1	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA						
2	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES						
3	HOUSE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE						
4							
5	GATEWAY HIGH SCHOOL AUDITORIUM						
6	3000 GATEWAY CAMPUS BOULEVARD						
7	MONROEVILLE, PENNSYLVANIA						
8							
9							
10	FRIDAY, JUNE 18, 2010						
11	PUBLIC HEARING - TRANSPORTATION FUNDING:						
12	ISSUES AFFECTING THE SOUTHWEST REGION						
13							
14							
15	BEFORE:						
16	Representative Joseph Markosek, Majority Chairman						
17	Representative Richard Geist, Minority Chairman Representative Mike Carroll						
18	Representative Paul Costa Representative Joseph Petrarca						
19	Representative Stan Saylor Representative Randy Vulakovich						
20	Representative Jeffrey Pyle Representative Dom Costa						
21	Representative Chris Sainato Representative Anthony DeLuca						
22	Representative William Kortz Representative Mark Longietti						
23							
2 4							
25	Reported by: Lisa Ann Bauer, RPR, CRR, CMRS						

1	Ī	\overline{N}	$\underline{\mathbf{D}}$	$\underline{\mathbf{E}}$	\overline{X}

2	<u>NAME</u>	PAGE
3	H. DANIEL CESSNA JOSEPH SZCZUR	8 16
4	RON URIAH	31
5	CHAD AMOND JOSEPH KIRK	3 6 3 9
6	LYNN DeLORENZO MICHAEL WELSH	4 4 4 8
7	JOYCE DRIBEN STEPHEN BLAND	51 53
8	PATRICK McMAHON RICHARD BLOOMINGDALE	7 1 7 8
9	LUCY SPRUILL JOHN TAGUE	8 2 8 6
10	JONATHAN ROBISON ANDREW BONI	90 93
11	KEN ZAPINSKI DAN FRIEDMAN	98 102
12	CHARLES NIEDERRITER LYNN MANION	106 111
13	BILL NEWLAND MARY JO MORANDINI	114 117
14	SHEILA GOMBITA LARRY MORRIS	124 124
15	VALERIE KISSELL MICHAEL EDWARDS	125 132
16	PATRICIA KIRKPATRICK CHRIS SANDVIG	135 141
17	GENEVIEVE BARBEE SCOTT BRICKER	147 151
18	ROBERT CRONAUER CHARLIE CAMP	155 160
19	COURT GOULD MICHAEL ALEXANDER	166 170
	DONALD DUNLEVY	174
20	GARY ENGLISH JOHN SMITH	179 183
21		

- - - -

2.0

PROCEEDINGS

(11:17 o'clock a.m.)

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Good morning,
everybody. Please take your seats. Welcome. The
first order of business will be to have the
co-chairman of the Pennsylvania House Transportation
Committee, Chairman Geist, lead us in the Pledge of
Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

attending today. This is a hearing sponsored by the Pennsylvania House of Representatives Transportation Committee, along with the committees of -- the Policies Committees of both the House Democrats and the Republicans. This is a bipartisan hearing.

The purpose is all because of the Governor's calling a special session on the very difficult transportation funding problem that faces all of us here in Pennsylvania, and we decided that we'd take the committee around statewide, seven different areas of the state.

We'll try to get the sound system corrected.

But we decided to bring the committee around the state to all the regions of the state, seven regions of the state. This is our seventh, the southwest, and we're

- - - -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

happy to be here at Gateway High School, and I want to first thank the folks here at Gateway for their wonderful hospitality in allowing us to attend here today.

The first thing I want to do is introduce my fellow colleagues who are here, members who are here. We have, to my far right, Representative Joseph Petrarca of Westmoreland County, Representative Paul Costa of Allegheny County, Representative Mike Carroll, Luzerne County, Chairman Rick Geist is Blair County. We have the chair of the Republican Policies Committee, Chairman Stan Saylor of York County, Randy Vulakovich of Allegheny County, Representative Jeff Pyle of Armstrong County, Representative Dom Costa of Allegheny County, Representative Chris Sainato of Lawrence County, and my good friend Representative Tony DeLuca from Penn Hills, Allegheny County, and we have Bill Kortz, on my far right, from Allegheny County, who has also joined us here today, and there will be some members, I'm sure, coming and going as we move forward.

Before I get started here, I'd like to offer either Chairman Geist or Chairman Saylor any opening remarks.

REP. GEIST: Thank you very much.

- - - -

2.0

It's certainly a pleasure for us to travel the length and breadth of this state listening to these that we have on both the structures and highways and transportation and the amount of (inaudible) the General Assembly.

I want to thank everybody who has participated today. I want to thank the staffs that worked very hard to make this happen. Joe's staff and my staff and Stan's and Mike's, they have gone really out of their way. (Inaudible.) Chairman Joe Markosek has done a fabulous job as chairman of the Transportation Committee and (inaudible).

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Representative Stan Saylor.

REP. SAYLOR: I'm pleased to be here in Pittsburgh today, or Monroeville, as such. I want to compliment Chairman Markosek and Chairman Geist for putting these hearings together and their staff for doing a wonderful job.

It's so critical for Pennsylvania to come up with a unified plan, both Republicans and Democrats, and it's important basically because our highways in Pennsylvania doesn't serve just Republicans or just Democrats. We need to have an infrastructure that supports our business community and job growth, so I'm

- - - -

pleased to be here and hopefully hear some solutions today as we go forward to try and solve the infrastructure problems here in Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Chairman Markosek.

2.0

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you, Stan. A couple of notes here. When we call a testifier -- by the way, this is a hearing of the committee. We have an agenda of testifiers. They are being called up individually and given a certain amount of time, and when they come up, we would like everybody to come up these steps over here and testify and then move off that way so we can kind of get a free flow going here.

