufficiently fund the program. COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:

Which is 3 cents per ounce.
MR. DUBOW: So --
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: This
is another one of those real simple questions. I know you're very crafty. You and I have been around a long time, but that's a pretty, pretty, pretty clear question that usually requires a pretty clear answer.

MR. DUBOW: So there is
analysis done by Council's technical
staff, which we agree, that shows that
2.5 would also generate sufficient revenue.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: So
now you're going to put it back on us.
MR. DUBOW: No. You asked the
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question. I just gave the answer. I was just answering your question.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: I
got to tell you, there's a reason why
you've been here through, what, four Administrations?

MR. DUBOW: This is the fourth.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
You're pretty good.
MR. DUBOW: Thank you.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: I've
been here a little long too, though. I've been here for a minute.

MR. DUBOW: That was like
getting a free pizza.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: So
basically your projections for the 89 -is it 89 million?

MR. DUBOW: Yes.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Is 3
cents per ounce?
MR. DUBOW: As I said, there
was another analysis, which we agree,
that 2.5 --
1
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COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: No,
no. I'm asking very specifically. So you're saying 2.5 will generate 89 million?

MR. DUBOW: Yes.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Okay. All right. I just want to get it clear. Okay. So anything below 2.5 will not?

MR. DUBOW: We have to look at what we'd have to cut.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Which would be problematic. Okay. Thank you.

The Chair recognizes Councilman
Greenlee.
COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: Thank
you, Mr. President.
Good afternoon.
MR. DUBOW: Good afternoon.
COUNCILMAN GREENLEE:
Mr. Dubow, I just had a couple of
questions on your concerns about the container tax. I'm not going to get into
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the money aspect. Other people may raise that. Obviously that's important, but --

MR. DUBOW: We think so.
COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: -- I'll
take it from another angle.
I know when you've talked about
sugar tax, you've talked about
consumption level. I think you're projecting 55 percent drop-off; is that --

MR. DUBOW: That's correct. At
3 cents, yes.
COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: Is it
fair to assume that given that the container tax hits just about all beverages, that the consumption level would not fall off nearly that much, because people have to drink something?

MR. DUBOW: Right. So I think
the analysis here assumes about a 30 percent reduction.

COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: 30
percent?
MR. DUBOW: So it does assume a
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much lower fall-off, which we thought was reasonable.

COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: Where would they fall off to, $I$ guess is the question? Like with the soda, I think the assumption is that folks will stop drinking soda or at least buying it in Philadelphia. What would be --

MR. DUBOW: So you could still, for example, buy fountain sodas. Those wouldn't be covered, from what I understand, by the bill. You could still decide to go outside the City to buy. So there are ways -- there are other choices. There are just fewer other choices.

COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: Do you think it's likely or logical that for just 15 cents a container that people will go outside the City?

MR. DUBOW: So what we saw, one of the things we saw with what happened in Baltimore, there we saw that the increase from 2 to 5 cents resulted in a
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decrease in consumption. So we think
that, yes, going to 15 cents would result in a decrease in consumption.

COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: Now, I'm
not going to get -- it seems like
different people are defining
"regressive" different ways. I know you think this tax would be regressive for the reasons you say. I think there's some folks that think regressive because of it hits -- the sugar tax would hit certain communities harder than others. So I guess we can debate what regressive means, but as far as fairest, you say, We believe the sugar tax is the best and fairest vehicle.

If the container tax hits just about everybody instead of just certain portions of the community, as was shown in the chart that Council President had, I guess, a week or so ago, why is that less fair? Why would --

MR. DUBOW: So our concern here
is what you talked about, is people have
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much fewer options to get around this tax. So if you're talking about impact on low-income neighborhoods, they will have fewer choices for not paying this tax.

COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: But the object is for all communities to take advantage of pre-K, community schools, rec centers, right? So wouldn't an argument be that being fair is to make all those communities have to pay the tax that's funding those services?

MR. DUBOW: So both of these taxes would hit people in every area.

COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: I think it's been stated that the soda tax would hit some communities harder.

MR. DUBOW: Yeah, and what we said, though, is that there's a choice with the sugary drinks tax, that you can buy other products that are not sugar sweetened. With this tax, you really wouldn't have that option unless you were buying milk products.

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc. COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: But
wouldn't that make a more consistent assumption of money that's coming in every year? Because doesn't -- I think historically the last few years soda has dropped off -- intake has dropped off anyway, right, 30 percent? So I guess what I'm saying is, people are going to keep drinking something. So isn't there a more -- to fund these good programs, we all agree are good, wouldn't this have a more consistent forecast of what money would come in? Again, people are going to probably drink something.

MR. DUBOW: Right. I think that's why the projected fall-off at the start is much smaller with this tax, because we're assuming that fewer people would avoid it. So that's already built into each projection.

COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: Okay. And I know you bring up the health. I'm sorry. This will be my last question. You bring up the health issue. I know
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before we've heard from the
Administration that that wasn't their focus. Their focus was bringing in the money. Now, I know we can debate what this brings in and all that. So in a sense, with all due respect, aren't you changing the goalpost a little bit by now talking health? I know a lot of people have talked health, but the

Administration, that was not -- the Mayor made it clear in the beginning this was all about bringing in money.

MR. DUBOW: It is definitely
about bringing in money. Our point is that the container tax actually adds tax to drinks that are healthy, so -COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: So you're saying health is a factor? MR. DUBOW: It's not why we were imposing the tax, but obviously we're concerned about the health of Philadelphians. COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: Okay.

All right. Thank you.
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Thank you, Mr. President.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilman.
The Chair recognizes Councilman
Jones.
COUNCILMAN JONES: Thank you,
Mr. President.
And good afternoon.
MR. DUBOW: Good afternoon.
COUNCILMAN JONES: First of
all, let me thank my colleague Blondell
Reynolds Brown for presenting options to discuss, deliberate on. I think this is the forum for those kinds of discussions. So I applaud her for taking the initiative to do that.

I have some questions related to the difference between a soda tax being oppressive and a container tax not being oppressive. I get confused when a grocery tax on all items that are in plastic containers versus soda, and I don't know if philosophically you have thought about this at all, but it just

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc. confuses me to see one in one light and another that is more wide-reaching in a different light. Do you have any -MR. DUBOW: I think I agree with your underlying point, that because a container tax applies to more products and is harder to avoid, I think of it as more regressive.

COUNCILMAN JONES: And I also
thank her for having a briefing to
discuss a lot of this. My staff
attended, and they used the Baltimore model and the Berkeley model, I believe. Have you looked into Baltimore and Berkeley? So in Baltimore, what was their net out of their tax?

MR. DUBOW: So Baltimore
generated, $I$ believe, about $\$ 11$ million from the tax. They were at 5 cents. We've heard different reports about how much it costs them to implement.

COUNCILMAN JONES: What were
those figures?
MR. DUBOW: So we've heard as
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much as 3 million and then we've also heard that it didn't cost nearly as much as that. But I think the 11 million we've heard consistently from how much they generated and at -- sorry. Go ahead.

COUNCILMAN JONES: And under this proposal, it was brought up about health. I think Greenlee mentioned that. Does Baltimore's model include water?

MR. DUBOW: I believe it does.
Yes, it does. It includes water. It actually also includes alcohol. So it's a different tax. I mean, it has a different base.

COUNCILMAN JONES: And that was
a part of their net?
MR. DUBOW: Yes.
COUNCILMAN JONES: So we're not
proposing alcohol?
MR. DUBOW: We are not.
COUNCILMAN JONES: And we're not proposing water, I hope?

MR. DUBOW: Yes. Water would
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be taxed under the container bill.
COUNCILMAN JONES: So I would
be concerned about water being an essential part of anybody's diet under any circumstances, sugar, no sugar. Water is a part of that. So if that were exempted from it, because that would have to be a consideration for me, have you done numbers if you take water out?

MR. DUBOW: Yeah. So I think
about 16 and a half million of the 61 roughly million comes from water. So then the net would go down to about 45.

COUNCILMAN JONES: So another concern was looking at an option of how we collect and being more aggressive about our collection. Have we juxtaposed those numbers on top of what is being proposed?

MR. DUBOW: Yeah. I don't
think between the two taxes, I don't think there's a substantial difference in what the cost would be. I'll ask the Revenue Commissioner to come up and talk
1 5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc.

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc. about that. He would know more detail than I would.

COUNCILMAN JONES: While he's coming up, because I know that clock is going to come out at some point, what would be the difference between the Berkeley Philly model? Do they also do water in that, in Berkeley?

MR. DUBOW: In their --
COUNCILMAN JONES: Container tax.

MR. DUBOW: They don't have a
container tax. They have a
sugar-sweetened beverage tax. So it
wouldn't include water.
COUNCILMAN JONES: So they
didn't do water?
MR. DUBOW: No.
COUNCILMAN JONES: So if we are
for health, you know, I'm wondering fresh fruit juices also are being covered under that?

MR. DUBOW: Correct.
COUNCILMAN JONES: And we want

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc. to encourage that. Because here's my concern: One, revenue. Where would the shortfall be made up at, and if those projections come close to what would be needed based on the goals that we all agree on. And then, number two, I did travel -- my granddaughter made a special request of lunch from pop-pop, and I came across the East Falls Bridge coming down Ridge Avenue towards Allegheny. From Allegheny and Ridge all the way to her school, which is on Broad Street, I could not find a healthy lunch for her and beverage to go with it. So if we're talking about health, we cannot ignore there are some food deserts here that, impacted one way or another, aren't very healthy right now. And so whatever solutions we come up with need to address some of those options.

So back to the revenue side.
COMMISSIONER BRESLIN: So your
question was about enforcement?
COUNCILMAN JONES: My question
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COMMISSIONER BRESLIN: Looking
at the dollar amounts?
COUNCILMAN JONES: Yes, money,
revenue, income.
MR. DUBOW: So we included \$1.8
million in the Revenue Department's budget for collections. So you can net that out of the 95 million we projected for sugar-sweetened beverage. I think
that for the container tax, the cost would probably be roughly the same. So you have 1.8 million off of the 61 million. You'd wind up around 59. COUNCILMAN JONES: So under your conservative effort, if we did container which excluded water, what would that net be?

MR. DUBOW: So if we exclude water, that would take us down to about 45. If you take out the cost of the 1.8 million, you get down to about 43.2, but that 1.8 we've kind of put in our budget
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COUNCILMAN JONES: My time has been concluded, but I will come around on the second round.

MR. DUBOW: Thank you.
COUNCILMAN JONES: Thank you,
Mr. President.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilman.
The Chair recognizes
Councilwoman Reynolds Brown.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Thank you,
Mr. President.
Good afternoon, Administration.
MR. DUBOW: Good afternoon.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Thank you,
City Solicitor, for your testimony and for affirming that we have legal standing should this measure indeed become law.

To our wizard of numbers, Rob
Dubow, let's --
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MR. DUBOW: I thought you were talking about the Budget Director.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: What did
you say?
MR. DUBOW: I thought you were talking about the Budget Director when you said our wizard of numbers.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: For
clarity purposes, define for me "regressive."

MR. DUBOW: So I think when you look at tax policy, regressive would be having a larger impact on lower income taxpayers.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: So if I accept the definition as you just presented it, would you agree that research shows that consumption of sugary-sweetened beverages based on research is higher in lower income communities?

MR. DUBOW: I think that is what the research shows. It also shows that those communities are more targeted
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with advertising and that that $I$ think is part of the reason the consumption is higher.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Accepting
that as well, then do you believe then that the sugary-sweetened beverage rate -- we won't use the four-letter word tax -- is indeed regressive?

MR. DUBOW: I think --
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Yes or no.
Is it regressive?
MR. DUBOW: So I'd like to give
a fuller answer than just yes or no, if that's okay. I think for people who continue to consume those beverages and pay it, yes. But I think people have a choice and will have choices to consume something else.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: For
clarity purposes, define for me
"sustainability."
MR. DUBOW: For tax?
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Yes.
MR. DUBOW: Predictability over
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a long term at relatively level amounts.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Do you accept what some might view as the hypotheses that soda consumption is on the decline?

MR. DUBOW: Yes. Soda
consumption is on the decline.
Sugar-sweetened beverages as a whole are not declining as rapidly as soda is, and we've built in a decline each year in our projections.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: All right,
then. In general, do you believe that broader taxes are preferable than very narrow taxes, in general?

MR. DUBOW: In general, I
actually -- I don't have a real strong point of view on that either way. I mean, we really would look at what taxes are projected to generate.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: All right.
Do you think there's value in casting a wider net so that there's, what I call, shared sacrifice than to have a measure
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that potentially narrowly hits one particular sector?

MR. DUBOW: So I think while there's some merit to that argument, I also think that in this case, you're giving people more of a choice to avoid the tax with the sugar-sweetened beverage, which is narrower because it doesn't apply to as many products.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: So did I
hear you say that you actually believe in shared sacrifice?

MR. DUBOW: I do, and I think that you'd have shared sacrifice with either one of these measures.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Okay. Do you believe that a non-reusable beverage container tax is broader than a sugar-sweetened beverage tax, since you agree that shared sacrifice has value?

MR. DUBOW: I think that the way that it's defined in this legislation, it applies to more products. COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Okay.

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc. When determining your internal revenue projections, what collection rate are you assuming for a non-reusable beverage container tax?

MR. DUBOW: So actually we're using the projections from Council that assumed 30 percent either fall-off in consumption or non-compliance or avoidance, so the kind of 30 percent general fall-off from what you would project if you collected every dollar based on current consumption.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: So then help me understand why do you believe that the Administration would be able to collect this tax at 30 percent, which is perplexing for me, if you're confident you'll be able to collect the sugar-sweetened beverage tax at 90 percent?

MR. DUBOW: So actually the equivalent of the 30 percent fall-off for sugar-sweetened beverage is actually 65 percent, because we have the 55 percent
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fall-off in consumption plus 10 percent non-compliance. So that's the equivalent
of the 30 percent. COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Okay.

That's it for me in terms of prepared questions.

Thank you, Mr. President.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilwoman.
The Chair recognizes
Councilwoman Quinones-Sanchez.
COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Thank
you.
Good afternoon.
MR. DUBOW: Good afternoon.
COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: You've been here for multi Administrations. Can you recall a time when we have debated revenue that we need three years from the date it's proposed?

MR. DUBOW: Yes. We've had
discussions about, for example, the business taxes where we legislated taxes far into the future. We had Five Year
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COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: For a new initiative.

MR. DUBOW: For a new initiative, $I$ don't remember the specific discussion.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: So I want to get to the point around regressive, because I think that both of these measures, container and the sugar beverage tax, is regressive. But I want to kind of highlight Councilman Jones' perspective around choice.

We keep talking about people having a choice, and as I visit Wawa, 7-Eleven and the bodegas, 98 percent of what is in those stores would be taxed. And so when we talk about deserts and the options, there is a diet option, there is water, and then there is juice that is three times more expensive. So I have a hard time in this debate. I've had such
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a hard time getting my hands around when we say to people have choice, because the fact of the matter is that we don't -folks in neighborhoods that $I$ represent will not have that choice.

But let's talk about the water notation that you make. The Water Department asked for a water increase of how much?

MR. DUBOW: It was a multi-year increase and I'm not sure of the --

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: About 11 percent.

MR. DUBOW: Over four years, I think.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Yes.
Two years. Eleven percent. It was like a 5 and a half and a 6 and a half. And part of the justification they used was because people were drinking bottled water as opposed to tap water. That was part of their challenge for the rate increase, right?

MR. DUBOW: I didn't see that,
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but I believe it.
COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Okay.
So if we're going to tax water at 15 percent, do you think we would have an increase in our water consumption, our tap water consumption?

MR. DUBOW: So I don't think we'd have a dramatic increase in our tap consumption, no.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: So you don't think it would offset people going back to tap water as opposed to --

MR. DUBOW: I don't think so. COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Okay. As it relates to the income amount that we're debating in terms of what the needs are, one of the issues for us or at least for me is we're building out a plan, all plans that we agree. Why the stickler for needing the full amount up front and not getting started so that we can justify more revenue later to the voters? MR. DUBOW: To be clear, the 89 million is actually the fifth year
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number. The first year is about half -COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: You told me 48.

MR. DUBOW: That's right. So
it does ramp up a little bit over time. The 48 included more than just these three initiatives. It included the Energy Authority initiative and it included contributions to the Pension Fund. These numbers, 89, no longer include the Energy Authority initiative, so that's part of the reason for the difference. But it does ramp up over time.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: I think
again -- and we've -- one of the things
that particularly on the loan piece is how long is it going to take us to build capacity to be actually able to expend on the capital side this type of initiative?

MR. DUBOW: On rebuild?
COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Yes.
MR. DUBOW: So I can call
someone from the Managing Director's

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc. Office to give more detail, but we have done a lot of the kind of build-up work already, and that work will continue between now and when we would do the first bond issue, which would be in January. So I actually think by the time that we got to doing a bond issue, we would be ready to go.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: So your assertion is that we do the bond measure in January and by June 30th, we will have expended the first hundred million?

MR. DUBOW: No. We don't
actually assume that we'll do the next borrowing for two years. So we assume that we'd spend that hundred million dollars over two years. COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: It's a hundred million plus what you're leveraging privately that we still don't know the amount.

MR. DUBOW: That's right. Yes.
And we assume that that would be spent within two years.
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have a better idea of what that amount is going to be since we have not been told?

We've been told that there's money committed. We don't know.

MR. DUBOW: I don't think we can give a specific amount here today.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: SO, again, we're being asked to take a vote on something we all agree on on something that's not finalized.

MR. DUBOW: I think that you've been briefed on rebuild. You know the details of that.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: I have the details on the expenditures. I don't have the details on the income, other than trust me.

MR. DUBOW: I don't think it's trust me. I think we've said that we've had discussions with outside sources and that those discussions made it clear that we are going to get a substantial amount of money. What we haven't said is that
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COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Will
that be finalized before we're expected
to take a vote?
MR. DUBOW: I don't know, but
we'll get back to you on whether that
will be finalized.
COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Okay.
Thank you, Mr. Chair.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilwoman.
The Chair recognizes Councilman
Domb.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: Thank you,
Council President.
Good afternoon.
MR. DUBOW: Good afternoon.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: I just wanted
to verify that my numbers are accurate.
MR. DUBOW: I'm sure they are.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: I'm not so
sure.
I'm talking about the soda tax
for a minute, just to make sure. We
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talked about this in prior meetings. I just want to make sure we're on the same page.

At a half a cent, my numbers say that generates $\$ 31$ million roughly. And at 1 cent, we generate 57 million. And at 1 and a half cents, we generate 76 million and --

MR. DUBOW: I don't have the half cent, but for 1 cent, 57.8; for 1 and a half, 77 million.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: And this is a question I had asked several weeks ago. I'm not saying I'm in favor or against any tax. Just in general from the math standpoint, it seems to me that at 1 cent, you generate the most money, 57, because at half a cent, you generate 31.

MR. DUBOW: The most money per cent, you mean?

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Yeah. Your fall-off is only $\$ 4$ million. You go to the next half and the fall-off is more dramatic, but going from 1 and a half to
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2 is not that much, and going from 2 to 3 is minimal. So I'm just trying to understand why we even look at that.

MR. DUBOW: Because going from
1 and a half up to 2 and a half, it's another $\$ 20$ million, which funds a lot of programs. So even though it's generating less per cent than the first cent, the revenue that it generates is important for the programs.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: So the 1 and
a half to 2 and a half generates, I guess, about 19 million going the penny. So the first penny gets 57.

MR. DUBOW: Right.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: I just wanted to make sure I had the numbers.

MR. DUBOW: You have it right.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: Thank you.
Thank you, Council President.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilman.
The Chair recognizes Councilman
Oh.

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc.
(No response.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: The Chair now recognizes Councilman Squilla. COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: Thank you, Mr. President.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
You're welcome, sir.
COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: Question
on the taxes as far as the container tax at 15 cents, and I do appreciate too Councilwoman Blondell Reynolds Brown for putting out some options for us as Councilmembers, looking at opportunities to raise money for these great programs. Since it's on everything, so it's 15 cents, it would work the same way as a case of water. So the 15 cents for each bottle in the case?

MR. DUBOW: Right. Yes, for each bottle in the case.

COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: Would that be considered one container, the whole case?

MR. DUBOW: No. It would be
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for each bottle.
COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: How about
for like juices in like -- are the
schools exempt from this?
MR. DUBOW: Yes. The School
District is exempt.
COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: So when
they buy the juices, that will not be included?

MR. DUBOW: Correct.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Point of
information.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Point of information, Councilwoman
Reynolds Brown.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Yes. I
would like to remind my colleagues that we do have the School District scheduled to offer brief testimony to fully address Councilman Squilla's question.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilwoman.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Thank you.
COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: Thank you.
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With those exemptions, then do the dollar amounts change? You said it went from 70 million to 40 million for without water?

MR. DUBOW: From 61 to 45.
COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: 61 to 45.
MR. DUBOW: Right.
COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: And then
if we couldn't -- why can't we include the liquor into the container tax?

MR. DUBOW: I think because it's overseen by the LCB, but there are two lawyers at the table, so I'm going to let them answer that.

SOLICITOR TULANTE: Yeah.
There's a real good case to be made that if you -- liquor is preempted under -because the state regulates so heavily liquor, that if you impose an additional tax on liquor as opposed to other taxes that are imposed statewide, that there
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would be an issue.
COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: Would that be challenged by the state?

SOLICITOR TULANTE: No. We would advise that we don't -- we wouldn't be comfortable with Council's authority with respect to that.

COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: Okay. And
so the -- because it would be a lot more containers if you included liquor.

So the revenue generated from this container tax at the 15 cents would be sufficient or not sufficient to run the programs?

MR. DUBOW: It would not be sufficient. It is about $\$ 27$ million short of funding for those three programs. So we'd have to pull back and figure out how to pull back on the programs.

COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: Is it possible to use both taxes, the container tax and the sugar tax?

MR. DUBOW: I think --
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MR. DUBOW: I think there would be administrative nightmares, and then from a policy perspective, we'd be taxing the same product two different ways.

COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: One you're taxing what's the container. The other one you're taxing what's in it.

MR. DUBOW: Right.
COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: I don't know. I'm just asking questions out there since we have options. It's good to find out what the total options would be affordable to us come time for a vote.

When we go through the process of collection, is it going to be collected the same way as both the beverage tax and the --

MR. DUBOW: Yeah. I think they'd be pretty similar. I think there are more distributors who would be subject to the container tax. So there would be a slightly wider network, but in
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COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: I mean, we hear about the loss of jobs from the sugar tax, the possibility of loss of jobs from the sugar tax. Did Baltimore see any loss of bottlers or anything in that instance that we know of?

MR. DUBOW: They did see a loss
of bottlers. I think two factories closed, I think. I think there were two factories that closed and said part of the reason was this tax.

COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: Factories
that were in Baltimore, do we know?
MR. DUBOW: I think they were
in Baltimore.
COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: And --
MR. DUBOW: And I read this a
long time ago, but $I$ think...
COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: Right. So
they closed or they moved out; do you know?

> MR. DUBOW: I think they
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closed.
COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: Okay. So do we see that as a negative effect? Were there taxes lost, jobs lost? Obviously wage tax lost. Do we know how many people lost jobs over that?

MR. DUBOW: I don't. We can get back to you with that number.

COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: Okay. All right. Thank you very much.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilman.
I'm sorry. I was going to jump in, but it's not my turn yet.

The Chair recognizes Councilman Henon.

COUNCILMAN HENON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Based on the conversation here, which tax, the soda or sugar-sweetened beverage and the container taxes, which one taxes more products in our grocery stores?

MR. DUBOW: The container tax.
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COUNCILMAN HENON: Are you
analyzing or have you fully analyzed how many more products or will you be analyzing?

MR. DUBOW: No. I think the big difference is water and fruit juices that are not taxed under the sugar-sweetened beverage tax and I guess diet sodas too not taxed under the sugar-sweetened beverage tax and are taxed under the container tax.

COUNCILMAN HENON: Is it accurate that the container tax would be at the same rate for juice boxes that you might have for kids as a Big Gulp?

MR. DUBOW: Yes. It would be the same for both.

COUNCILMAN HENON: Are Big
Gulps taxed?
MR. DUBOW: I'm sorry.
MS. ADAMS: Just to clarify, I think the Big Gulps actually wouldn't be subject to the container tax because that's a fountain drink and I think it's
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just the sealed containers that would be.
So actually someone getting a Big Gulp would not be paying any tax under the container tax.

COUNCILMAN HENON: So the juice boxes would --

MS. ADAMS: Juice boxes you'd actually pay more under the container tax bill than you would under --

COUNCILMAN HENON: I was just going to ask. My next question was, fountain drinks are exempt; is that correct?

MR. DUBOW: Correct.
COUNCILMAN HENON: So would it be fair to say that the bodegas and the corner stores that don't tend to have soda fountains, would they be at a competitive disadvantage to larger chains like 7-Eleven's or Wawa's or any other chains?

MR. DUBOW: Go to Wawa where you have fountain drinks or McDonald's where you fountain drinks. Those

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc.
wouldn't be taxable, whereas the containers at the bodegas would be.

COUNCILMAN HENON: So the
bodegas, the corner stores, the commercial corridors would have at least a disadvantage; is that correct? MR. DUBOW: I think that's correct.

COUNCILMAN HENON: If this tax comes in at revenues that you project and no other estimates that have been circulated, in the best-case scenario what programs would you cut?

MR. DUBOW: So I think if --
we'd probably have to look at doing it proportionately. So we would have fewer pre-K seats, probably fewer community schools, and less investment in our parks, recs, and libraries.

COUNCILMAN HENON: Speaking of parks and recreation, $I$ have a question here on the -- so how much revenue is
needed to generate in order for the fund -- in order to fund the bonds that
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will be taken out for the Mayor's
initiatives?
MR. DUBOW: So for the -- hold on one second. I have that. So for the rebuild bonds over the life of our Five Year Plan would cost about $\$ 56$ million. COUNCILMAN HENON: That's all our parks, recreations, and libraries? MR. DUBOW: Yes.

COUNCILMAN HENON: And what is the impact on our bond rating if the City does not generate the revenue proposed through the container tax or the SSB?

MR. DUBOW: So if we did not get either one of those taxes, we would not issue the bond.

COUNCILMAN HENON: If we didn't generate the proposed revenue.

MR. DUBOW: Are you saying if we implemented the tax and it came in lower than we --

COUNCILMAN HENON: Right.
MR. DUBOW: So if it was lower
but not a lot lower, it wouldn't really
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COUNCILMAN HENON: So what are
the consequences if we're overly
optimistic on projections?
MR. DUBOW: So the worst
consequence is that we wind up running deficits, and that's not just a consequence for kind of how rating agencies look at it but how we operate the government.

COUNCILMAN HENON: I know
Councilman Jones was talking a lot about
health benefits. Are there any health benefits to a container tax?

MR. DUBOW: So we don't think
so, and in fact, it would in some way
steer people away from water and fruit
juices, which are healthy.
COUNCILMAN HENON: Because
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MR. DUBOW: Will be taxed.
COUNCILMAN HENON: Is it
accurate to say that we're taxing some necessities of these healthy products that we want people to drink under the container tax?

MR. DUBOW: Yeah. We believe that, and we believe that they have fewer choices to move to other products with the container tax.

COUNCILMAN HENON: They were talking about water, health supplements like pediatric, nutritional drinks. Would they all be included?

MR. DUBOW: In this tax I think that there's an exemption -- well, water would be taxed. Milk products would be exempt. So if it's a product that has milk in it, it would not be taxed. But alcohol and milk are the things that are exempt. Everything else would be taxed. COUNCILMAN HENON: But health supplements --
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MR. DUBOW: Health supplements
are not excluded.
COUNCILMAN HENON: They're not
excluded. So they would be taxed.
Pediatric, nutritional drinks, they would be taxed?

MR. DUBOW: (Mr. Dubow nods
head in the affirmative.)
COUNCILMAN HENON: Are they
taxed under the sugar-sweetened
beverages?
MR. DUBOW: We plan to offer
amendments to make it clear that they would be exempt.

COUNCILMAN HENON: So you
would --
MR. DUBOW: We would exempt
them.
COUNCILMAN HENON: Okay. Thank you.

I have no further questions at this time.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilman.
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The Chair recognizes
Councilwoman Bass.
COUNCILWOMAN BASS: Thank you, Mr. President.

Good afternoon.
MR. DUBOW: Good afternoon.
COUNCILWOMAN BASS: I just have
a couple of questions here. I just want to make sure that we get the facts out and that we clarify things that may be a little bit misconstrued, because what we cannot afford to do is have any level of buyer's remorse. So after we vote for whatever it is that we want to vote for, whether it's soda tax or container tax or whatever it may be, that we get it right. We have to get it right. And I think that there's a good deal of information out there that's not completely accurate and I wanted to just clarify, and you can correct me if I'm incorrect on this. But I think that there's a common assumption that universal pre-K means that every child in the City of Philadelphia is
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MR. DUBOW: So our projection is that under our plan, there would be 10,000 more spots available. That doesn't get you to universal within three years, but we also think that after three years, we'll kind of reexamine -- the plan was always to reexamine the program, see whether it was working to see whether we expand it further.

COUNCILWOMAN BASS: Is it
10,000 or is it $6,500 ?$
MR. DUBOW: 6,500 funded by the City, which we think will be matched by another 3,500 by the state to get us to 10,000.

COUNCILWOMAN BASS: And of
those 10,000 spots, what's the universe? What's the range of young people, threeand four-year-olds who would be able to have the benefit versus that which is in the universe here in Philadelphia that
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MR. DUBOW: So I'm going to ask other people to answer that question, Otis Hackney and Mr. Engler.
(Witnesses approached witness
table.)
MR. HACKNEY: Good afternoon. Can you repeat your question, please.

COUNCILWOMAN BASS: Certainly.
Can you give us some idea of what the universe of three- and four-year-olds are here in Philadelphia that would require -- well, they all require universal pre-K, but what's the range? Because I've heard numbers anywhere from 1,400, which the School District says is the current wait list for pre-K in the School District's numbers, versus I think it was up to 27,000 , was it, from the Administration?

MR. HACKNEY: Good afternoon.
I'm Otis Hackney, Chief Education Officer for the Mayor's Office.

The number is about 17,000
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COUNCILWOMAN BASS: Say again. MR. HACKNEY: That fall under 300 percent poverty.

COUNCILWOMAN BASS: Okay. And what's the number that don't fall under the 300 percent? Because there will be, as I understand, an allotment available for those who are above 300 percent.

MR. HACKNEY: Well, in terms of the world of -- it's about another 10,000 that would be above that range.

COUNCILWOMAN BASS: Okay. So I'm just throwing a number out there. Let's say for a family of four, if the number is, $I$ don't know, $\$ 30,000$ that will be required to qualify for universal pre-K under the Administration's plan, if you're at $\$ 31,000$, you would not qualify
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and, therefore, you would fit into the additional 10,000 numbers that you just referred to?

MR. HACKNEY: When you -- I'm sorry. Repeat the question. Are you talking about in terms of salary or just overall numbers?

COUNCILWOMAN BASS: The overall
number.
MR. HACKNEY: So your
question -- repeat your question, please.
COUNCILWOMAN BASS: So there are 10,000 slots that are available for pre-K and that's based on being 300 percent or below; is that correct? No?

MR. HACKNEY: Go ahead, finish your question and then I'll fix, I think, or correct whatever you're asking.

COUNCILWOMAN BASS: So there are -- so it's 300 percent or below that will qualify for universal pre-K in the 10,000 spots that are available; is that correct?

MR. HACKNEY: No.
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COUNCILWOMAN BASS: Okay.
MR. HACKNEY: So in terms of
there's 17,000 three- and four-year-olds
that are not in quality pre-K centers
across the City. We're looking to
decrease that number of children that are not in -- and increase the number from that 17,000. So in terms of the total need, so the total need of children that need to be in pre-K is about 27. So I think that's where you're getting that 27.

COUNCILWOMAN BASS: Right. So
the total universe is 27,000 and then there's 17,000 that would qualify?

MR. HACKNEY: Correct.
COUNCILWOMAN BASS: Okay.
MR. HACKNEY: Or my -- that's correct.

COUNCILWOMAN BASS: Yes, no, maybe?