We have a very long agenda today. These hearings have been averaging about five hours each, and so we would like, as far as public comments -- people have said, hey, I'd like to say something -- you have to wait until the end, assuming we have time. I do understand they have another event here, so if we have time, we'll have people that are not on the agenda and we'll give them one minute apiece.

We have a timer here, and you might be able to see it, but we set the time for the allotted time for each testifier. There is a green light that's on that turns into a yellow light with one minute left to sum up, and the red light comes on when time is up, and it

- - - -

2.0

beeps so everybody knows when their time is up. And we would ask the testifiers to please move forward and sum up immediately when they hear the beep.

There is no food or drink allowed in the auditorium part of the auditorium here where the audience is sitting, and so I would caution you about that. I want to thank the Concrete Association here today that supplied some goodies for us that are located in the back area here.

So with that, just one last thing. I would ask the members who are here when they ask questions to make them short, too, and try to stay away from speeches, which we get in the habit of doing once in a while, and just ask your questions so we can move things forward.

We have Representative Mark Longietti who has also joined us from Mercer County as well.

So without any further adieu, I'm going to go right to the agenda, and the first folks up are our friends from PennDOT District 11 and District 12. We have District 11 Executive Dan Cessna and District 12 Executive Joe Szczur, both friends with all of us here who have worked very hard on behalf of PennDOT. And I guess, Dan, you're going to start and give an overview of the state transportation funding issues and each of

- - - -

you can talk about your district. You may proceed. You each have 20 minutes.

2.0

MR. CESSNA: Thank you. It's good to be here. It's a little awkward setup with the PowerPoint presentation displayed in the back, and it might be helpful if you could turn and look to the back to -- these pictures help illustrate what we're going to discuss.

The first slide that I show you are just -- I want to say first, I am speaking on behalf of the Secretary. And these first few pictures demonstrate bridge needs of structurally deficient bridges that are currently not scheduled to be repaired. So this just shows the diary of the issue across the state, considering that we have a large bridge program and we still have bridges that look like this that are not programmed and being addressed.

Similarly, we have state highways that are in need of resurfacing, maintenance deficiencies that just currently cannot be addressed or repaired due to funding constraints.

I want to talk, certainly, around the region, around the state, several lines on this graph, I want to draw attention to. The green line is called the bid price index, the red line is the consumer price

- - - -

2.0

index, and the final line, blue, is the construction cost index. What's dramatic here, you can see two of the lines seem to follow inflation pretty well over time. However, the bid price index, which indicates the bids that Pennsylvania uses to build our projects, has escalated at a dramatic rate in comparison to overall inflation. The result of this is a loss of buying power of about \$1.6 billion since 2002, and that's the impact just in stable funding of what the dollar doesn't buy today that it did eight years ago.

Currently, in Pennsylvania, 74 percent of the motor license fund's highway and bridge operating budget is spent on contracts with private industry. We want to emphasize that, because a lot of people don't realize that most of the work that PennDOT does is completed, whether it's design or construction, by private industry, and it has a major impact on our state and local economies.

Across Pennsylvania, because of inadequate funding for transportation, we really had to refocus our program. In 2001 and 2004 TIP, about 25 percent of PennDOT's resources were spent improving and adding capacity to our highway system. You can see over the last five TIP cycles, each time PennDOT has had to reduce that dramatically and redirect the funds to

- - - -

2.0

maintain our existing system. The current TIP has 5 percent, only 5 percent of our money going to improve, meaning adding capacity to our existing system, and that number will likely continue to decline moving forward as we redirect dollars to the maintenance of the existing 40,000 miles of highway and 25,000 state bridges.

Act 44, which was enacted in 2007, presented a new funding source for PennDOT. It generated, basically, \$950 million per year, but the advantage was it also increased with inflation over time. This funding was provided by the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission and it required approval of the federal government to toll Interstate 80. Unfortunately, as everyone knows, I80 is not going to be tolled. The federal government rejected the application, and because of that, Act 44 required that the funding level would drop to \$450 million per year, rather than 950 and growing, and that would remain constant for the next 46 years.

Across Pennsylvania, dramatic improvements have been happening to our transportation system conditions, despite the funding challenges. Over the past two decades, we focused on paving and resurfacing our highways and have seen a decrease from 1996 of

- - - -

2.0

18,000 miles of highway in poor condition to about a little over 8,000 today, so that's a significant increase over time. I want to draw your attention, though, to the difference between 2008 and 2009. Unfortunately, that trend has turned in the opposite direction and we ticked up a little bit and actually added more poor miles of road than we removed from the system, and if the funding condition continues, that will likely get more dramatic and worse.

Similarly, for structurally deficient bridges, we've had improvement over the last number of years, but what I do want to draw your attention to is that from 2002 until 2008, we actually increased the number of structurally deficient bridges because we were not investing enough money removing structurally deficient bridges from the system quicker than older bridges were becoming structurally deficient.

With the increases in funding from Act 44, some additional bond revenues and other investments, PennDOT adopted our accelerated bridge program, and that number peaked at 6,000 in 2008, and now we've reduced it to 5600 beginning this year, and that number should continue to decrease under the current bridges under construction.

I want to draw your attention, though, that

- - - -

because of Act 44 failing or not providing the funds that we expected, we have 441 unfunded highway and bridge projects across the state that are at risk of not being funded.

2.0

Additionally, we showed the good that can happen with increased investment in bridges. This graph has two lines on it, a green and a yellow. The green indicates what we had expected to do with Act 44 funds and other bridges through a heavy investment bridge program in driving our number of structurally deficient bridges to 12 percent of the national -- 12 percent versus the national average of 8 percent by 2033. We would still have about 3,000 structurally deficient bridges, but it would be a significant improvement over today.

Unfortunately, the yellow line indicates what we expect to happen now without the funding of Act 44. That trend will continue to show an improvement, but then we'll continue to worsen as the bridges age and deteriorate. Currently, Pennsylvania has more structurally deficient bridges than any state in the nation.

In 2006, the Transportation Funding and Reform Commission, which was a bipartisan commission that was developed and commissioned by Governor Rendell to

- - - -

2.0

estimate transportation needs across the state, released a report that said we had \$1.7 billion in unfunded annual needs. If you recall, Act 44 followed that and provided about half of that. Today, the transportation funding study that was completed earlier this year by the Transportation Advisory Committee issued a final report that said that that dollar need increase has increased to about 3.5 billion per year statewide, and that's broken down very quickly here from highway and bridge, 2.5; public transportation, about 500; and local governments, 432.

Further breaking down the highway in pavements, bridges, congestion management, safety, and capacity -- because we've looked at this. This report was very thorough and indicated that additional investment needs to be made in your system to ensure a good economy moving forward. We need to get back to doing some system enhancements that support regional growth.

Now I want to talk very briefly about the regional impact to District 11. Around the region, similarly, we have some pavement needs and bridge needs that are not able to be addressed and some that unfortunately blew up during this very tough winter, and we addressed them under an emergency basis, and

- - - -

2.0

for far too long we've had to react because the system is in a very delicate nature.

Across our district, we have 565 structurally deficient bridges. That's significant. Out of 1800, it's about one-third of our bridges are structurally deficient. What we're doing to fix the bridges -- this slide indicates what we had intended to do. Under the current funding shown in blue, if Act 44 was able to be restored, we would hopefully be able to drive improvement according to the red line, and the green line shows our goal that we established at the beginning of the accelerated bridge program in July of 2008. Around the region, we do have 38 posted bridges that are impacted by this and we also have four bridges that are closed.

Talking now about highways, we have 554 miles of poor ridability roadways throughout the district. And if you see those red lines, that indicates a poor section, and it's really not segregated to any one area. It's across all networks, but certainly and most dramatically on the lowest-level networks. Our interstates and our higher-level networks, they are smoother than the lower-level networks.

Because of Act 44 and the money that was not available or won't be available come July $1^{\rm st}$, we

- - - -

have about 84 unfunded projects that we had anticipated including in our program, for a value of about \$216 million.

2.0

Overall, with bridge and pavement needs, we estimate that our regional need is \$469 million annually, and our current funding level allows us to invest around 295 million for a shortfall of about 50 percent, 174 million. It's very dramatic in reality, and, unfortunately, as time goes on with that deferred maintenance and underinvestment, that challenge becomes greater.

Just breaking it down very briefly around the region, we just wanted to hit on the fact that we have the transit agencies, Port Authority, Beaver County Transit, and New Castle Area Transit in our district and just showing what their ridership is and their state operating assistance, which certainly is impacted by funding decisions that are made.

In the near term, certainly for PennDOT, the ability to generate new revenue and stabilize our transportation system and address the 500 million funding gap and then, certainly, we need a phased long-term strategy, because honestly, the best decisions can't be made on transportation investment when you do not know what next year's budget is going

- - - -

And a longer-term investment need establishing, certainly, a new transportation funding framework to ensure sustainable mobility. Predictable and sustainable funding resources so that we can do that good planning. And then major elements, you know, that could be considered there would be possibly a direct user pay system, whether it's based on vehicle mile traveled fee, tolling options. Certainly, there might be a component for public/private partnerships, strategic borrowing that's done with a long-term approach in mind and local option taxes. And I do say carefully on strategic borrowing, because a number of our neighboring states are suffering the consequences of not having strategic borrowing and have sapped all of their available resources for maintenance projects, which Pennsylvania fortunately has not done.

This is just a slide of some additional information, and that concludes my presentation.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you. Next we have -- you can stay there for questions, but we'll have Joseph Szczur from District 12, who will give a presentation on District 12.

Joe?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SZCZUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

- - - -

2.0

Good morning, everybody. I'll briefly go through some of the same information that Dan had with regard to funding needs in our area. Similar slides. You saw some of the depictions earlier of some of the roadway and transportation and bridge needs. We have been dealing with this for many, many years now.

From a structurally deficient standpoint in our neck of the woods, in our four-county area of Washington, Westmoreland, Fayette, and Greene Counties, we currently have 648 structurally deficient bridges. Now, this is down from a high of 725 back in 2008. We had changed our investment strategies and broken our program down, especially when it looks at bridges, into a specific strategy on our major bridges, our smaller bridges, and then everything in between.

We currently have -- out of the 648 structurally deficient bridges, 32 of those are on interstate, 19 on the national highway system, and the remainder on the lower priority networks. We have about 2360 bridges in our four-county area to go along with our nearly 3900 miles of transportation highway that we're responsible for. Nine of our bridges are closed; 158 of our bridges are posted, three of which are posted at 3 tons.

- - - -

2.0

With regard to fixing our structurally deficient bridges, I had mentioned we are at a high of 725 structurally deficient bridges. Nearly one out of every three of our bridges percentage-wise was structurally deficient, and we have a long way to go with regard to trying to drive our program down to get near the national average of 10 percent. However, we have changed our investment strategies along the way to do that.

Nearly 70 percent of our transportation funds in our four-county area through the last transportation improvement plan cycle, for the next cycle, and indefinite future is going to be dedicated towards structures, both replacements, rehabilitations, and preservation work. We currently have 43 projects under construction, 24 of those replacement and 19 are rehabilitation and preservation-type work.