DEPUTY MAYOR ENGLER: I'm
sorry. Jim Engler, Deputy Mayor for Policy and Legislation.
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So if there were to be an
income cap at 300 percent of poverty, there's about 17,000 kids that fall underneath that 300 percent. What the Administration has proposed is a program that gets towards universal access that is accessible to everyone regardless of income, most specifically because of those families that might fall just outside of the income guidelines. So quality child care for a parent of a child age three or four is about $\$ 272$ per week. So for a single mother who has two kids in quality child care, if she's making over $\$ 1,175$ per week before taxes, she would not be eligible for any subsidy under a program that required a 300 percent of poverty income cap.

COUNCILWOMAN BASS: Okay. But the income cap does not apply?

DEPUTY MAYOR ENGLER: The
program that the Administration has talked about does not include an income cap.
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COUNCILWOMAN BASS: It does not
include an income cap, okay. I just
wanted to be clear, because $I$ think a lot of people are under certain assumptions that every child in the City of

Philadelphia is going to be able to get universal pre-K, and that's not accurate, and every child is going to qualify for one of these high-quality spots.

Can you also give me some sort of an idea of what the rollout is going to be of those 10,000 slots?

MR. HACKNEY: Well, the initial rollout is going to be 2,000 seats next year starting in January, and then we would add an additional 2,250 seats per year to get up to the 6,500 City-funded slots.

COUNCILWOMAN BASS: So as a District Councilmember, if I think of 2,000 seats next year, I'm thinking, okay, so if you divide it by the ten districts, there's 200 seats per district, approximately. So can you give
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MR. HACKNEY: Well, we would have a very targeted rollout in terms of how we would identify certain areas of the City based on some risk factors to get the children in those communities to be in the quality pre-K program.

COUNCILWOMAN BASS: Okay.
So I'll come back around on my next round. Thank you.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilwoman.
The Chair recognizes
Councilwoman Gym.
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: Hi. Good
afternoon. So I am interested in
questions about the soda tax in particular and its impact on pre-K. So I am, like many of my colleagues here, fully in support of universal pre-K. I
think we're working towards that as a city. I see that as not only an enormous

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc. anti-poverty measure, it's an education measure. It also puts women back to work, and that's one of the biggest factors in allowing our families and especially our single female heads of household to come back to work and begin earning income. So I'm very interested in the impact on pre-K.

So my colleague had talked about the differential between 1 and a half to 2 and a half cents, and you said that that differential was about \$20 million; is that right?

MR. DUBOW: That's right.
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: And I generally don't tend to look at things just in a percent measure, because I'm sure that economically that's a difference, but $\$ 20$ million. So how much is the Administration planning to spend on each pre-K student?

MR. DUBOW: \$8,500.
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: So at $\$ 8,500$
and a 20 million gap, we're talking about
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a differential of almost $2,300,2,350$
students?
MR. DUBOW: Yeah. If we
took --
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: 2,350
students.
MR. DUBOW: Right. If we took
all of the cut out of pre-K, you would be down to about 4,100 seats.

COUNCILWOMAN GYM: So losing
$\$ 20$ million out of the budget would mean, if we were looking at it from a pre-K perspective, that we could not educate 2,352 students that we had hoped to bring into a quality pre-K program?

MR. DUBOW: That's correct.
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: And that
total in the first three years, the total
number of pre-K students that we're
hoping to bring into the program is
6,500?
MR. DUBOW: City-funded spots over the three years.

COUNCILWOMAN GYM: Correct,
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6,500. So that 2,352 students not being impacted out of 6,500 means that we're not fulfilling our mission by over a third.

MR. DUBOW: (Mr. Dubow nods
head in the affirmative.)
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: So I guess
one of the questions that $I$ would want to be asking is the question about moving around as we go incrementally through the different options. If we're talking about pre-K, is there a reason not to -this tax obviously is difficult for everybody. Any kind of movement towards taxation needs to be thought out very carefully and thoughtfully, but if we're going to move towards that, are we not trying to move towards the maximum that we can do as opposed to, you know, compromising for incremental amounts that have significant impact on our ability to actually do the job?

MR. DUBOW: Yes. We believe that we should tax the amount that gets
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COUNCILWOMAN GYM: So that you don't actually look at incremental gains in the tax as just being about
incremental gains in revenue. We should also think about it in terms of how many students and young people, three-year-olds and four-year-olds in the City, that would not be able to access a quality City-funded seat in universal pre-K?

MR. DUBOW: That's a very good way to look at it.

COUNCILWOMAN GYM: The second question $I$ had was a little bit about my colleague's bill, and I want to thank Councilwoman Blondell Reynolds Brown like everybody else, because it is important to have other options on the table.

In terms of this question of whether a tax is regressive or not, in your opinion, are flat taxes considered regressive?
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MR. DUBOW: Yes.
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: So a flat
tax is a tax that applies across the board to all incomes, unavoidable --

MR. DUBOW: Yes.
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: -- and on a
broad level?
And I think that --
MR. DUBOW: And then tends to have a larger impact on people at lower levels. A higher percent of their --

COUNCILWOMAN GYM: And they're unavoidable as a result.

MR. DUBOW: Correct.
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: And they
will overwhelmingly impact families who can't avoid the tax?

MR. DUBOW: Correct.
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: Thank you.
And then the other question I
had is, has the -- I know that the School
District has testified about that it doesn't appear to be impacted by a container tax on its particular products.
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Have you discussed whether Parks and Recs and the programming done through Parks and Rec, which I believe includes beverages, water, and juice, are impacted at all?

MR. DUBOW: I think they would
be. I don't think they're excluded from the bill, so I think they would be impacted.

COUNCILWOMAN GYM: And have you
costed out how much that impact would
have on the City?
MR. DUBOW: We have not.
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: Okay. Is
that something that you could provide?
MR. DUBOW: Yes. We can provide it, yeah.

COUNCILWOMAN GYM: Thank you
very much.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilwoman.
The Chair recognizes
Councilwoman Parker.
COUNCILWOMAN PARKER: Thank
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And good afternoon to each of you.

MR. DUBOW: Good afternoon. COUNCILWOMAN PARKER:

Councilwoman Reynolds Brown, thank you very much for just adding value to the discussion. Options are always welcomed and valued.

Let me just go back to the line of questioning that was started by Councilman Squilla earlier, and Councilwoman Reynolds Brown mentioned that the School District would be offering its own testimony relevant to how this would impact them, although it was answered that the School District of Philadelphia would be considered exempt and/or as the language in the bill states, they would not be considered a dealer. However, do we know whether or not parochial schools, private schools, and any other private day care centers, would they be considered as dealers as it
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is described in the bill?
MR. DUBOW: So I don't see an exemption in the legislation for other schools.

COUNCILWOMAN PARKER: Okay. So
just the listing of the School District of Philadelphia?

MR. DUBOW: Correct.
COUNCILWOMAN PARKER: With that being said, let me ask you, because I've heard this quite often and I thought, Council President, after we dealt with that sort of elasticity of demand when we worked on that $\$ 2-$ per-pack cigarette tax to get that enabling authority, I thought that was the last time I was going to have to deal with the elasticity of demand regarding the selling of anything. MR. DUBOW: Aren't you happy it's back?

COUNCILWOMAN PARKER:
Especially since Cheltenham Avenue is a part of the district and Councilman Curtis Jones has City Avenue and our
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people can easily cross the street.

With that being said, has the Administration reviewed or do you have any numbers reflective of how the elasticity of demand would be measured with the soda tax versus the container tax?

MR. DUBOW: Sure. So for the sugary drinks tax at 3 cents, we built in 55 percent reduction in consumption and then an additional 10 percent tax avoidance. So a total reduction of 65 percent.

For the container tax, which is at a lower level, the assumed fall-off in the analysis is about 30 percent. So it's a much smaller fall-off, which makes sense.

COUNCILWOMAN PARKER: In
addition to that, one of the things we have heard quite often in this debate -and I will definitely be addressing the issue I know a little more in detail later -- is this impact on small
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neighborhood-based businesses, particularly our corner stores, all of those neighborhood-based businesses. And we value the taxes generated in those businesses, from sales to U\&O. They are extremely valuable. However, a question that has come up when we talked about the high level of consumption where we see a large number of neighborhood-based corner stores -- I'm talking about those areas that are deserts -- has the

Administration conducted any analysis about ownership?

And let me just be more
specific in my question. Have we conducted an analysis of whether or not the owners of the small neighborhood corner stores in our city, do we have a number relative to how many of them live in the City of Philadelphia?

MR. DUBOW: I do not know that.
COUNCILWOMAN PARKER: We do not know? Okay.

And the reason why $I$ ask that

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc. question is because after concluding about eight budget briefing and town hall meetings throughout the 9 th District and we talked about the tax that was proposed and everything that was sort of on the table, one of the questions was the issue that we have been talking about as it related to City business and construction about minority inclusion and ownership, and I will tell you that it was a little interesting to hear questions coming from my constituency about how many of those neighborhood-based corner stores were actually owned by people who lived in the communities in which they served.

So has the Administration conducted any sort of analysis from that perspective?

MR. DUBOW: We don't. We don't have information on the residency of owners of businesses.

COUNCILWOMAN PARKER: Okay.
Let me just state for the record that if by any chance there's any way that you --

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc. and we will be in contact with our chambers to see whether or not they have any data that can be helpful, but when we talk about the issue of consumption, I would hope that we would find a way to add into this discussion the issue of ownership, because what we're seeing in many communities is that while we have high levels of consumption, there are very low levels of ownership there. So I think that's something that I would like to see. And there are some instances where there will be some owners who actually live in the community. I don't want anyone to think that I'm talking about in absolute terms, but just in sort of an informal survey of the district that I serve, along with some others in the area, there was not a great sampling of particularly on neighborhood commercial corridors and on neighborhood corner stores that it was a high level of ownership amongst those that actually lived in the communities that were being
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MR. DUBOW: And I think the way
we'd probably have to do that is some kind of survey, which may take a little bit of time, but we could do that to understand that better.

COUNCILWOMAN PARKER: Thank you, Mr. President, and I think I'll come back the second round.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
You're welcome, Councilwoman.
Councilman Oh.
COUNCILMAN OH: Thank you, Council President.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
You're welcome.
COUNCILMAN OH: Earlier we had a discussion about the fact that the cost of the universal pre-K is being proposed at 8,500 per person, per child, and that the cost averaged 14,000, but that since this program was not going to run a full year and it would have shorter hours,
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that the 8,500 per child would be
adequate funding. Do you recall that or was I talking to somebody else?

MR. DUBOW: I think -- and, again, Mr. Engler and Mr. Hackney can come up. I think that actually the 8,500 would be matched with other funding streams to get you up to the 14,000 per seat.

COUNCILMAN OH: Okay. He
doesn't have to come up, because you just told me that 8,500 would need to be matched by other funding streams to get to 14,000 .

MR. DUBOW: Yes.
COUNCILMAN OH: Okay. But the proposed tax that you have gets you to 8,500, not more than that?

MR. DUBOW: That's correct.
COUNCILMAN OH: Okay. And you're not in favor of a container tax. And I'm not saying that $I$ am. I'm just saying that what is the difference in your testimony between a tax that gets
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the money that you need and a tax that gets the money that -- what's the difference? Why is it that you don't want to do the container tax? I understand what you said about health, but health cannot really be at the base of this discussion, can it?

MR. DUBOW: So the primary
reason is $\$ 27$ million.
COUNCILMAN OH: Right, money.
MR. DUBOW: It generates \$27 million less. We also think that it's because it's not avoidable that it's more regressive than the sugar-sweetened beverage tax. So those are the two reasons that are in the testimony.

COUNCILMAN OH: Okay. So the regressiveness of the tax and the health outcomes are a part of the reason why you are proposing a sugary drink tax?

MR. DUBOW: No. We're
proposing a sugary drink tax to generate money for these initiatives. That's why we're proposing that tax. And the reason
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that we favor that over the 15 cents container tax are it generates more money. I mean, that's the first reason we give in the testimony.

COUNCILMAN OH: Okay. If you start -- if you were to get your sugary drink tax and you started this program, can you sustain it?

MR. DUBOW: Yes.
COUNCILMAN OH: For how long?
MR. DUBOW: We think we can continue it indefinitely.

COUNCILMAN OH: Indefinitely, okay.

So the School District will need $\$ 600$ million in 2021 and that will, let's assume for discussion's sake, say be in the earlier portion of the Mayor's second term. He's got eight years, no more than eight years. So in 2021, the School District needs 600-some million dollars, which I am thinking that perhaps by that time, $I$ hope we get control of the School District back, but if we do,

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc. we are not going to get as much of an input of revenues from the state. If we don't get it back, I'm not sure we're getting any more money from the state anyway, but they need $\$ 600$ million. Where will you get that money if you are being asked to provide a large portion of that money?

MR. DUBOW: So that money is a cumulative amount and assumes that nothing happens to address the issue between now and then.

COUNCILMAN OH: Right.
MR. DUBOW: And it assumes that the state doesn't step up to do its part. I think it's too early to draw that conclusion and to speculate on what would have to happen.

COUNCILMAN OH: Right. But we
know two things are going to happen definitely, the cigarette tax sunsets and we know that the PICA wage tax sunsets in 2023. And according to your testimony numerous times, you said that puts a hole
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in the City's budget of 350 million per year from that point forward unless there is another tax of some sort to fill that hole.

MR. DUBOW: Or unless the PICA
tax is reauthorized or we increase it locally. So we have options on the wage tax amount. And the School District's projections already assume that the cigarette tax expires. That's part of that projection of 600 million. COUNCILMAN OH: So does any of these numbers concern you? I mean, it concerns me in the sense that the Kenney Administration will be done in 2023 and, therefore, a new Mayor comes in and inherits all these problems. Are there problems that you are leaving or are you taking care of this? Is this all sustainable?

MR. DUBOW: I think I've
testified many times that we plan to take -- that we plan to address that PICA tax issue well before 2023. And the
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cigarette tax issue is actually 2019, so that's during the Mayor's term.

COUNCILMAN OH: So with
whatever universal pre-K is going to turn out to be, which is not truly universal, we have neighborhoods that have good neighborhood schools and we have neighborhoods that have poorly performing neighborhood schools. How is it that you're going to put five-star pre-K in every neighborhood, good and bad, according to your plan?

MR. DUBOW: So for that, I'll ask Mr. Engler and Mr. Hackney to come up.

MR. HACKNEY: So a major
component of our plan is building the capacity of providers across the City. And so we want to make sure that as we expand the number of seats available to children, we want to also move the -increase the capacity of the providers along with that.

COUNCILMAN OH: Okay. So could
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I just say that I would like to see some hard reports, because the thing that occurs to me is it's like saying we want every restaurant to be a five-star restaurant, and not every restaurant wants to be a five-star restaurant. It requires an investment of capital on their part. It requires an analysis on their part. And so if you're going into good neighborhoods, I am sure that they generally are going to cater to more wealthy people who have higher kind of options, but this is really -- universal pre-K is addressing poor neighborhoods and you're going into neighborhoods and saying, You shall be a five-star provider, which means they have to pick up costs, increase salaries, and a whole lot of other things. So my question about the 8,500 per student is, there would be an additional level of cost if you want -- because I've spoken to pre-K providers who say, We're happy where we are. We make more money where we are
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than if we were to take on these additional costs.

Are you going to compensate them or provide the cost that they need to be pre-K? And if you're not, is there an opportunity for the School District to pick that up or is that just not part of the plan?

MR. HACKNEY: So in terms of the rate at which students would be compensated for the 8,500 for the school day school year, that's what that amount would cover. So that's the rate that we -- in terms of the cost of quality that we have projected in our plan as we built it out.

COUNCILMAN OH: Okay. I'm
sorry to stop, but the bell has rung and so I'll come back in the next round.

Thank you.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilman. I didn't hear the bell.

```
                        COUNCILMAN OH: Oh, I could
```
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have just kept going?
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: No.
I'm just kidding. Thank you, Councilman.
Actually maybe you guys want to
stay up. So I'm going to try not to get myself in trouble. So I've been here for a lot of years and through a lot of budget seasons, and normally it's like the people in the audience against us or maybe against the Mayor, but I got to tell you, this has been like one of the most divisive proposals since I've been here. And I'm being very frank, candid. I know I'm going to get in trouble. But I see this division along class lines, along all sorts of different lines, young versus old, manufacturing jobs versus service and white-collar jobs, and it troubles me, because actually for every child that gets pre-K whose parents might make $\$ 150,000$, the child whose mom makes $\$ 10,000$ doesn't get one because we're making a choice because this is unlimited. And it troubles me that
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whenever there's a serious conversation about funding this -- because I believe everybody should have everything, right? I mean, that's normally what we promise as politicians when we're out campaigning, and then reality sets in and you got to make decisions.