We have 40 bridges, also, that have been bid that are in the design phase of the design/build/ contracting process. We have really taken advantage of that bidding technique to try to help expedite the project delivery. Us, along with the consulting and contracting community, have really championed that effort and it has been proven very successful.

- - - -

2.0

You can see, similar to what Dan had explained, both statewide and region in District 11, our trends are the same. We are making some progress, but, again, with the shortfalls that we anticipate occurring, actually occurring with Act 44 going away on us, we're going to be able to continue to make some improvements for the next year, and then we're going to see both of those curves go up.

Similarly, with regard to our highway system, we have 655 miles of poor road. Three of those are on our interstates, seven are on our national highway system, the remainder of which is on our secondary systems and lower priority traffic routes. The concern here is that as funding level -- we will have to maintain our -- 65 to 70 percent of our transportation funds into bridges is the impact that that's going to have on us being able to maintain some semblance of a pavement management cycle, pavement management strategies, both on the interstates, on the national highway system, and on the remaining portion of our network.

The impact of the loss of the potential revenue that could have been generated by Act 44 in our region, in our four-county areas, was 412 million, resulting in 25 unfunded projects currently, a large

- - - -

2.0

mixture, a large portion of which were bridges. And, again, in our four-county area, our estimated regional need is 335 million. Current funding level is 200 million, so we are at a shortfall in our neck of the woods of 135 million.

Then again, with the transit agencies that we are working with and that are in our four-county area, Fayette Area Coordinated Transportation, the City of Washington, Mid Mon Valley Transit, and the Westmoreland County Authority, you can see from their annual ridership and their operating revenues and also how that is broken down and also where it is not nearly where it needs to be with regard to helping transportation needs in our region.

That is a brief overview of the particular statistics from the District 12 region. I think that concludes both Dan and I's presentation, so,

Mr. Chairman, we'll throw it back to you.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Thank you. Chairman Rick Geist?

REP. GEIST: For both of you fellows, throughout the state we have seen a lot of bridges that are either closed or weight limited to 3-, up to 10,000 pounds, and along with each of those, there are detours for trucks that can't use those facilities.

- - - -

Could you elaborate a little on that, especially down in the area where you guys haul coal and things like that? There is a real cost to that.

2.0

MR. SZCZUR: Yes, Representative. In our neck of the woods, in our four-county area, out of the 43 projects that we currently have under construction, we have -- 13 of those are under detour, and combined, it's about 104 miles' worth of detour that traffic has to navigate to get around the closed detour -- closed bridge.

MR. CESSNA: Similar in District 11. We have 81 bridges under construction this year.

Fourteen of them have detours and we estimate about 200 miles' worth of detours that folks are on. Some of those vary in length from six months to a year.

REP. GEIST: To elaborate on the question, how many of those bridges that you have weight limited, say, from 10 tons down where trucks must detour because they can't cross it, have you analyzed what the detours are and what the costs are? We've had the trucking industry testify at two different hearings about the large cost to them, especially on deliveries.

MR. SZCZUR: We have not analyzed that, but we can imagine that the impact is significant.

- - - -

MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Louder, please.

2.0

MR. SZCZUR: Just to repeat the answer to Representative Geist's question, with regard to the detour routes the trucking industry has to negotiate as a result of our posting, we don't have that statistic, but it is phenomenal. It is phenomenal. Anytime you affect commerce, you're also affecting local services, school bus, emergency services. It is a significant, significant impact.

MR. CESSNA: The four bridges that have closures or restrictions of 3 and 10 tons in District 11 are on low commercial routes. I don't think the impact is quite as great for commercial travel, but certainly the other 34 that are restricted are impacting travel.

REP. GEIST: One last question on the same vein. I know that local government has a real problem. You do a great job of analyzing the structures on the state system and staying up to speed with it. We're trying to ascertain in either of your districts, have you done a planometric analysis of bridges, in municipalities, that are 20 feet and under, and have you helped them in any way, especially the municipalities that don't have engineers, inspect any of those structures?

- - - -

2.0

We keep getting feedback about how many are old, old structures and are part of the state that are in very bad shape in municipalities. Have the districts done anything at all to help local government out in doing that inventory and finding out where they are?

MR. CESSNA: I'll go first and say that we have dealt with those on a case-by-case basis when issues arise. We certainly don't have the resources or the staff to endeavor upon doing that wholesale across the region. We did, however, just identify --currently statewide, PennDOT is developing the linking, planning, and need effort as part of our smart transportation, and, working with the 23 planning regions across the state, have identified that as a need, as something we need to address in the next several years as part of the work programs that the regions are developing.

So we haven't determined yet how we're going to do that or the resources required, but it is something we know needs addressed.

MR. SZCZUR: To build upon that, we are also limited in manpower and resources; however, where we do lend a helping hand to the municipalities is especially with structures of 20 feet and less. A lot

- - - -

of those bridges don't need to be bridges anymore.

Build a box culvert and pipe system and they can be replaced easily, and so we have done that. We have put that in place in our maintenance organizations.

And we actually have a small bridge pilot initiative that's going on right now in Westmoreland County. We have three contracts side by side of seven bridges each. We've listened to the contracting industry and tried to take advantage of some of their needs and the economies of scale, and so as we're going through this process, we are learning daily about how to correct issues like that and we pass that expertise on to municipalities, particularly through our outreach and our municipal services unit.

Same deal when we're dealing with any roadway issues or slide issues, how to fix those pretty readily at a low cost so we can try to at least have them maintain a handle on their local transportation issues, but we do empathize with the local municipalities. Their challenges are greater than ours.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Representative Costa?

REP. PAUL COSTA: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

2.0

Gentlemen, I want to thank you for testifying

- - - -

today. Particularly, I want to thank Dan, not only because he's in our district, but he's one of my constituents. You guys have a difficult task with limited money.

2.0

One of the questions I have for you, when you determine what we're going to do with roads, what difference does it make between if you cement or asphalt?

MR. CESSNA: How did we make that determination? Oftentimes we look at the existing highway. If it's an asphalt road, generally we're looking at whether it can simply be milled and resurfaced, whether it needs to be reconstructed. If it needs to be reconstructed, then we would make a determination on what pavement type it should be, whether it be a life cycle cost analysis or looking at things like constructability.

In the Pittsburgh urban region, oftentimes our pavement decisions are based on the impact of how long we can actually close or restrict a lane or a section of highway to get the construction done.

REP. PAUL COSTA: Thank you. Speaking of lane closure, we have a lot of that in this region, and I appreciate that you consider events that are going on in the city when shutting down the roads. I

- - - -

think it makes a big difference.

2.0

Again, I think you do a great job. I think the only mistake you ever made was giving me your cell phone, because I can call you on Saturdays and Sundays, but I want to personally thank you. You've always been very responsible whenever I've called. Thank you and your staff.

MR. CESSNA: No problem. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Representative Jeff
Pyle.

REP. PYLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Joe, good to see you again.

Mr. Chairman, before I ask my question, I want to give my thanks to Mr. Szczur. I understand we just had a very good outcome on bids to replace the 356 bridge, and I'm sure your office's due diligence has had a lot to do with that, and I appreciate that.

MR. SZCZUR: Thank you.

REP. PYLE: You had mentioned in your funding scheme the needs of mass transit for additional funding. My question for you is, given what appears to be a very tough decision, roads, bridges, or buses, have you ever analyzed what the local county shares are for maintaining the various mass transit agencies? I've read studies where states

- - - -

range from Minnesota, where the state picks up nearly the entire tab for mass transit, to states that drive out significantly less funding than Pennsylvania does for mass transit.

What I'm looking for here, gentlemen, is some type of assessment that will give us a report card of sorts as to whether local governments are doing their shares to maintain the mass transit system.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ SZCZUR: We would need to coordinate that with the experts when it comes to transit.

REP. PYLE: I'm sorry to interrupt, but the one question that jumped up off the screen at me when I looked at that is how much we are currently putting in to them. I'm curious as to what the big number is. How much are they actually putting into themselves?

MR. SZCZUR: That's a very fair question, and we can do some follow-up research on that and get you that information.

REP. PYLE: Much appreciated. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you.

23 Representative Mike Carroll.

2.0

REP. CARROLL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you both for your testimony. You two

- - - -

2.0

gentlemen, more than any other folks, are familiar intimately with the highway/bridge needs in your districts, and in Harrisburg and throughout the state there are really two schools of thought with respect to how we proceed here. The one school of thought is that we need to do something right away this year and the other school is that we can wait.

And so my question for each of you, considering the funding gap that's created by the loss of funds from Act 44, do you believe we need to act this year or do you believe we can wait?

MR. CESSNA: I'll address that first. I think we need a solution immediately, and there is a couple reasons why:

First and foremost, we're driving to put as many transportation projects on the street right now due to the dire conditions of the pavements and the bridges, and what's happening right now is an underinvestment in future projects. Our engineering resources, we're not investing in engineering right now to prepare projects to be ready for construction in two to three years, and you can't develop those projects in six months. It takes a year in many cases, sometimes three to four. So the lack of funds for engineering right now is creating a real potential

- - - -

problems for us two years out.

2.0

MR. SZCZUR: To build on that comment that Dan made, it does need to be immediate, both within the state and nationwide, from a transportation funding standpoint. You reach a point, whether it's bridge or a roadway and it gets to the point where it's structurally deficient or in a condition like your roadways are, that the deterioration goes in an exponential rate. It goes beyond what we can do from a preservation standpoint, and when that happens, all that results in is additional costs with regard to how much it is going to take to either fix that road, replace that bridge, or fix that bridge, and so it cannot happen soon enough.

Our transportation plans right now, all we end up doing, both Dan and myself and our other counterparts across the state, is we make decisions what lousy bridge or what crumbling road we can't get to over the next four years or two years. Even from a maintenance standpoint with the way our maintenance budgets have been cut over the last three years, it's really starting to put strain on keeping our roadways not only in a decent state or condition, but also in a safe state or condition.

REP. CARROLL: I share your view. The

- - - -

2.0

best evidence of that is the slides you had with respect to projects that will be not funded with regard to the loss of funds from Act 44. Those sentiments were echoed at all the hearings we had throughout the state, and it really highlights the need to backfill that level of funding, if not go beyond that, so I thank you for your testimony.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you, gentlemen.

I just want to point out the slide that you had the map with all the deficient bridges marked as red dots, I've been calling that the measles map around the state, because if you look at it, it looks like the map has measles, but those are all the many, many, just hundreds and thousands, in some cases, deficient bridges that we have in our regions here.

So, very good testimony. Appreciate it very much, and thank you for coming today.

MR. CESSNA: Thank you.

MR. SZCZUR: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: The Chair would like to recognize Heidi Tappe and Nick Demicheli, who are here representing Representative Chelsea Wagner from the South Side. They are in the audience. And also Dericka from Representative Frankel's office from Squirrel Hill of Pittsburgh in Allegheny County.

- - - -

Welcome.

2.0

Next, I'd like to bring a couple of the next several groups of folks up here. The Pennsylvania Motor Truck Association, Ron Uriah, my good friend from high school, my high school buddy. Is Ron here today? Oh, there he is. He's coming.