But every time there seems to be a conversation about a broad-based revenue source, it seems to get rebuffed, every imaginable reason why you can't do it. I mean, the notion that you're sitting here talking about a container tax, you can't do it because it's not going to be enough revenue. And I think everybody in this room on this side of the rail knows it's not going to be a $3-c e n t-a n-o u n c e ~ t a x, ~ u n l e s s ~ s o m e t h i n g ~ i s ~$ going on that $I$ don't know about. So the notion that you're going to raise the revenue to do all of the programs, it's probably not realistic. But when there's a conversation about doing something -and I don't know where I am. I talked to
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the Mayor directly, because I think that's the way it should be. I have those conversations. I want to help the Mayor. I want to help the Administration. More importantly, I want to help the citizens in the City of Philadelphia. But when I'm hearing that this is going to be universal pre-K, which I guess we all support, although I'm telling you -- and I'm too old for this now, but if $I$ had a kid in pre-K, I don't think that the taxpayers should have to pay for that. I should be able to pay for that. But the conversation about it not being --
(Applause.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: And
I'm not trying to do it for applause or anything. Every now and then I'm supposed to be conducting hearings and just kind of not give my opinion, but, you know...

So I guess I'm saying that the notion that it can't be some sort of $a$
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universal or broader based funding source for this is beyond my comprehension when everybody in the City -- I'm sure when we're looking at rec centers -- and I've heard from some members there might be rec centers that are going to be proposed that are going to be in areas where there's projected growth as a result of, quote/unquote, gentrification. And that's okay, because you got to provide support for everybody.

So I don't know why -- and I'm not saying $I$ 'm voting for the container tax. I think it's a laudable idea. If there's a conversation about a broader based tax that everybody should pay, this notion that, well, you know, only the poor people should pay -- because you all know. You saw the map up there where all of these stores are that are selling this product. It's going to be in low-income neighborhoods. That's just a fact, right?

So I think that people should
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take a little more serious the notion of having a broad-based tax, and maybe not this year but maybe in future years as we try to get to 10,000 , if you're saying that's the number, because I thought it was 65 , but whatever it is, that we can't keep going to a source that is going to diminish, not necessarily because of the consumption but just generally the industry in terms of soda consumption is going down and the revenues associated with that are going to go down.

So we got like a week, two weeks to finish this up, and we're going to probably do something, I would hope. I would ask the Administration to take a little more seriously about a broader based revenue stream and a more fair and equitable revenue stream than just simply, as my good friend Harold Jackson from the Philadelphia Inquirer Editorial Board, who never agrees with me, said on Inside Story that this was the least path of resistance, poor people. I really
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would like us to, as we move through this
process -- and as I say, not just today and not just this budget, but in a longer-term conversation, let's really like talk about broadening the responsibility for making sure that our kids, who are the most important aspect of what we do, and our neighborhoods and our city, we take it a little more seriously than coming up with some of the stuff that I've heard, and with respect to the container tax, why it won't generate revenue. It will generate the revenue. It's just a matter of the rate if you want. And if it does generate the revenue, we pass it. Is the Administration not going to do the programs because it wasn't a sugary tax? I would think not. I would hope not. So that's over the next week and a half -- and this is more of an internal game plan -- can we like have like a little sit-down and kind of like talk about not only short term, a little
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longer term strategy for doing the things that we need to do in the City that has some shared responsibility and not just simply targeting one particular category of individuals. All right?

So I know that wasn't a question, but $I$ just had to put it out there, because I'm serious about this. I'm like really concerned about some of the stuff that I've seen going on in our city about this particular issue.

Mr. Engler.
DEPUTY MAYOR ENGLER: We're
happy to continue the discussions.
Obviously we meet with your staff on a regular basis.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: I'm
sorry. Could you bring that a little closer.

DEPUTY MAYOR ENGLER: I'm
sorry. Yes. We meet with your staff on a regular basis. We're happy to continue those meetings and to talk about a way that's going to fund the programs.
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Obviously the Administration --
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Yeah, but we've been meeting and every
time something gets posed to you all, you're like, Yeah, okay.

DEPUTY MAYOR ENGLER: And we've reviewed them and we're happy to continue those discussions in a real full way.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Yeah, but $I$ know, and continue the discussions -- we've been talking about this for two months, and I've said stuff. And we had two months of hearing, and one of my people said, Well, they don't know. Councilman, the press doesn't know -- I'm sorry to bring you guys into it. The press doesn't know what you guys are talking about.

I said, Well, we've been having two months of hearings.

So I'm saying you can talk, but then you can talk. So all I'm saying is like, you know, seriously, folks -- and I hate to bring this public, but we got to

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc. really start talking about some kind of broader based strategy than just simply going after taxing poor people, when the testimony is inconsistent with the reality of saying -- one hand you say you want to deal with health and I look at the health budget, you got an increase of a million dollars in the Health Department's budget and none of it is going towards obesity. It's going towards raises and family center, you know, so -- that's all I'm saying. I'm going to get off my little soapbox and I'm going to call on the next member. Thank you.

The Chair recognizes Councilman Jones.

COUNCILMAN JONES: Thank you, Mr. President.

I still have not heard the difference in why a soda tax is a grocery tax and a container tax is not. I'm just confused.
(Applause.)
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COUNCILMAN JONES: I disagree
that -- and I can pay for my
granddaughter's pre-K, but if I couldn't, that she doesn't deserve an equal footing and an opportunity for a life and then $I$ think somehow government is responsible for public education. And every study shows everyone that if a kid can't read by the time they are in fourth grade, that they are -- their outcomes are determined in a negative way, usually resulting in a place that $I$ visited today, which is prison. So I disagree totally that it is not a government issue, because we will either pay now or we will pay later. So I'd rather pay now and get positive outcomes than pay later and see a kid that says, The best school I ever went to was a jail school. I don't get that.

So on the issue, I need to know how if we can't -- can we do both taxes or not? What would happen? Isn't that a double tax, if you would, on the same
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product?
SOLICITOR TULANTE: We can look
into it. So this is the first time I've heard it --

COUNCILMAN JONES: Sometimes compromise is difficult because of the regulations and laws that we have. We either -- you stand on one side of the street, you okay. You stand on the other side of the street, you okay. You stand in the middle of the street, you get run over. So we need to figure this out.

I agree with my colleague that
we all agree that these are important
issues, but we got to get -- I think it was Sanchez that said it. We got to get this right.

We talked about consumption and sustainability on the cigarette tax, and I get the cigarette runs that were supposed to happen and probably do, but nobody can argue the benefit of 88 extra million dollars in a school district even though two years from now, you're right,
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we're going to be dealing with a problem.
But ever since I came here, we've been dealing with public education, not in a planned way, not in a well thought-out way, but in a response to crisis, like they're getting ready to cancel kindergarten.

So I think it is incumbent upon
us to do two things. Recognize that there are intended and unintended consequences of not doing pre-K, and they are serious. The second thing is that it is our responsibility to look into that. And, yeah, those who can afford pre-K, but there's a lot of Philadelphians that cannot, and they deserve good outcomes for their children too.

Thank you, Mr. President.
(Applause.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: See, now that's what I'm saying, the division. So when Councilman Jones spoke, that side of the room clapped. When I spoke, that side of the room. Come on, we got to
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stop all this, right? I'm serious. We got to stop. We got to figure out a way to get this to work. See what I'm saying.

The Chair recognizes -- folks, please, please.

The Chair recognizes
Councilwoman Quinones-Sanchez.
COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: I guess
in the spirit of what you said, Council
President, I will withhold this, because I do think the week and a half will give folks an opportunity for pause. But I think it's important to remember that the Pre-K Commission was started out of a Council initiative. It was a commission that came out of here that then the people voted for. And so the division doesn't exist on the goal. The division exists around how we get there. And, quite frankly, I'd be ready to vote for a 3 percent real estate tax and do this right the same way we do education. And I believe that it should be sustainable,
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and if we want to do it, we want to do it in a way that's thoughtful and that at the same time we are taking into
consideration what Councilman Oh says, that we are going to hit a cliff and we're going to have to be here and make those tough choices.

But the rhetoric around this, around people having choices, is one that as a person of color in this city, I've been extremely offended, because my folks don't have choices, you know. They don't -- when you look at that person that goes and buys a 128 ounce of Hawaiian Punch, under this sugary drink, that's a $\$ 3.84$ tax. Under the container, it's 15 cents. When you look at that 64 ounce iced tea that that mother buys for the week, you know, under the sugar tax, it's \$1.92. Under the container tax, it's 15 cents.

Now, I don't like either one of these, but I am concerned about the rhetoric and using the kids as a shield

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc. around bad policy. We're making bad choices here. And I support and I think these things are too important and they're things that this Council has talked about too long for us not to take this serious.

So, Council President, I'm going to take your advice and use the next week and a half so that we can have a more thoughtful resolution to the conversation. But I don't like a conversation where it's them against us, because that's not the case, that it is rich people versus poor or brown and black people versus folks who have choices. I think this discussion is too, too important to be narrowed that way.

And I don't like to be told as an independent elected official that I only have one option. I've never taken on a budget discussion with one option, and that's the kind of rhetoric that really gets people against the wall and doesn't allow for the open, respectful
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So I'll take my week and a half recess.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Thank you, Councilwoman.

The Chair recognizes Councilman Domb.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Thank you, Council President.

I just wanted to clarify. I know my colleague had some comments about the analysis. I'm in favor of all the initiatives. I'm just not clear how we're going to fund them. And I want to just give you my observations, because I'm probably the least political person here. I come from the business community.

In the four or five months I've been here, in business when you need money, the first thing you do is you make yourself more efficient. You try to buy products cheaper. You try to figure out
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how to make efficiencies within labor cheaper. You put systems in place that save you money. And the last thing you do is you raise prices.

It seems to me in government
the first thing we do is raise prices instead of doing the efficiencies. Now, I know we are working together to do more efficiencies, and I'm not blaming this Administration or this Mayor, because I think they're doing a good job, but I think some of these things are holdovers from prior situations that should have been addressed. One is OPA that still has the same value as three years ago, 134, and we're addressing it now.

And the other question I have -- maybe you could answer this for me, because I'm just curious. I've sat through every budget hearing. There's 1,300 positions -- I added them all up -that aren't filled. I don't think we're going to fill 1,300, but $I$ don't think we'll fill 200. If we could assume we're

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc. going to fill half of those positions, 650, close to 1,300 positions in our budget are $\$ 64$ million a year and, with benefits, 48 million. So we're talking over $\$ 120$ million on that piece. Our benefits, by the way, are 76 percent of salaries. In private industry it's 32 percent. It's amazing the benefits working in the government.

Is there a way to cut that in half and say we'll fill half the positions, and is there a way to put money not to this initiative but to the pensions? That's my concern.

MR. DUBOW: So there were a lot of things in there. I'd want to kind of go back to the beginning.

So we did, in putting our
budget together, the first things we looked at were can we do a better job of collections, and we have over our plan \$70 million in additional collections. Can we reduce things like unnecessary overtime? So we have overtime
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On the vacant positions, the budget actually doesn't assume that they'll all be filled. We have what's called a vacancy allowance in each department. So we've already assumed a significant amount of savings from those. In addition, from the list, some of those weren't in our General Fund. So they were Aviation Fund and Water Fund positions that don't accrue, but we're kind of happy to go through that list with you and show you kind of what's in the budget and what's not for them.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: It just seemed like a lot of money that was being allocated to positions that aren't going to get filled. Even if it's half the amount, even half the amount is close to over 60 million.

MS. ADAMS: And I just want to

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc.
add to that. Sometimes it's related to the timing of when that class. So, for example, if you have a large police class or a large fire class that come in in the fourth quarter of the year, we include their positions, because they will eventually get filled, but then three-quarters of the year they won't get paid. So we use that in a vacancy allowance. And so there's often timing by each budget, and so there's a bit of an art and a bit of a science that goes into it based on what we think will get filled and then we try and have that vacancy allowance reflect what we think is the reality. And so if there are challenges filling certain positions, then we may have a larger vacancy allowance or if there's a large class that we assume that comes in much later. And so we plan for that within the budget. We try not to allocate any additional funds that we don't think actually will get filled. But then at
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the same time, we want -- some of those positions are really critical and we want to fill them and we're working through different processes to make sure they get filled, because they really help the operations of the department.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Okay. I
still think when you're dealing with a \$4 billion budget, saving 2 or 3 percent is not difficult to do, just in general.

MS. ADAMS: Our big challenge is, there are a large amount of fixed costs, and I think once you start removing the big fixed costs, which I think is like the pension costs and our other kind of big fixed costs, when you start whittling it down, we actually have very limited flexibility despite the large size of our budget, and I think that's where -- and we can have many more conversations about this. We kind of give this presentation on a regular basis. But once you start whittling down those big fixed costs that we don't have
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any control over, the amount of
flexibility that we have as an
Administration and Council is relatively
small despite the large size of the budget.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: But we had
the court system president here who testified that their fees haven't been raised since 1984.

MS. ADAMS: And some of those
fees -- and we're doing a lot of analysis on those fees themselves. Some of those fees -- there's only a portion of those fees that flow into and remain in the General Fund. Some of those fees flow directly to the court system. So we want to work with you and with the courts to understand those fees. We also have to make sure that for every fee, that there's a real cost structure that we can align those fees to. So we need to do quite a lot of analysis to make sure, but that's definitely on our radar. We have about three or four departments we want
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to work with on reviewing their fees, L\&I, the Sheriff's Office, the courts, just to make sure, and we hopefully will introduce something in the fall to look at those fees, and we'll work with you on that.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Just to be clear, we write a check for $\$ 56$ million out of our fund to the court system, and if you had raised the fees per inflation from 1984, it would be an extra $\$ 48$ million, just on an inflation basis.

Thank you, Council President. COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:

Thank you, Councilman.
The Chair recognizes
Councilwoman Reynolds Brown.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Rob Dubow, I join you in appreciating the laser beam focus that Councilman Domb brings to the numbers in his analysis of numbers. I want to revisit your response to his questions regarding the yield of potential soda tax rates at 1 cent.
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So what was the yield you believe we would get with the 1 cent per ounce?

MR. DUBOW: Roughly $\$ 58$ million when you annualize it.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: And --
MR. DUBOW: So the first full year, which is FY18, it would be about 58 million.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: And 1 and
1 half cent, the yield you anticipate?
MR. DUBOW: 77 million.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: And on 2
cents?
MR. DUBOW: 2 cents is roughly 90, 89.8.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Okay. And so then with the conservative -- and I underscore that -- the conservative estimate of a 15 cent flat rate in our projections yield for us $\$ 64$ million. Is it fair to say then that our 15 cent flat rate yielding $\$ 64$ million would get us where we need to be if the Administration
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came in at 1 cent?
MR. DUBOW: Yes. I mean, it's
not where -- it's not equivalent to the cost of the programs, but in terms of revenue generated, it's a little bit more than 1 cent.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Looking
strictly at numbers, putting the programs that we all agree are essential and also acknowledging the fact that there's no appetite for 3 cents, the question again is, with the conservative estimate of a 15 cent flat rate yielding $\$ 64$ million, does that not get us where we need to be compared to the Mayor's 1 cent?

MR. DUBOW: Well, just to be clear, the Mayor hasn't proposed 1 cent.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN:
Prospective potential.
MR. DUBOW: Compared to 1 cent,
yes, it's about the same. But neither one of those would fund the programs at the level we want.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Thank you,
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Mr. President.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
You're welcome, Councilwoman.
The Chair recognizes
Councilwoman Parker.
COUNCILWOMAN PARKER: Thank
you. Thank you, Mr. President.
I want to, one, acknowledge that I agree with all of my colleagues and that we will ultimately reach the much-needed compromise. It's just great to hear everyone echo the sentiments about the ultimate goals and objectives and that the sausage gets made, and that depends on how we get there in the end.

With that being said, I need to
know from a programmatic perspective, has the Administration changed its
perspective in any way, shape or form relative to assuring that neighborhood-based pre-K providers who are STAR 1 and/or STAR 2 or no STARS, that they receive technical and administrative assistance to improve
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their quality? And the reason why I ask that question is aside from the programmatic base, when we're thinking about the business and economic development side and the employment side, many of our home-based providers actually do live in the neighborhoods where they are providing their services.

And so with that being said,
has any of that changed?
MR. DUBOW: That is still part
of the proposal, but two people are coming up who can answer it better than $I$ can.

MR. HACKNEY: Yes. Thank you
for the question. That is an important part of the plan that we have put together in terms of making sure in order for us to get -- to increase the number of children going into seats across the City, we need to increase the number of 3- and 4-star providers across the City. So an important aspect of our work will be helping to provide the technical
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COUNCILWOMAN PARKER: And just
for the record, the reason why I asked that question is because you will find, again, particularly neighborhood based, neighborhood-based early childhood providers on neighborhood commercial corridors in residential blocks up to six children, but just because they are available, it does not always mean that quality is offered. And there are a number of barriers that we've discussed in hearings about why, the amount of dollars that they can afford to pay their workers, the level of education. And so what I don't want us to end up doing with this program is that we begin to simply direct dollars to 3 and 4 stars and it's almost like we begin creating magnet schools, right? So we end up having the Masterman-like preschools throughout the
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City of Philadelphia. And the problem with creating magnets is, there are not enough magnets to go around in all of our neighborhoods.

So I will hope that as we, the legislative body, led by our President, along with the Administration and the Mayor sort of work to hammer out the compromises, that we remember that we should not be creating magnet sort of preschools, but just trying to make sure that that quality is available in neighborhoods. So that's commercial corridors along with home-based and not forget that many of the home-based providers are African American women and that these are business owners. So let's not forget the business perspective of it.
(Applause.)
COUNCILWOMAN PARKER: Thank
you, Mr. President.
COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: Thank
you, Councilwoman.

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc. Councilman Oh.

COUNCILMAN OH: Thank you very much.

I'll say that I think our goal is to educate and equip individuals in our city to be the best that they can to help them discover what their capabilities are. And for me I clearly understand and agree with the discussion about $K$ to 4. That $I$ understand. I'd like to say that with limited resources, I am concerned that we have the resources, the vocational equipment, the opportunities, the art, the music, the technology for young people who are making decisions about their lives. For people with good households, for children with good households, parents make good decisions for them. For many of the people that we're talking about, they don't necessarily have good decision-makers in their lives, but they don't have good schools. They have poor performing schools. They will make the
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decision for themselves. Their
self-determination comes with their
maturity and the realization of the situation if there's a job for them, if there's education and training.

So when we talk about pre-K and
we juxtapose that to a point where a young person says, I'm going to get my act together, and I look at this room and I'm going to say $I$ think $I$ see a lot of late bloomers. They didn't do well in first grade, second grade, third grade. I'm going to guess. I could be wrong, but $I$ was a late bloomer, $C$ and $D$ student in elementary school. I didn't get myself together until $I$ got into law school. I was a late bloomer. I made a decision, as many people in this room did. They weren't $A$ and $B$ students or all A students in first, second, and third grade. And a lot of people in our city who are struggling around making a future for themselves need the help, and I'm concerned that when we start focusing

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc. on three- and four-year-olds who don't have self-determination, at the expense of not providing these choices. Now, if you can come up with a sustainable way of funding schools, education, and choice and add pre-K, I'm with you. But here's what $I$ would say to that at risk, like the Council President did: Soda tax is a minuscule way of raising money and it adds a lot of cost to people who are purchasing. Could I ask, what happened to the fact, for example, that every time someone goes through a red light camera and we collect all this money, that it goes out of our city? What happened to once upon a time when we tax and towed vehicles and gave them a ticket, that money was all inside? How many hundreds of millions of dollars of Philadelphia money is going to fund projects all throughout our state?

So I would challenge the
Administration to stop going after little

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc. bitty bits amount of money that are new taxes and new costs and why don't you look at the revenues that we generate in this city that should be going to our city to fund our schools and our large projects and to more completely deal with the lack of education, because we're not getting the money from Harrisburg. MR. HACKNEY: So I will tackle the education question. In terms of the impact that pre-K would have on threeand four-year-olds, you would see that if children are in quality programs, their readiness for kindergarten and their readiness for reading. So, I mean, I can put on my former education principal hat for a moment and tell you that children that cannot read often if you look in schools and find out where you have a lot of disruptions or the children have deficits or gaps in their learning, kindergarten sets the table -- I mean, pre-K would set the table for that. So as children transition into kindergarten,
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they will be able to read and be prepared for that transition that's most important from third grade to fourth grade when reading turns from learning to read to reading to learn. If we could address that with a robust, quality expansion of quality programming for our three- and four-year-olds across the City -- and getting them at three is a key component to ensuring that success -- we would see an improvement in schools across the board. I feel very confident about that. And as someone that ran a school, I would understand the level of resources and interventions that were once used for children to get caught up can now be allocated and used in other places around the school.

> So the investment -- as

Councilman Jones said earlier, to invest early is key to the long-term success. So it definitely would be a high return on investment for pre-K, quality pre-K across the City.
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COUNCILMAN OH: I appreciate
the answer and the spirit. We talked about taking a week and a half to think about this. I'm just saying I agree K through 4, put the resources in, put the books in, put the computers in, put the art class, put all that stuff in there, do the pre-K too, but what I'm looking for is the hundreds of millions of dollars in revenues that we should be getting that through a taking over of our Parking Authority is now going to fund projects everywhere outside of Philadelphia, and I don't think politically we should let that happen.

MR. DUBOW: I mean, we're happy to work with you or talk to you about how to approach the General Assembly about changing those things. I mean, those are all things that were done at the state level, and we're happy to work with you on that.

COUNCILMAN OH: And I think we
should.
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MR. DUBOW: Happy to.
COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: Thank
you, Councilman.
Councilman Jones.
COUNCILMAN JONES: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
So I went to public school, and so when I heard the "rhetoric" word three times, I went and looked it up, and it says "eloquent oratory." So I guess that wasn't an insult, so I'm going to press pause too and wait for the week and a half to find compromise at this level. So at first, I pressed the button. I'm like, wait a minute. But I'm going to work with my colleague, my dear friend, to try to figure this out, and hopefully the math adds up and the kids get help.

Thank you.
COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: Thank you, Councilman.

Councilman Domb.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: I just want to make a comment. This morning -- I

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc. want to thank the Revenue and Finance and the Mayor. We had a press conference this morning about the idea of possibly selling some of our delinquent taxes, specifically BIRT taxes, and monetizing those, and we're going to look into that. And I don't know if you want to speak to that, Rob, but $I$ think it's a great thing for the City to be taking those efficiencies in place. I just want to make sure I call that attention to you guys. So maybe just speak about that briefly.

MR. DUBOW: I actually just
wanted to thank you for all the help you've given us since you've been in office and even before with kind of prodding us and giving us ideas and working together to come up with solutions, like selling business tax debt. So we're going to do a feasibility study to see how we can do that, and hopefully that will generate some revenue.
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you.
Thank you all very much.
Unless you want to stay longer, Rob. You look like you're having fun up there.

MR. DUBOW: It's never enough. COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: Okay. If you really mean that, $I$ worry about you.

I understand the School
District has been here this whole time. We're sorry. I know you may have a short statement. I know that your issue has been addressed. Are you still here? Somebody from the School District here? There you are. Okay. Would you like to come up, Ms. Burns?
(Witness approached witness
table.)
COUNCILMAN GREENLEE:
Councilman Oh.
COUNCILMAN OH: I'll just put
this out there, because I'm not sure of the answer either. The City asked the state to create an Authority. That's the

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc. Parking Authority. The City put its parking responsibilities under the Authority. I don't know that we need the General Assembly to take back the functions of the Streets Department. So I just lay that out there.

COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: It's something that we can discuss certainly. Sure.

Ms. Burns, hold on one second.
If I could ask everybody as you're leaving, please do it quietly. The hearing is still going. Thank you. Ms. Burns, I appreciate your patience. You've been here a while. MS. BURNS: Certainly. COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: Please.

MS. BURNS: Thank you. Good afternoon, City Council President Clarke, City Councilwoman Blondell Reynolds Brown, and Councilmembers. I am Fran Burns, Chief Operating Officer of the School District of Philadelphia. I thank you for the opportunity to testify today
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on Bill No. 160508 regarding a possible non-reusable beverage container tax.

The School District provides
breakfast, lunch, and dinner meals to all
students daily at no charge to our
students. That includes School District of Philadelphia students as well as charter schools who participate in our meals program. These meal services are funded by our participation in various state and federal meal reimbursement programs, and, therefore, the School District of Philadelphia Food Services Division is fully funded through direct state and federal reimbursements; in fact, 95 percent federally funded, and currently operates as an Enterprise Fund. Under proposed Bill No. 160508, all milk products would be exempt from any non-reusable beverage container tax. This bill also defines a dealer as any person engaged in the business of selling at retail and stipulates that the proposed non-reusable beverage container
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Since the bulk of our beverage volume is milk products and given the District does not meet the criteria for a retail dealer under the proposed bill, we believe passage of the proposed Bill No. 160508 would have little or no financial impact to the School District or to our ongoing ability to provide students daily breakfast, lunch, and dinner meals at no cost.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Sorry. Thank you. Thank you so much for your testimony.

Councilwoman Sanchez, you have a question for the witness?

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Yes. I just want -- one of the questions that Councilwoman Cherelle Parker had posed and I know her staff did so yesterday was -- and I wanted to ask Fran Burns if
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she had any knowledge about the
archdiocese parochial schools or the lunch programs, because they're similarly reimbursed by the feds and the state. Is there some sort of common designation so that if an exemption is going to be built in to capture those, that we can tie them into?

MS. BURNS: I don't know. I
think they would have the same interpretation as us under the current legislation, but $I$ don't know. I also don't know what percentage of their beverages are milk compared to other drinks.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: They
similarly have the same breakdown
depending on -- because we have the
Streets programs that do in some cases breakfast and lunch or lunch and afternoon snack. I'm just wondering in your reimbursement model, is there a category that we can ensure that it gets captured? You don't need to answer that

5/25/16 - WHOLE - BILL 160170, etc. now, but it would be something that we'd be interested in receiving.

MS. BURNS: Okay. COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you.