I'd also like to have Mr. Jeff Pope, who is representing the Plum Senior Community Center Advisory Council, and also the Monroeville Chamber of Commerce representative, Mr. Chad Amond, who is the president, and with him is Joe Kirk, the Expressway Partnership Initiatives.

So if we could have all four of those people. There are four seats here. You'll all get your time, but we've found out when we're up on a stage like this, if we bring up three or four at a time, it saves from folks walking up. In a long day, if we can save five minutes here and there, it makes a difference.

Ron, how are you? Good to see you. Ron and I were classmates at Chartiers Valley High School, and he made all the money. I ended up here, but that's good. We both did okay. Ron is representing the Pennsylvania Motor Truck Association. Five minutes, Ron, and you may proceed.

MR. URIAH: Thank you, Joe. Good to see

- - - -

1 you.

2.0

Good morning, gentlemen. My name is Ron
Uriah, Vice President of Safety and Risk Management,
Pitt Ohio Express, headquartered in Pittsburgh,
Pennsylvania. Pitt Ohio is an LTL trucking company
with seven terminal locations within the state of
Pennsylvania, employing approximately 1100 employees
throughout the Commonwealth. Chairman Markosek and
Chairman Geist, I appreciate the opportunity to speak
before the committee on behalf of Pitt Ohio Express
and the trucking industry within the state of
Pennsylvania.

I agree there is a need to provide funding for safe and efficient transportation infrastructure throughout the Commonwealth. Because of the unique geography of Pennsylvania and the seasonal impact of the weather conditions, there is a dire need to repair and maintain the highway systems, bridges, and tunnels that are used to provide for the efficient and effective delivery of our essential products to businesses that support our communities.

Many of our fellow citizens do not realize the importance of maintaining the transportation and highway system or the need to provide appropriate and consistent funding for its expansion and constant

- - - -

2.0

upkeep. We respectfully ask that any funding system considered be applied in a fair manner. We would support an increase in some specific areas, including registration fees and fuel tax, to provide revenue critical for highway maintenance and improvement projects.

We also respectfully ask for you to consider that such increases be directed only to those projects and not diverted to discretionary projects which are outside specifically identified transportation improvement protects.

Pitt Ohio Express currently travels an average of 25 million miles a year on Pennsylvania highways.

It pays approximately 38 cents a gallon in state tax on diesel fuel to Pennsylvania, in addition to about 24 and a half cents a gallon in federal tax, which is apportioned back to the states based on the number of miles traveled in each state.

Truck transportation is and will continue to be essential to the Pennsylvania economy and the people and commerce of this great state. Our drivers in Pennsylvania provide an average of 2900 deliveries a day to all types of businesses, including government, factories, hospitals, and retail stores of all types of products from raw materials to finished

- - - -

goods, using around 95,000 gallons of diesel fuel a week to provide the essential transportation service to our fellow citizens.

2.0

The trucking industry operates on low profit margins, coupled with intense recapitalization costs for legislative compliance for equipment and mandates for engine emission standards. An increase of fuel tax, registration fees, or the lifting of the cap on the wholesale fuel would increase expenses to our organization and our customers. Expense notwithstanding, it is still the most equitable solution to apportion such daunting expenses fairly so that reasonable revenues will be provided for everybody for the proper repair and maintenance of our highways and roads and keep them in appropriate condition moving forward.

I would also suggest that any such increase considered would be indexed for inflation to maintain the same level of annual funding and eliminate the task of constantly looking for revenue sources.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our thoughts today and for your consideration in those matters as you continue to develop and form your strategy to resolve this challenging issue. As always, we remain available to you at any time to

- - - -

engage in further discussion on this topic.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you, Ron.

Representative Mike Carroll.

REP. CARROLL: Thank you very much,

Mr. Chairman.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

22

23

24

25

Thank you for your testimony. I know it can't be an easy proposition for somebody in the trucking industry to sit at a microphone like that and advocate for a fuel tax increase, so I suspect that your business and others throughout the state have provided testimony and made a calculation that the need is just so great, there really are no other choices.

So I appreciate your taking the time to be here today. It really does highlight the need, the urgent need, and folks like Pennsylvania Motor Trucking Association and Pitt Ohio wouldn't make a decision like that without careful analysis. So I appreciate that analysis and that result. Thank you.

MR. URIAH: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: All right, Ron.

21 Thank you.

Our next speaker is Mr. Chad Amond, who is the president of the Monroeville Area Chamber of Commerce, of which I am a happy member. Five minutes. And also with him is Joe Kirk from the Mon Valley Partnership

- - - -

Initiatives. And, Chad, you may proceed.

2.0

MR. AMOND: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for the opportunity to speak. First, let me, in the unique position of being president of the Monroeville Area Chamber of Commerce, welcome you all to Monroeville. I think it's particularly fitting that we're having one of the seven transportation hearings here in Monroeville, because this community understands very well the importance of transportation projects. Our growth is attributed very much to the transportation for the interchange of the Turnpike here that is the Pittsburgh interchange and the Parkway East, and we are challenged by our lack of adequate transportation in and out of the city and to the airport. So we understand the importance of transportation projects all too well.

I did submit seven pages of testimony that I would prefer to sum up so you have an opportunity to ask us a few questions. I'm sure that would probably not be something that you would have a problem with.

In a nutshell, we say that investment in transportation infrastructure provides for a direct and measurable positive impact on economic growth, which is certainly not surprising to you. Typically, I stand in front of committee hearings like this and

- - - -

2.0

ask for your help in providing funding for expansion projects, most namely the Mon-Fayette Expressway, which my organization still is supportive of, but I'm today asking for expanded funding for transportation projects across the Commonwealth, while at the same time, asking you to set in motion a plan that is working towards expanding and enhancing the Commonwealth's woefully inadequate overall transportation system.

Our folks from PennDOT had laid out all too well the challenges that are before us with 3 and a half billion dollars' worth of funding shortfall each year. Those are well documented. I'm not going to go into that, but perhaps maybe it's summarized by saying that one of the most fundamental purposes of state government is to provide adequate transportation and infrastructure, and we seem to be failing miserably at that.

The Chamber of Commerce here in Monroeville applauds the move to call for a special session of the legislature, and we hope that you will find new and improved funding strategies, funding strategies that provide for not just maintenance of the crumbling roadways, bridges, and mass transit, but also for expansion of the current system. Now is really a time

- - - -

2.0

not just to provide for making us average, but a time for vision so that we can bring the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania not up to a state that is providing average transportation but as a leader across the states.

that my organization would support: One, we believe that an increase in the oil company franchise tax is a very viable option. We believe that also increasing the vehicle registration fee -- in Pennsylvania, the vehicle registration fee is one of the lowest in the entire union -- is an opportunity for increased funding. And then, finally, we would support the resubmission of the provision within Act 44 to toll Interstate 80. In his letter, Secretary LaHood's denial circulated around the transfer of funds to mass transit. If those funds were rededicated to only upgrading I80, it would free up resources, we believe, across the rest of the transportation system.

Finally, just in summary, at the core, transportation projects are aimed at rebuilding and revitalizing communities. You all know that very well. They can't happen without you. You have the ability to provide funding. That funding directly impacts jobs. For every billion dollars spent on a

- - - -

2.0

highway project equals 30,000 jobs. I can't imagine in any district across this Commonwealth someone who wouldn't like to go back and say, hey, we are able to provide 30,000 jobs for every billion dollars that's spent.

Thank you very much for your time. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you, Chad. Mr. Joe Kirk.

MR. KIRK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will summarize a couple remarks from my testimony. First, we all recognize it as a \$3.5 billion deficit that we face and requires comprehensive solutions regarding both highways, bridges, and transit.

Let me focus on two of the recommendations we have. One, that we suggest adjusting the oil franchise tax to adjust for inflation and bring that up to that level so that it reflects what the cost of oil is right now; and, secondly, I also want to say that we really do need to revisit the tolling of I80 and resubmit the application that reserves all funds for I80. That, we feel, will return back to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania somewhere in the range of 100- to \$200 million.

Thank you very much.

- - - -

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you very much, Joe.

Before I recognize Representative Pyle and Representative Carroll, just so folks know, the tolling of any other interstate highway would require federal approval all over again, which would not necessarily be as quick as -- even if it was approved in our favor, which is in doubt, of course, it would be quite awhile before we would see any funds from that.

Representative Pyle?

2.0

REP. PYLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Amond, I'm also a Chamber member in a couple of counties. Thank you for your testimony.

This woefully inadequate transportation system you identified, I have questions about that. I believe Westmoreland County just completed their Route 22 project. It's not inadequate. It works. I'm asking.

MR. AMOND: Yes, sir.

REP. CARROLL: I believe your PennDOT district engineers have pointed out in the last panel that Mr. Szczur has just tackled a \$9 million bridge replacement, that was left to go for 20 years, crossing the Allegheny in Freeport from Allegheny

- - - -

Township, Westmoreland. I believe that came in 7 million under speculation.

2.0

Here is my question to you: Given the choice between transit or bridges, where do we put the money? There is only so much.

MR. AMOND: I think that's the Sophie's Choice question that's before the House, Senate, and state government.

me. We don't rely on transit. I would pose the same question: What is the local share for transit? I'd rather build bridges. That's just me.

MR. AMOND: I'm having an incredibly difficult time hearing you, sir. I'm hearing an echo. I'm not hearing the question.

REP. PYLE: I just wanted to know if you've done an analysis of local share to maintain transit. If given my druthers, I would rather put the money into bridges. I'm just curious. If there is only so much in the pot, where do we direct it?

MR. AMOND: I think we need to make the pot bigger. I think we need to make the pot bigger.

If you look at the recent report card that come out from the American Society of Civil Engineers, across this Commonwealth, the grade was a D-minus for

- - - -

2.0

roads, a C for bridges, a D-minus for mass transit, a C-minus for dams and levees, and navigable waterways was a D-plus. I don't think there is anything in that report that this Commonwealth can be proud of, so I think that the answer is we need to make the pot bigger.

REP. PYLE: That's very good. I have not noticed whether or not the Monroeville Chamber has a position on public/private partnerships.

MR. AMOND: We do. We believe that it is not the sole answer to the problems across the Commonwealth, but we have advocated for some period of time that the Commonwealth needs to be more straightforward with its position on P3s in a way that provides a clear picture to the private sector firms that are interested in investing in this state.

REP. PYLE: Very good. I appreciate your input on tolling 80. What's your input on leasing the Turnpike?

MR. AMOND: We have no formal position on tolling the Turnpike, the main line of the Turnpike, although I think that there is a strong argument to be made for some of the expansion projects of the Turnpike that might be ripe for leasing or becoming part of other private public/private partnership

- - - -

ventures here, certainly in the southwestern part of the state.

2.0

REP. PYLE: Super. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Representative Mike Carroll.

REP. CARROLL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chad, in your testimony -- you didn't mention orally, but in your written testimony I noticed you talked about capacity-adding projects for roads and bridges. I share your view that if we're going to be serious about solving transportation needs of the state, we're going to have to think about capacity-adding projects. We've heard testimony in other regions of the state, growing regions, that maintenance of bridges and roads is not enough and we need to think about additional capacity, so I applaud you for that provision of your testimony.