Thank you.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilwoman.
There appears to be no additional questions for this witness. Thank you very much.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: And
there being no additional business before this Committee today, the public hearing of Bills No. 160172, 160176, 160508, 160509, Resolution No. 160180 will stand in recess until Wednesday, June 8th at 2:00 p.m., at which time we will reconvene in Room 400.
(Committee of the Whole
concluded at 3:50 p.m.)
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| eloquent | estate 4:8,17 | 2:11 | 95:18 | 123:25 | five 6:4 54:25 | 36:11 71:25 | 24:13 28:11 |
| 143:11 | 12:15,17 | expend 58:20 | Falls 46:10 | 143:18 | 55:3 74:6 | 72:13,24,25 | 29:8,10 |
| employment | 120:23 | expended | families 84:10 | figures 42:24 | 123:21 | fountains | 31:14,19 |
| 134:6 | estimate | 59:13 | 87:5 91:17 | fill 104:4 | five-star | 72:19 | 32:4,7 |
| enabling | 131:21 | expenditures | family $81: 21$ | 124:24,25 | 105:11 | four 33:6 | 39:11 58:11 |
| 94:16 | 132:13 | 60:17 | 116:12 | 125:2,12 | 106:5,7,17 | 56:15 81:21 | 73:25,25 |
| enact 26:13 | estimates | expense | far 37:15 | 128:4 | fix $82: 18$ | 84:13 | 114:25 |
| encourage | 73:12 | 139:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 54: 2564: 10 \\ & \text { fault } 14: 5,7 \end{aligned}$ | filled 124:23 | fixed 128:13 | 123:21 | 123:16 |
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| 126:13,14 | 129:16 | go 12:9 13:3 | 116:14,15 | granddaug... | 90:4,16 | 31:7 94:20 | 6:20 13:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 126:14 | 142:19 | 23:4,10 | 119:2 121:6 | 46:8 | 91:3,7,13 | 106:24 | 23:5 110:8 |
| 129:16 | 146:5 | 36:14,21 | 121:7 122:9 | granddaug... | 91:16,20 | 114:15,23 | 115:14 |
| 130:10 | generally | 43:6 44:14 | 123:16 | 117:4 | 92:11,15,19 | 115:8 | 124:21 |
| 132:23 | 87:17 | 46:15 59:9 | 124:24 | grant 8:16 |  | 126:16 | 146:14 |
| 139:22 | 106:12 | 62:23 68:17 | 125:2 | grants 8:19 | H | 142:17,22 | 150:16 |
| 140:6 | 112:10 | 72:23 82:17 | 126:21 | 8:20,21 | Hackney 80:5 | 143:2 | hearings |
| 142:13 | generate | 89:11 93:11 | 134:21 | great 64:15 | 80:8,22,23 | hard 55:25 | 110:21 |
| 147:18 | 28:17 32:21 | 112:13 | 138:9,11,14 | 98:20 | 81:6,9,16 | 56:2 106:3 | 115:21 |
| funded 79:16 | 34:4 51:21 | 125:18 | 139:22,25 | 133:12 | 82:5,11,17 | harder 37:13 | 135:17 |
| 147:11,15 | 62:7,8,18 | 126:16 | 140:5 | 144:9 | 82:25 83:3 | 38:18 42:8 | heavily 66:22 |
| 147:17 | 62:19 73:24 | 136:4 | 142:13 | GREEN 1:12 | 83:17,19 | Harold | HELEN 1:13 |
| funding 8:25 | 74:13,19 | goal 120:20 | 143:12,16 | Greenlee 1:12 | 85:14 86:5 | 112:21 | help 53:15 |
| 9:7,16,24 | 101:23 | 137:5 | 144:7,22 | 34:17,18,22 | 100:6 | Harrisburg | 110:4,5,7 |
| 28:17 29:7 | 113:14,14 | goalpost 40:8 | 146:14 | 35:5,14,23 | 105:15,17 | 140:9 | 128:6 137:8 |
| 29:18 30:25 | 113:16 | goals 46:6 | 149:7 | 36:4,18 | 107:10 | hat 140:17 | 138:24 |
| 31:14 38:13 | 140:4 | 133:14 | $\operatorname{good} 2: 27: 16$ | 37:5 38:7 | 134:16 | hate 115:25 | 143:19 |
| 67:18 100:3 | 144:24 | goes 121:15 | 11:21 12:7 | 38:16 39:2 | 140:10 | Hawaiian | 144:16 |
| 100:8,14 | generated | 127:13 | 23:18 24:8 | 39:22 40:18 | half 30:13 | 121:16 | helpful 98:4 |
| 109:3 111:2 | 42:19 43:6 | 139:15,17 | 26:2 27:14 | 40:24 43:10 | 44:12 56:19 | head 77:9 | helping |
| 139:6 | 67:12 96:5 | going 2:3 | 33:10 34:20 | 136:24 | 56:19 58:2 | 89:7 | 134:25 |
| funds 8:6,13 | 132:6 | 12:3,4,9,10 | 34:21 39:11 | 143:3,21 | 62:5,8,11 | heads 87:6 | Henon 1:13 |
| 8:14 9:15 | generates | 12:24 13:24 | 39:12 41:9 | 145:2,8,20 | 62:12,19,24 | health 30:19 | 13:8,11,20 |
| 9:23,24 | 32:6 62:6 | 14:8 32:24 | 41:10 48:18 | 146:8,18 | 62:25 63:6 | 39:23,25 | 13:23 14:10 |
| 63:7 127:24 | 63:10,13 | 34:25 37:3 | 48:19 54:15 | grocery 41:22 | 63:6,13,13 | 40:9,10,19 | 14:14 15:10 |
| further 4:5 | 101:12 | 37:6 39:9 | 54:16 61:17 | 70:23 | 87:12,12 | 40:22 43:10 | 15:12 16:20 |
| 4:14 15:16 | 102:3 | 39:14 45:6 | 61:18 66:20 | 116:22 | 113:22 | 45:21 46:16 | 16:22 17:19 |
| 16:2 17:25 | generating | 57:4,12 | 68:14 78:6 | growth 111:9 | 120:13 | 75:19,19 | 17:21 19:3 |
| 19:9,17 | 63:8 | 58:19 60:4 | 78:7,19 | guarantee | 122:10 | 76:14,24 | 19:5 20:11 |
| 20:17,25 | gentrification | 60:24 62:25 | 80:8,22 | 24:15 | 123:4 125:2 | 77:2 101:6 | 20:13 21:20 |
| 22:2,10 | 111:10 | 63:2,5,14 | 86:18 90:14 | guess 36:5 | 125:12,12 | 101:7,19 | 21:22 70:17 |
| 23:12 77:22 | getting 33:16 | 66:17 68:18 | 93:3,5 | 37:14,22 | 126:22,23 | 116:7,8,9 | 70:18 71:2 |
| 79:13 | 56:2 57:22 | 70:14 72:12 | 105:7,12 | 39:8 63:14 | 131:12 | healthier | 71:13,19 |
| future $54: 25$ | 72:3 83:12 | 79:2 80:3 | 106:11 | 71:9 89:8 | 142:4 | 30:16 | 72:6,11,16 |
| 112:4 | 103:5 119:7 | 85:7,9,12 | 112:21 | 110:10,24 | 143:14 | healthy 40:17 | 73:4,10,21 |
| 138:24 | 140:9 | 85:15 86:3 | 119:17 | 120:10 | hall 1:6 97:3 | 46:14,19 | 74:8,11,18 |
| FY17 7:22,23 | 141:10 | 89:18 94:17 | 124:12 | 138:14 | hammer | 75:24 76:6 | 74:23 75:8 |
| 9:17 10:15 | 142:12 | 99:24 103:2 | 137:18,19 | 143:11 | 136:9 | hear 7:3 23:5 | 75:17,25 |
| 10:19,20 | give 12:13 | 103:21 | 137:19,22 | guidelines | hand 116:6 | 24:11,24 | 76:4,13,24 |
| FY18 131:9 | 50:13 59:2 | 105:5,11 | 137:24 | 84:11 | hands 56:2 | 52:12 69:5 | 77:4,10,16 |
| FY19 9:18 | 60:8 80:11 | 106:10,12 | 146:19 | Gulp 71:16 | happen 2:24 | 97:12 | 77:20 |
|  | 85:11,25 | 106:16 | government | 72:3 | 103:19,21 | 107:23 | Hi 7:16 86:18 |
| G | 102:5 | 107:4 108:2 | 75:16 117:7 | Gulps 71:20 | 117:24 | 133:13 | high 8:11 |
| gains 90:5,7 | 110:22 | 108:6,15 | 117:15 | 71:23 | 118:22 | heard 13:25 | 96:9 98:10 |
| game 113:23 | 120:13 | 109:16,18 | 124:6 | guys 27:6 | 142:16 | 40:2 42:21 | 98:23 |
| gap 87:25 | 123:17 | 109:20,21 | 125:10 | 108:5 | happened | 42:25 43:3 | 141:23 |
| gaps 140:22 | 128:23 | 110:9 111:7 | 126:3 | 115:17,18 | 36:23 | 43:5 80:16 | high-quality |
| general 5:19 | given 28:22 | 111:8,22 | governmen... | 144:13 | 139:13,17 | 94:12 95:22 | 30:2 79:2 |
| 5:21 8:6 | 35:15 | 112:8,8,12 | 9:3 | Gym 1:13 | happening | 111:6 | 85:10 |
| 10:12 51:14 | 144:17 | 112:13,15 | grade 117:10 | 86:17,18 | 75:4 | 113:12 | higher 49:21 |
| 51:16,17 | 148:5 | 113:18 | 138:13,13 | 87:16,24 | happens | 116:21 | 50:4 91:12 |
| 53:11 62:16 | giving 52:7 | 114:11,25 | 138:13,22 | 88:6,11,18 | 103:12 | 118:5 143:9 | 106:13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 126: 13 \\ & 128: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 144:19 | 116:4,11,11 | 141:4,4 | 88:25 89:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { happy 11:3 } \\ & \text { 26:21 27:2 } \end{aligned}$ | hearing 3:7 | highlight |
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| 55:15 | 85:12 86:2 | 24:20 | industry | internal 53:2 | Jones 1:14 | kid 110:12 | 116:13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Highway | 111:15 | incidents 2:9 | 112:11 | 113:23 | 41:6,7,11 | 117:9,19 | 117:22 |
| 8:21 | 144:4 | include 43:11 | 125:8 | interpretati... | 42:10,23 | kidding 108:4 | 121:13,20 |
| historically | ideas 25:4,6 | 45:16 58:12 | inflation | 149:12 | 43:8,17,20 | kids 71:16 | 123:13 |
| 39:6 | 144:19 | 66:13 84:24 | 130:11,13 | interventions | 43:23 44:3 | 84:4,15 | 124:9 |
| hit 37:12 | identify 86:7 | 85:3 127:6 | info 24:20 | 141:16 | 44:15 45:4 | 113:8 | 133:18 |
| 8:15,18 | ignore 46:16 | included 9:4 | informal | introduce | 45:11,17,20 | 121:25 | 144:8 |
| 121:6 | imaginable | 47:8 58:7,8 | 98:18 | 130:5 | 45:25 46:25 | 143:19 | 145:12,13 |
| hits 35:16 | 109:12 | 58:10 65:10 | information | introduced | 47:6,17 | kind 2:8 | 146:4 |
| 37:12,18 | impact 8:5 | 67:11 76:16 | 2:14,20 | 23:9 | 48:6,10 | 12:13 47:25 | 148:24 |
| 52:2 | 10:14 38:3 | includes | 65:13,15 | invest 141:21 | 75:18 94:25 | 48:3 53:10 | 149:10,13 |
| hold 11:24 | 49:14 74:12 | 43:13,14 | 78:19 97:21 | investment | 116:18,19 | 55:15 59:3 | 149:14 |
| 23:21 74:4 | 75:2,7 | 92:4 147:7 | infrastruct... | 30:4 73:19 | 117:2 118:6 | 75:14 79:10 | knowledge |
| 146:11 | 86:21 87:9 | inclusion | 31:3 | 106:8 | 119:23 | 89:15 99:6 | 149:2 |
| holdovers | 89:22 91:11 | 24:15 97:10 | ingredient | 141:20,24 | 141:21 | 106:13 | knows 109:18 |
| 124:13 | 91:17 92:12 | inclusive 3:19 | 28:8 | investments | 143:5,6 | 110:22 |  |
| hole 29:21 | 93:17 95:25 | income 47:7 | inherits | 28:13 | Jones' 55:15 | 113:24 | L |
| 103:25 | 140:12 | 49:14,21 | 104:18 | issue 39:25 | JR 1:14 | 116:2 | L 1:10, 11, 16 |
| 104:5 | 148:10 | 57:16 60:18 | initial 85:1 | 59:6,8 67:2 | juice 30:19 | 122:23 | 151:14 |
| home-based | impacted | 84:3,9,11 | initiative | 74:17 95:24 | 55:23 71:15 | 125:17 | L\&I 130:3 |
| 134:7 | 46:18 89:3 | 84:19,21,24 | 41:17 55:6 | 97:7 98:5,7 | 72:6,8 92:5 | 126:4,16,17 | labor 124:2 |
| 136:15,16 | 91:24 92:5 | 85:3 87:8 | 55:8 58:9 | 103:12 | juices 45:22 | 128:17,22 | lack 140:8 |
| homework | 92:10 | incomes 91:5 | 58:12,21 | 104:25 | 65:4,9 71:7 | 144:18 | Landing 9:22 |
| 25:2 | implement | inconsistent | 120:17 | 105:2 | 75:24 76:2 | kindergarten | 10:7 |
| hope 43:24 | 42:22 90:2 | 116:5 | 125:14 | 114:12 | jump 70:14 | 119:8 | language |
| 98:6 102:2 | implemented | incorporati... | initiatives | 117:16,22 | June 23:7 | 140:15,23 | 93:20 |
| 112:16 | 29:16 74:21 | 6:6 | 58:8 74:3 | 145:13 | 59:12 | 140:25 | large 96:10 |
| 113:20 | important | incorrect | 101:24 | issues 57:18 | 150:19 | kinds 41:15 | 103:8 127:4 |
| 136:6 | 35:3 63:10 | 78:22 | 123:15 | 118:16 | justification | know 14:3 | 127:5,20 |
| hoped 88:15 | 66:2 90:20 | increase | input 103:3 | ITEF 10:10 | 56:20 | 32:13 35:7 | 128:13,20 |
| hopefully | 113:8 | 36:25 56: | Inquirer | items 41:22 | justify 57:23 | 37:8 39:23 | 129:5 140:6 |
| 130:4 | 118:15 | 56:12,24 | 112:22 |  | juxtapose | 39:25 40:5 | larger 49:14 |
| 143:18 | 120:15 | 57:6,9 83 | inside 112 | J | 138:8 | 40:9 41:24 | 72:20 91:11 |
| 144:24 | 122:4,18 | 104:7 | 139:20 | J 1:15 | juxtapos | 45:2,5,21 | 127:19 |
| hoping 88:21 | 134:17,24 | 105:23 | instance 69 | Jackson | 44:18 | 59:22 60:6 | laser 130:20 |
| hours 99:25 | 141:3 | 106:19 | instances | 112:21 |  | 60:14 61:6 | late 138:12 |
| household | importantly | 116:8 | 98:13 | jail 117:20 | K | 68:13 69:9 | 138:15,18 |
| 87:7 | 8:4 110:6 | 134:20,22 | instructio | JANNIE 1:11 | K 1:12 | 69:16,24 | laudable |
| households | impose 4:7, | incremental | 23:12 | January 6:14 | 137:11 | 70:6 75:17 | 111:15 |
| 137:18,19 | 66:23 | 89:21 90:5 | insult 143:12 | 59:7,12 | 142:5 | 81:22 89:20 | launch 9:17 |
| hundred | imposed | 90:7 | intake 39:7 | 85:16 | keep 39:10 | 91:22 93:22 | law 48:23 |
| 59:13,17,20 | 30:17 66:25 | incremental... | intended 9:17 | Jim 83:24 | 55:17 112:8 | 95:24 96:22 | 138:17 |
| hundreds | imposing | 89:11 | 28:10 | job 89:23 | Kenney | 96:24 | aws 118:8 |
| 139:20 | 40:21 | incumbent | 119:11 | 124:12 | 104:15 | 103:21,23 | lawyers 66:17 |
| 142:10 | imposition | 119:9 | interchange | 125:21 | Kenney's | 108:15 | lay 146:7 |
| hypotheses | 28:2 | indefinite | 10:8 | 138:5 | 25:13 | 109:20,25 | LCB 66:16 |
| 51:5 | improve | 102:13 | interested | jobs 69:5 | KENYATTA | 110:23 | learn 141:6 |
|  | 133:25 | independent | 86:19 87:8 | 70:5,7 | 1:14 | 111:13,18 | learning |
| I | improvement | 122:20 | 150:3 | 108:18,19 | kept 108:2 | 111:20 | 140:22 |
| I-676 10:8 | 10:6 141:12 | indicated | interestin | JOHNSON | key 29:5,18 | 114:7 | 141:5 |
| $9510: 7$ | improveme... | 24:2 | 97:12 | 1:14 | 31:12 | 115:11,15 | leave 29:21 |
| iced 121:19 | 9:13,22 | individuals | Intergover... | join 130:20 | 141:10,22 | 115:16,18 | 30:16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { idea } 2: 19 \\ & 60: 380: 11 \end{aligned}$ | inaccurate | 114:6 137:6 | 6:9,11 | $\begin{gathered} \text { joined } 24: 9 \\ 27: 17 \end{gathered}$ | Keystone 135:4 | 115:24 | leaving 104:19 |


| led 136:7 | list 80:18 | 126:2 | 134:19 | meals 147:5 | milk 28:8,9 | 42:14 43:11 | 89:19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| legal 48:22 | 126:12,16 | 143:10 | 137:17 | 147:10 | 38:25 76:19 | 45:8 149:23 | 105:22 |
| legislated | listen 24:25 | looking 26:17 | 138:23 | 148:12 | 76:21,22 | mom 108:22 | 113:2 135:3 |
| 54:24 55:2 | listing 94:7 | 44:16 47:4 | managed | mean 29:24 | 147:20 | moment | moved 14:22 |
| legislation | liter 30:21 | 64:14 83:6 | 10:3 | 43:15 51:20 | 148:5 | 140:18 | 15:22 16:2 |
| 26:17 29:6 | little 14:7 | 88:13 111:5 | Managing | 62:21 69:4 | 149:15 | monetizing | 17:6 18:7 |
| 29:20 31:13 | 33:13 40:8 | 132:8 142:9 | 58:25 | 88:12 102:4 | million 9:6,22 | 144:6 | 19:14,17 |
| 52:24 83:25 | 58:678:12 | losing 88:11 | manufactur... | 104:14 | 29:14,17,22 | money 35:2 | 20:22,25 |
| 94:4 149:13 | 90:17 95:24 | loss 69:5,6,8 | 108:18 | 109:5,13 | 30:12,13 | 39:4,13 | 22:7,11 |
| legislative | 97:11 99:6 | 69:10 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { m a p }} 111: 20$ | 132:3 | 31:21 32:6 | 40:5,13,15 | 69:23 |
| 136:7 | 112:2,18 | lost 70:5,5,6,7 | Maria 1:16 | 135:14 | 33:19 34:5 | 47:6 60:5 | movement |
| lend 29:3 | 113:10,24 | lot 40:9 42:12 | 25:17 | 140:16,23 | 42:19 43:2 | 60:25 62:18 | 89:15 |
| let's 48:25 | 113:25 | 59:3 63:7 | MARK 1:17 | 142:17,20 | 43:4 44:12 | 62:20 64:15 | moves 8:24 |
| 56:7 81:21 | 114:19 | 67:10 74:25 | mass 2:15 | 145:9 | 44:13 47:9 | 101:2,3,11 | 9:6 |
| 102:18 | 116:14 | 75:18 85:4 | Masterman... | means 37:15 | 47:11,15,16 | 101:24 | moving 12:12 |
| 113:5 | 132:6 | 106:20 | 135:25 | 78:24 89:3 | 47:24 57:25 | 102:4 103:5 | 89:10 |
| 136:18 | 139:25 | 108:8,8 | match 8:12 | 106:18 | 59:13,17,20 | 103:7,9,10 | much-needed |
| level 30:18 | 148:9 | 119:16 | matched | 151:22 | 62:6,7,9,12 | 106:25 | 133:12 |
| 35:9,17 | live 96:20 | 125:16 | 79:17 100:8 | measure | 62:23 63:7 | 123:23 | multi 54:18 |
| 51:2 78:13 | 98:15 134:8 | 126:20 | 100:14 | 26:14 27:10 | 63:14 66:7 | 124:4 | multi-year |
| 80:2 91:8 | lived 97:15 | 129:12,23 | math 62:16 | 48:23 51:25 | 66:7 67:17 | 125:14 | 56:11 |
| 95:16 96:9 | 98:25 | 138:11,22 | 143:19 | 59:11 87:2 | 74:7 87:14 | 126:20 | Multimodal |
| 98:23 | lives 137:17 | 139:11 | matter 56:4 | 87:3,18 | 87:20,25 | 139:11,16 | 8:20 |
| 106:22 | 137:23 | 140:20 | 113:15 | measured | 88:12 | 139:20,22 | multiple 25:6 |
| 132:24 | loan 58:18 | low 98:11 | 151:7 | 95:6 | 101:10,13 | 140:2,9 | MURPHY |
| 135:19 | locally 104:8 | low-income | maturity | measures | 102:17,22 | months | 151:14 |
| 141:15 | logical 36:19 | 38:4 111:22 | 138:4 | 6:23 52:16 | 103:6 104:2 | 115:13,14 | music 137:15 |
| 142:22 | long 32:14 | lower 12:23 | maximum | 55:13 | 104:12 | 115:21 |  |
| 143:14 | 33:13 51:2 | 36:2 49:14 | 89:19 | media 2:15 | 116:9 | 123:21 | N |
| levels 91:12 | 58:19 69:21 | 49:21 74:22 | Mayor 5:19 | 2:16 24:20 | 118:24 | morning | name 7:10,18 |
| 98:10,11 | 102:11 | 74:24,25 | 6:8,14 | meet 114:16 | 125:4,5,6 | 143:25 | 23:15 |
| leverage 9:23 | 122:6 | 91:11 95:16 | 25:13 28:15 | 114:22 | 125:23 | 144:4 | narrow 51:16 |
| leveraging | long-term | lunch 46:9,14 | 28:19 40:11 | 148:6 | 126:24 | mother 84:14 | narrowed |
| 59:21 | 141:22 | 147:5 | 83:23,24 | meeting | 130:9,13 | 121:19 | 122:18 |
| libraries | longer 9:19 | 148:12 | 84:22 | 12:10 13:3 | 131:5,10,13 | motion 13:9 | narrower |
| 24:14 73:20 | 58:11 114:2 | 149:4,21,21 | 104:17 | 14:10,11 | 131:22,24 | 13:18 14:12 | 52:9 |
| 74:9 | 145:5 |  | 108:11 | 23:4 115:4 | 132:14 | 15:10 16:12 | narrowly |
| library 28:14 | longer-term | M | 110:2,5 | meetings 62:2 | millions | 16:20 17:19 | 52:2 |
| life 74:6 | 113:5 | machines | 114:14,21 | 97:4 114:24 | 139:21 | 18:12,19 | nature 30:9 |
| 117:6 | look 34:11 | 9:18 | 115:7 | member | 142:10 | 19:3 20:3 | nearly 35:18 |
| light 42:2,4 | 49:13 51:20 | magnet | 124:11 | 116:15 | mind 25:10 | 20:12 21:6 | 43:3 |
| 139:15 | 63:4 73:16 | 135:23 | 132:18 | members | minimal 63:3 | 21:12,20 | necessarily |
| lighting 9:12 | 75:15 87:17 | 136:11 | 136:9 144:3 | 7:18 11:8 | minority | 22:20 | 112:9 |
| limited | 90:5,15 | magnets | Mayor's 74:2 | 14:17 16:25 | 97:10 | move 2:10,21 | 137:22 |
| 128:19 | 116:7 118:3 | 136:3,4 | 80:24 | 23:20 26:4 | minuscule | 12:11,24 | necessary |
| 137:12 | 119:14 | maintain | 102:19 | 27:15 111:6 | 139:10 | 13:9,12 | 9:19 28:18 |
| line 10:10 | 121:14,18 | 25:10 | 105:3 | mentioned | minute 33:14 | 14:18 15:13 | necessities |
| 93:11 | 130:5 | major 75:7 | 132:16 | 43:10 93:14 | 61:25 | 15:16 17:2 | 76:6 |
| lines 10:17 | 138:10 | 105:17 | MBE 24:16 | merit 52:5 | 143:16 | 17:22,25 | need 24:7,19 |
| 108:16,17 | 140:4,19 | making 13:9 | McDonald's | MICHELE | misconstrued | 19:6,9 | 46:20 54:20 |
| liquor 66:14 | 144:7 145:6 | 30:10 81:5 | 72:24 | 151:14 | 78:12 | 20:14,17 | 80:2 83:10 |
| 66:21,23,24 | looked 42:15 | 84:16 | meal 147:10 | middle | mission 89:4 | 21:23 22:2 | 83:10,11 |
| 67:11 | 125:21 | $\begin{aligned} & 108: 24 \\ & 113: 7 \text { 122:2 } \end{aligned}$ | 147:12 | 118:12 | model 42:14 | 76:11 89:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 90: 2 \text { 100:13 } \\ & 101: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
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| 102:17 | 112:23 | 130:22,22 | 100:11,17 | opening 24:3 | 3:25 4:11 | 95:20 96:23 | 111:17,19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 103:6 107:5 | 122:21 | 132:9 | 100:21 | 24:18 | 4:20 5:2,9 | 97:23 99:9 | 117:3,16,17 |
| 114:3 | 145:7 | numerous | 101:11,18 | operate 75:15 | 5:16 6:13 | 133:6,7 | 117:17,18 |
| 117:22 | new 5:5,12 | 103:25 | 102:6,11,14 | operates | 9:2 | 135:6 | 135:18 |
| 118:13 | 9:18 28:13 | nutritional | 103:14,20 | 147:18 | originally $8: 7$ | 136:22 | paying 38:5 |
| 123:22 | 55:6,7 | 76:15 77:6 | 104:13 | operating | Otis 80:5,23 | 148:23 | 72:4 |
| 129:22 | 104:17 |  | 105:4,25 | 3:23 6:22 | ounce 31:17 | parking | pediatric |
| 131:25 | 140:2,3 | 0 | 107:18,25 | 146:23 | 32:2,9 | 142:13 | 76:15 77:6 |
| 132:15 | newly $23: 8$ | O'NEILL | 107:25 | operations | 33:22 | 146:2,3 | Penn 9:25 |
| 133:17 | nightmares | 1:15 | 121:5 137:2 | 9:10 128:7 | 121:15,19 | parks 24:15 | PennDOT |
| 134:22 | 68:5 | obesity | 137:3 142:2 | opinion 26:24 | 131:4 | 73:20,22 | 9:24 |
| 138:24 | nods 77:8 | 116:11 | 142:24 | 27:3 90:24 | outcome 30:7 | 74:9 92:2,3 | Penns 9:22 |
| 146:4 | 89:6 | object $38: 8$ | 145:21,22 | 110:22 | outcomes | parochial | 10:7 |
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| 132:6 144:2 | 120:2,24 | 125:8 | schedules | 146:11 | 99:2 | 135:21 | somebody |
| 144:25 | 135:24 | salary 82:7 | 24:11 | seconded | service | single 84:14 | 100:4 |
| revenues | risk 86:8 | sales 26:15 | school 4:6,9 | 13:16 14:20 | 108:19 | 87:6 | 145:15 |
| 73:11 75:4 | 139:9 | 96:6 148:3 | 4:16 5:22 | 14:23 15:20 | services | sir 64:8 | soon 2:25 |
| 103:3 | River 10:4 | sampling | 30:5 46:13 | 15:23 17:4 | 38:13 134:9 | sit-down | sorry $2: 7$ |
| 112:12 | Rob 27:16 | 98:20 | 65:6,19 | 17:7 18:5,8 | 147:10,14 | 113:24 | 39:24 43:6 |
| 140:4 | 48:24 | Sanchez | 66:3 80:17 | 19:12,15 | session 15:19 | sitting 109:14 | 70:14 71:21 |
| 142:11 | 130:19 | 54:13,17 | 80:19 91:22 | 20:20,23 | 16:4,18 | situation | 82:6 83:24 |
| reviewed | 144:9 145:5 | 55:5,10 | 93:15,18 | 22:5,8 | 18:4,24 | 138:5 | 107:19 |
| 26:16 95:4 | robust 141:7 | 56:13,17 | 94:7 102:16 | Section 4:2 | 19:11,20 | situations | 114:19,22 |
| 115:8 | rollout 85:12 | 57:3,11,15 | 102:22,25 | 4:12 | 20:8,19 | 124:14 | 115:17 |
| reviewing | 85:15 86:6 | 58:3,16,23 | 104:9 107:7 | sector 52:3 | 21:3,17 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { s i x }} 3: 18$ | 145:12 |
| 130:2 | roof 9:9 | 59:10,19 | 107:12,13 | see 42:2 | 22:4,13,25 | 135:12 | 148:17 |
| Revised 6:3 | room 1:6 | 60:2,9,16 | 117:19,20 | 56:25 69:8 | set 140:24 | size 30:19 | sort 85:11 |
| revising 4:23 | 109:17 | 61:3,9 | 118:24 | 69:10 70:4 | sets 109:7 | 128:20 | 86:2 94:14 |
| revisit 130:23 | 119:24,25 | $\begin{aligned} & 118: 17 \\ & 120: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 138:16,18 | 79:12,12 | 140:23 | 129:5 | 97:6,18 |


| 98:17 99:2 | 114:16,22 | 23:14 | 148:2 | 86:23 | table 7:13 | 57:7,9,13 | 95:8,10,12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 104:4 | 148:24 | stop 36:7 | submitted 6:8 | 110:10 | 11:20 25:5 | targeted | 95:15 97:5 |
| 110:25 | stand 118:9 | 107:19 | subsidy 84:17 | 111:12 | 25:7 27:17 | 49:25 86:6 | 100:18,22 |
| 136:9,11 | 118:10,11 | 120:2,3 | substantial | 122:3 | 27:19 66:17 | targeting | 100:25 |
| 149:6 | 150:18 | 139:25 | 28:12 44:23 | supposed | 80:7 90:21 | 114:5 | 101:2,5,16 |
| sorts 108:17 | standing | stores 55:20 | 60:24 | 110:21 | 97:7 140:23 | task 28:16 | 101:19,21 |
| source 109:11 | 48:22 | 70:24 72:18 | substitute | 118:22 | 140:24 | TAUBENB... | 101:23,25 |
| 111:2 112:8 | standpoint | 73:5 96:3 | 28:9 | sure 56:12 | 145:19 | 1:18 | 102:3,8 |
| sources 8:25 | 62:17 | 96:11,19 | success | 61:21,23,25 | tackle 140:10 | $\boldsymbol{t a x} 2: 17,21$ | 103:22,23 |
| 9:3 60:22 | STAR 133:23 | 97:14 98:23 | 141:11,22 | 62:3 63:18 | take 23:23 | 4:5,7,14,17 | 104:4,7,9 |
| south 10:8 | 133:23 | 111:21 | sufficient | 78:10 87:19 | 26:21 35:6 | 4:23,23 5:7 | 104:11,25 |
| speak 144:8 | stars 133:23 | Story 112:24 | 28:11 29:7 | 95:9 103:4 | 38:8 44:10 | 5:14 11:18 | 105:2 |
| 144:13 | 135:2,3,4 | strategy | 30:24 31:14 | 105:20 | 47:22,23 | 12:18,21 | 109:15,19 |
| Speaking | 135:22 | 114:2 116:3 | 31:18 32:21 | 106:11 | 58:19 60:10 | 26:8,12,16 | 111:15,17 |
| 73:21 | start 2:3 | stream | 67:14,14,17 | 111:4 113:7 | 61:5 99:6 | 28:3,5,10 | 112:3 |
| special 46:8 | 12:11 39:18 | 112:19,20 | sufficiently | 128:5 | 104:24 | 29:21 30:9 | 113:13,19 |
| specific 31:24 | 102:7 116:2 | streams | 32:3,7 | 129:20,23 | 107:2 112:2 | 30:15,16,17 | 116:22,23 |
| 55:8 60:8 | 128:14,18 | 100:9,14 | sugar 2:17,17 | 130:4 | 112:17 | 30:21 31:4 | 116:23 |
| 61:2 96:16 | 128:24 | street 9:12 | 2:21 35:8 | 134:19 | 113:10 | 34:25 35:8 | 117:25 |
| specifically | 138:25 | 46:13 95:2 | 37:12,16 | 136:12 | 122:6,9 | 35:16 37:9 | 118:20 |
| 34:3 84:9 | started 57:22 | 118:10,11 | 38:22 44:6 | 144:12 | 123:4 146:5 | 37:12,16,18 | 120:23 |
| 144:6 | 93:12 102:8 | 118:12 | 44:6 55:13 | 145:23 | taken 13:4 | 38:3,6,12 | 121:17,20 |
| speculate | 120:16 | streets 8:23 | 67:24 69:6 | 146:10 | 74:2 122:21 | 38:17,21,23 | 121:21 |
| 103:18 | starting | 9:7,8 146:6 | 69:7 121:20 | survey 98:18 | 151:6 | 39:18 40:16 | 130:25 |
| spend 59:17 | 85:16 | 149:20 | sugar-sweet... | 99:6 | talk 31:12 | 40:16,21 | 139:10,18 |
| 87:21 | state 8:14,17 | strictly 132:9 | 5:6 26:11 | suspend | 44:25 55:21 | 41:19,20,22 | 144:21 |
| spending | 66:22 67:4 | strong 25:3 | 30:15 45:15 | 13:21 | 56:7 98:5 | 42:7,17,20 | 147:3,21 |
| 6:23 8:13 | 79:18 97:24 | 51:18 | 47:12 48:3 | suspended | 113:6,25 | 43:15 45:12 | 148:2 |
| spent 59:24 | 103:3,5,16 | strongly | 51:9 52:8 | 15:17 16:3 | 114:24 | 45:14,15 | tax-related |
| spirit 120:11 | 139:23 | 26:12 | 52:20 53:20 | 16:16 18:2 | 115:22,23 | 47:13 49:13 | 2:18 |
| 142:3 | 142:21 | structure | 53:24 70:21 | 18:23 19:10 | 138:7 | 50:9,23 | taxable 73:2 |
| spoke 119:23 | 145:25 | 129:21 | 71:9,11 | 19:18 20:7 | 142:18 | 52:8,19,20 | taxation |
| 119:24 | 147:12,16 | struggling | 77:11 | 20:18 21:2 | talked 35:7,8 | 53:5,17,20 | 89:16 |
| spoken | 149:5 | 138:23 | 101:15 | 21:16 22:3 | 37:25 40:10 | 55:3,14 | taxed 44:2 |
| 106:23 | state-spons... | student 87:22 | sugary 29:21 | 22:12,24 | 62:2 84:24 | 57:4 61:24 | 55:20 71:8 |
| spots 79:7,21 | 8:19 | 106:21 | 31:3 38:21 | suspension | 87:10 96:8 | 62:16 64:10 | 71:10,12,20 |
| 82:23 85:10 | stated 38:17 | 138:15 | 95:10 | 13:18,24 | 97:5 109:25 | 66:14,24 | 76:2,3,19 |
| 88:23 | statement | students 88:3 | 101:21,23 | 18:11 | 118:19 | 67:13,24,24 | 76:21,23 |
| Squilla 1:17 | 145:13 | 88:7,15,20 | 102:7 | sustain 102:9 | 122:6 142:3 | 68:20,24 | 77:5,7,11 |
| 64:4,5,9,22 | states 93:21 | 89:2 90:9 | 113:19 | sustainability | talking 38:3 | 69:6,7,14 | taxes 5:4,11 |
| 65:3,8,25 | statewide | 107:11 | 121:16 | 50:22 | 40:9 46:16 | 70:6,21,25 | 12:16,17 |
| 66:10,12 | 66:25 | 138:20,21 | sugary-swe... | 118:20 | 49:3,7 | 71:9,11,12 | 38:15 44:22 |
| 67:3,9,22 | stay 108:6 | 147:6,7,8 | 49:20 50:7 | sustainable | 55:17 61:24 | 71:14,24 | 51:15,16,20 |
| 68:2,8,12 | 145:5 | 148:11 | sunsets | 104:21 | 75:18 76:14 | 72:4,5,9 | 54:24,24 |
| 69:4,15,19 | steer 75:23 | study 9:25 | 103:22,23 | 120:25 | 82:7 87:25 | 73:10 74:14 | 64:10 66:24 |
| 69:22 70:3 | stenographic | 10:5 117:8 | supervision | 139:6 | 89:12 96:11 | 74:21 75:20 | 67:23 70:5 |
| 70:10 93:13 | 151:6 | 144:23 | 151:23 | sweetened | 97:8 98:16 | 76:8,12,17 | 70:22,23 |
| Squilla's | step 103:16 | stuff 113:12 | supplements | 38:23 | 100:4 | 78:16,16 | 74:16 84:16 |
| 65:21 | stickler 57:20 | 114:11 | 76:14,25 | system 129:8 | 109:14 | 86:20 89:14 | 90:24 96:5 |
| SSB 74:14 | stipulates | 115:13 | 77:2 | 129:17 | 115:12,19 | 89:25 90:6 | 117:23 |
| stack 25:14 | 147:24 | 142:8 | support | 130:10 | 116:2 125:5 | 90:23 91:4 | 140:3 144:5 |
| staff 26:23 | Stitt 3:14 | subject 30:20 | 10:10 29:3 | systems 124:3 | 137:21 | 91:4,18,25 | 144:6 |
| 32:20 42:12 | 6:18 7:9 | 68:24 71:24 | 29:25 30:7 | T | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { t a p }} 56: 22$ | 94:15 95:7 | taxing 68:6,9 |
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| 68:10 76:5 | 23:8,23 | 136:22,24 | 69:11,12,12 | 119:5 | titles 3:15 | 110:19 | uniformity |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 116:4 | 24:25 25:25 | 137:3 143:3 | 69:17,21,25 | thoughtful | 8:24 | 136:12 | 26:16 |
| taxpayers | 26:6,8 29:3 | 143:6,20,21 | 71:6,23,25 | 121:3 | today 2:18,22 | Tulante | unintended |
| 49:15 | 31:6 48:21 | 144:2,16 | 73:8,15 | 122:11 | 2:24,25 | 11:17,21 | 119:11 |
| 110:13 | 65:20 93:16 | 145:2,4 | 75:6,21 | thoughtfully | 6:19 7:20 | 23:18 26:2 | universal |
| tea 121:19 | 100:25 | 146:14,19 | 76:17 78:18 | 89:17 | 24:22 60:8 | 27:5,18,20 | 5:20 24:12 |
| technical 8:3 | 101:17 | 146:24 | 78:23 79:9 | three 29:16 | 113:3 | 27:25 66:19 | 78:24 79:8 |
| 8:8 32:19 | 102:5 | 148:14,17 | 79:17 80:19 | 29:18 54:20 | 117:14 | 67:5 118:3 | 80:15 81:23 |
| 133:24 | 103:24 | 148:17 | 82:18 83:12 | 55:24 58:8 | 146:25 | turn 70:15 | 82:22 84:7 |
| 134:25 | 116:5 | 150:5,7,9 | 85:4,21 | 67:18 79:8 | 150:16 | 105:5 | 85:8 86:23 |
| technology | 148:18 | 150:12,13 | 86:24 90:8 | 79:9 84:13 | told 58:3 60:4 | turns 141:5 | 90:12 99:21 |
| 137:16 | thank 2:4 3:2 | they'd 68:22 | 91:9 92:7,8 | 88:19,24 | 60:5 100:13 | two 25:14 | 105:5,6 |
| tell 33:5 | 3:13 6:18 | thing 106:3 | 92:9 98:12 | 124:16 | 122:19 | 44:22 46:7 | 106:14 |
| 97:11 | 7:15 10:25 | 119:13 | 98:16 99:4 | 129:25 | top 44:19 | 56:18 59:16 | 110:9 111:2 |
| 108:12 | 11:6,12,14 | 123:23 | 99:10 100:5 | 141:10 | total 9:23 | 59:18,25 | universe |
| 140:18 | 13:11 14:14 | 124:4,7 | 100:7 | 143:9 | 29:16 68:15 | 66:17 68:7 | 79:21,25 |
| telling 110:11 | 14:22 15:12 | 126:4 144:9 | 101:13 | three- 79:22 | 83:9,10,15 | 69:11,12 | 80:12 83:15 |
| tells 25:5 | 15:22 16:22 | things 36:23 | 102:12 | 80:12 83:4 | 88:19,19 | 84:14 | unlimited |
| ten 85:23 | 17:6,21 | 58:17 76:22 | 103:17 | 139:2 | 95:13 | 101:16 | 108:25 |
| tend 72:18 | 18:7 19:5 | 78:11 87:17 | 104:22 | 140:12 | totally 29:13 | 103:21 | unnecessary |
| 87:17 | 19:14 20:13 | 95:21 | 109:16 | 141:8 | 117:15 | 112:14 | 125:24 |
| tends 91:10 | 20:22 21:22 | 103:21 | 110:2,13 | three-quart... | tough 121:8 | 115:13,14 | use $4: 4,8$ |
| term 51:2 | 22:7 25:21 | 106:20 | 111:15,25 | 127:9 | towed 139:18 | 115:21 | 10:10 50:8 |
| 102:20 | 25:23 27:5 | 114:2 | 113:20 | three-year-... | town 97:3 | 118:25 | 67:23 122:9 |
| 105:3 | 31:10 33:11 | 119:10 | 117:7 | 90:10 | traditional | 119:10 | 127:10 |
| 113:25 | 34:14,18 | 122:4,5 | 118:16 | throwing | 2:16 | 134:13 | usually 32:16 |
| 114:2 | 40:25 41:2 | 124:13 | 119:9 | 81:20 | traffic 9:10 | type 58:21 | 117:12 |
| terms 4:10,18 | 41:4,7,12 | 125:17,20 | 120:13,15 | ticket 139:19 | 9:11 | typically 25:7 |  |
| 4:24 5:7,14 | 42:11 48:9 | 125:24 | 122:3,17 | tie 149:8 | training |  | V |
| 5:23 12:8 | 48:10,13,16 | 142:20,21 | 124:12,13 | time 13:2 | 138:6 | U | vacancy |
| 54:6 57:17 | 48:20 54:8 | think 32:5 | 124:23,24 | 20:11 32:14 | transcript | U\&O 12:17 | 126:9 |
| 69:2 81:16 | 54:10,13 | 35:4,9,20 | 127:14,16 | 48:6 54:19 | 151:8,21 | 96:6 | 127:10,16 |
| 82:7 83:3,9 | 61:10,12,15 | 36:6,19 | 127:24 | 55:25 56:2 | transfer 5:17 | ultimate | 127:19 |
| 86:6 90:8 | 63:20,21,23 | 37:2,9,10 | 128:9,14, | 58:6,15 | Transit 9:2 | 133:14 | vacant 126:6 |
| 90:22 98:17 | 64:5 65:23 | 37:11 38:16 | 128:20 | 59:7 68:16 | transition | ultimately | valuable 96:7 |
| 107:10,15 | 65:24,25 | 39:5,16 | 137:5 | 69:21 77:23 | 140:25 | 133:11 | value 51:23 |
| 112:11 | 70:11,13,18 | 41:14 42:5 | 138:11 | 81:3 94:17 | 141:3 | unavoidable | 52:21 93:8 |
| 132:5 | 77:20,25 | 42:8 43:4 | 142:4,15,24 | 99:7 102:24 | travel 46:8 | 91:5,14 | 96:5 124:16 |
| 134:19 | 78:4 86:13 | 43:10 44:11 | 144:9 | 109:9 115:5 | trouble 108:7 | underlying | valued 93:10 |
| 140:11 | 86:15 90:18 | 44:22,23 | 149:11 | 117:10 | 108:15 | 42:6 | various |
| testified | 91:20 92:19 | 47:12 49:12 | thinking | 118:4 121:4 | troubles | underneath | 147:11 |
| 26:10 91:23 | 92:22,25 | 49:23 50:2 | 85:22 | 128:2 | 108:20,25 | 84:5 | vehicle 37:17 |
| 104:23 | 93:7 99:9 | 50:10,15,17 | 102:23 | 139:14,18 | true 151:7 | underscore | vehicles |
| 129:9 | 99:15 | 51:23 52:4 | 134:4 | 145:11 | truly 105:6 | 131:20 | 139:19 |
| testify 11:17 | 107:21,23 | 52:6,14,22 | third 89:5 | 150:20 | trust 8:20 | understand | verify 61:20 |
| 23:9 27:2 | 108:4 | 55:12 56:16 | 138:13,22 | timeline 12:8 | 60:19,21 | 36:13 53:15 | versus 41:23 |
| 146:25 | 116:16,19 | 57:5,8,12 | 141:4 | times 55:24 | try 2:10 | 63:4 81:14 | 48:5 79:24 |
| 148:15 | 119:19 | 57:14 58:16 | thought 36:2 | 103:25 | 108:6 112:5 | 99:8 101:6 | 80:19 95:7 |
| testifying | 123:7,10 | 59:7 60:7 | 41:25 49:2 | 104:23 | 123:24,25 | 129:19 | 108:18,18 |
| 27:7 | 130:14,16 | 60:13,20,21 | 49:6 89:16 | 143:10 | 127:15,23 | 137:10,11 | 122:15,16 |
| testimony | 132:25 | 66:2,15 | 94:12,16 | timing 127:3 | 143:18 | 141:15 | view 51:4,19 |
| 3:117:3 | 133:7,8 | 67:25 68:4 | 112:6 | 127:11 | trying 63:3 | 145:10 | virtually |
| 11:13 23:6 | 134:16 | 68:21,22 | thought-out | Title 5:3,10 | 89:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { unforeseen } \\ & 2: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30: 10 \\ \text { visit 23:10 } \end{gathered}$ |


| 55:18 | 144:2,8,11 | 133:20 | 43:5 47:25 | withhold | X | 63:6,12 | 13:13 14:1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| visited 117:13 | 145:5 | 139:6,10 | 51:11 54:22 | 120:12 |  | 87:11 | 14:13,16,24 |
| vocational | 148:22 | ways $36: 15$ | 55:3 58:17 | witness 7:10 | Y | 130:25 | 15:1,7,11 |
| 137:14 | wanted 61:19 | 37:8 68:7 | 60:5,21,21 | 7:12,12 | yeah 38:19 | 131:3,11,12 | 15:14,23 |
| volume 148:5 | 63:17 78:21 | WBEs 24:16 | 115:4,7,12 | 11:19 23:15 | 44:11,21 | 132:2,7,16 | 16:1,13 |
| vote 2:17,23 | 85:4 123:12 | we'll 11:16 | 115:20 | 80:6 145:18 | 62:22 66:19 | 132:18,21 | 17:1 18:1 |
| 13:24 24:23 | 144:16 | 26:20 59:15 | 119:3 123:2 | 145:18 | 68:21 76:9 | 133:23 | 19:1 20:1 |
| 60:10 61:5 | 148:25 | 61:7 79:10 | 126:10 | 148:20 | 88:4 92:18 | 135:2 | 21:1 22:1 |
| 68:16 78:14 | wants $12: 16$ | 124:25 | 135:16 | 150:11 | 115:4,6,11 | 1,175 84:16 | 23:1 24:1 |
| 78:15 | 12:19 106:7 | 125:12 | wealthy | Witnesses | 119:15 | 1,300 124:22 | 25:1 26:1 |
| 120:22 | Washington | 130:6 | 106:13 | 11:19 80:6 | year 3:24 | 124:24 | 27:1 28:1 |
| voted 13:14 | 10:9 | we're 2:3 12:3 | website 23:11 | wizard 48:24 | 5:18 6:4,7 | 125:3 | 29:1 30:1 |
| 120:19 | wasn't 40:3 | 12:4,9,10 | Wednesday | 49:8 | 7:5,6,7 | 1,400 80:17 | 31:1 32:1 |
| voters 57:23 | 113:19 | 12:13,16,24 | 1:7 150:19 | women 87:3 | 29:15 39:5 | 1.3 9:6 | 33:1 34:1 |
| voting 9:18 | 114:7 | 13:23 14:11 | week 37:22 | 136:17 | 51:11 54:25 | 1.8 47:8,15,23 | 35:1 36:1 |
| 24:21 | 143:12 | 26:17 30:8 | 84:14,16 | wondering | 57:25 58:2 | 47:25 | 37:1 38:1 |
| 111:14 | water 8:13,17 | 31:20 39:19 | 112:14 | 45:21 | 74:7 85:16 | 1.92 121:21 | 39:1 40:1 |
|  | 30:14,20 | 40:22 43:20 | 113:21 | 149:22 | 85:18,22 | 1:40 1:7 | 41:1 42:1 |
| W | 43:11,13,24 | 43:23 46:15 | 120:13 | word 50:8 | 99:25 104:3 | 10 54:2 95:12 | 43:1 44:1 |
| wage 4:22 | 43:25 44:4 | 53:6 57:4 | 121:20 | 143:9 | 107:13 | 10,000 79:7 | 45:1 46:1 |
| 12:21 55:3 | 44:7,10,13 | 57:17,19 | 122:10 | words 25:16 | 112:4 125:4 | 79:15,19,21 | 47:1 48:1 |
| 70:6 103:23 | 45:9,16,18 | 60:10 61:4 | 123:4 142:4 | work 24:10 | 127:6,9 | 81:17 82:3 | 49:1 50:1 |
| 104:8 | 47:2,19,22 | 62:3 75:9 | 143:13 | 59:3,4 | 131:9 | 82:14,23 | 51:1 52:1 |
| wait 80:18 | 55:23 56:7 | 76:5 83:6 | weeks 62:14 | 64:17 86:3 | years 3:18 | 85:13 | 53:1 54:1 |
| 143:13,16 | 56:8,9,22 | 86:24 87:25 | 112:15 | 86:4 87:4,7 | 6:5 39:6 | 108:23 | 55:1 56:1 |
| waived 26:24 | 56:22 57:4 | 88:20 89:3 | welcome 3:3 | 120:4 | 54:20 55:3 | 112:5 | 57:1 58:1 |
| wall 122:24 | 57:6,7,13 | 89:12,17 | 64:8 99:13 | 129:18 | 56:15,18 | 11 42:19 43:4 | 59:1 60:1 |
| Wallace 7:11 | 64:18 66:8 | 98:8 101:22 | 99:18 133:4 | 130:2,6 | 59:16,18,25 | 56:13 | 61:1 62:1 |
| 11:6,8 | 71:7 75:23 | 101:25 | welcomed | 134:24 | 79:9,10 | 120 125:6 | 63:1 64:1 |
| want 12:22 | 76:2,14,18 | 103:4 | 93:9 | 136:9 | 88:19,24 | 128 121:15 | 65:1 66:1 |
| 13:20 34:8 | 92:5 126:14 | 106:24 | went 66:7 | 142:18,22 | 102:20,21 | $134124: 17$ | 67:1 68:1 |
| 45:25 55:11 | Waterfront | 108:23 | 117:20 | 143:17 | 108:8 112:4 | 14,000 99:23 | 69:1 70:1 |
| 55:14 62:3 | 10:4 | 109:6 111:5 | 143:8,10 | worked 94:15 | 118:25 | 100:9,15 | 71:1 72:1 |
| 76:7 78:9 | Wawa 55:18 | 112:15 | weren't 48:2 | workers | 124:16 | 15 36:20 37:3 | 73:1 74:1 |
| 78:15 89:9 | 72:23 | 114:14,23 | 126:13 | 135:19 | yesterday | 57:4 64:11 | 75:1 76:1 |
| 90:18 98:16 | Wawa's | 115:8 119:2 | 138:20 | working | 148:24 | 64:16,18 | 77:1 78:1 |
| 101:5 | 72:21 | 121:7 122:2 | white-collar | 79:12 86:24 | yield 130:24 | 67:13 102:2 | 79:1 80:1 |
| 105:20,22 | way $31: 4$ | 123:16 | 108:19 | 124:9 | 131:2,12,22 | 121:18,22 | 81:1 82:1 |
| 106:4,23 | 46:12,18 | 124:17,23 | whittling | 125:10 | yielding | 131:21,23 | 83:1 84:1 |
| 108:5 110:4 | 51:19 52:23 | 124:25 | 128:18,24 | 128:4 | 131:24 | 132:14 | 85:1 86:1 |
| 110:5,6 | 64:17 68:19 | 125:5 | wide-reachi... | 144:20 | 132:14 | 15-cent-per... | 87:1 88:1 |
| 113:16 | 75:22 86:3 | 126:15 | 42:3 | world 81:17 | young 79:22 | 28:3 | 89:1 90:1 |
| 116:7 121:2 | 90:15 97:25 | 128:4 | wider 51:24 | worry 145:9 | 90:9 108:17 | 150,000 | 91:1 92:1 |
| 121:2 | 98:6 99:4 | 129:12 | 68:25 | worst 75:11 | 137:16 | 108:22 | 93:1 94:1 |
| 123:16 | 110:3 | 134:4 | William 1:12 | worth 9:6 | 138:9 | 1563-A 6:15 | 95:1 96:1 |
| 125:17 | 114:24 | 137:21 | 9:25 | wouldn't |  | 16 30:13 | 97:1 98:1 |
| 126:5,25 | 115:9 | 140:8 | win $25: 15$ | 36:12 38:10 | Z | 44:12 | 99:1 100:1 |
| 128:2,3 | 117:12 | 142:17,22 | win-win | 38:24 39:3 |  | 160170 1:20 | 101:1 102:1 |
| 129:17,25 | 119:5,6 | 144:7,22 | 25:15,20 | 39:12 45:16 | 0 | 3:1,9,16 4:1 | 103:1 104:1 |
| 130:23 | 120:3,24 | 145:12 | wind $47: 16$ | 67:6 71:23 |  | 5:1 6:1 7:1 | 105:1 106:1 |
| 132:24 | 121:3 | we've 26:14 | 75:12 | 73:2 74:25 | 1 | 7:21 8:1 9:1 | 107:1 108:1 |
| 133:9 | 122:18 | 40:2 42:21 | window 9:9 | write 130:9 | $162: 7,8,11,11$ | 10:1 11:1 | 109:1 110:1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 135: 20 \\ & 143: 24 \end{aligned}$ | 125:7,11,13 | 42:25 43:2 | wish 23:9 | wrong 138:14 | 62:17,25 | 12:1 13:1,5 | 111:1 112:1 |
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