Secondly, I applaud the Chamber for sharing the position taken by the Pennsylvania Chamber in support of increase in funds for the fuel tax. And, again, as I mentioned to the Pennsylvania Motor Truck Association, that position, I'm sure, wasn't arrived at lightly, and so for the Pennsylvania Chamber or the Monroeville Chamber of Commerce to sit at a podium and

- - - -

advocate for additional funds is noteworthy and compelling. So I thank you for that.

2.0

MR. AMOND: Can I make a comment? I thank you very much for recognizing that it is not easy for a business association to say, yeah, please increase fees and taxes that we're going to see. Our support is very clear that we would love to see additional transportation funding, but to the point that you made that is also in my testimony, we'd like to see that increase in transportation funding tied directly to expansion projects as well, so we can't just kick the can down the road and aspire to be average. We need to have a larger vision.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Well said. Thank you, gentlemen, all three of you, Ron, Chad, Joe.

Is Mr. Jeff Pope here? I called his name before. I thought maybe he might have stepped out, from the Plum Community Center. Jeff Pope?

Lynn DeLorenzo from NAIOP, as well as Mike Welsh from the carpenters. Would they come forward, please?

Good afternoon Lynn and Mike. Lynn, you may proceed. You have five minutes, please.

MS. DeLORENZO: Thank you. Good

- - - -

2.0

afternoon, Chairman Markosek and Geist and members of the House Transportation Committee. My name is Lynn DeLorenzo. I am president-elect of the Pittsburgh Chapter of NAIOP, which is a commercial real estate development association. And for clarification, we were formerly known, along with the acronym, as the National Association of Industrial and Office Properties.

NATOP is the leading trade portion for developers, owners, and related professionals in office, industrial, and mixed-use development. NATOP advocates for effective legislation on behalf of its members and advances responsible, sustainable development that creates jobs and benefits the communities in which we live. We welcome the opportunity today to provide testimony on the transportation crisis facing the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Transportation is the driver of economic development. Without an effective transportation system, be it highways, bridges, waterways, or public transit, we cannot provide a competitive environment in which to grow our communities and regions, the importance of which should not be understated. With the reduction of Act 44 revenue, the Transportation

- - - -

2.0

Action Committee study recommends an immediate need for new funding sources totaling more than 3 billion annually for highways and transit from federal, state, and local resources. Given the crisis, short-term fixes and the Band-Aid approach no longer works.

We need to think not only about the problems of today, but the future of the Keystone State. Where do we need to be in 20 years? How can we be competitive in the growing economy? What will our children require and then their children? How will we grow our population with antiquated transportation systems?

We are now positioned in between two of the fastest growing commerce centers in the country, the Midwest and the Northeast. The Keystone State can play an important role in the distribution, transportation, and warehousing of goods between these two areas, and, most importantly, to our own internal economies. We will become more familiar with the terms logistics centers, intermodal transportation hubs, intermodal rail/truck transportation terminals. A renewed focus on our waterways and expansion of our ports to reduce congestion on highways is also necessary. We have to be prepared to find the funding sources to complete the transportation networks

- - - -

already begun within our regions in order to maintain a competitive advantage in growing global commerce.

2.0

Also, as stewards of sustainability, we should prepare for the ongoing shift from the automobile to public transit occurring all over the country and the world and welcome it. Our communities cannot grow into strong regions without good public transit, the key to connecting people to jobs. Public transit equals less reliance on automobiles and, therefore, less congestion. The growth of our urban office and mixed-use centers will continue to demand strong public transportation systems.

NAIOP supports a dedicated funding source for the long-term expansion of mass transit in Allegheny County. It is critical that we create a structured transportation funding that is also sustainable.

Newer options must be considered, such as public/private partnerships. We need to establish the legislation necessary to bring private investment into transportation.

The current level of crisis demands new thinking, strategies, and funding sources. However, all of the ideas put forward today and throughout the special session hearings cannot be molded into solutions without effective leadership. The future

- - - -

growth and development of the Commonwealth are dependent upon critical decisions that must be made to fix the entire problem and not just a portion of it. Truman called it the ability to get people to do what they ought to know to do without being told.

Thank you for your time.

2.0

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you very much, Lynn. Any questions from the members?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Lynn, thank you. Mike? Five minutes, please.

MR. WELSH: Thank you, Joe. Glad to see the House here in support. Wish the Senate was here, but that's a little bit beyond your control, so I'll take what we can get.

I'll speak on a couple issues here today. As far as the infrastructure, I think you got a good report from District 11 and District 12, and I know this isn't your last meeting on the hearings and you know the dire need of improvement on the infrastructures and transit. I was unaware that it was one in three. I thought we were doing a little bit better than that on the bridges. It's kind of scary to think about one of three. I'm sort of wondering who is responsible. Is it PennDOT that is

- - - -

2.0

responsible or is it the legislators or is it the general public? We've had a bridge fall in Pennsylvania. We've had one fall in other parts of the United States, too. It's just a matter of time before some more fall. Hopefully, nobody gets hurt.

There is responsibility that we owe the public. As far as the need, it's there. The infrastructures, I don't think there is any question from the panel today about the need for the infrastructure.

I'm here with the carpenters union. We create a lot of jobs — or you create a lot of jobs when you do transportation projects. We have over 1,000 people that work just on bridges alone in 60 counties in Pennsylvania. On our commercial divisions, we have 14,000 other carpenters, and with the goose that laid the golden egg when we got the reinvestment money, the stimulus money, a lot of people said are you going to be able to do it? Are you going to be able to take another billion dollars and put it on the street? Hats off to PennDOT. They did it. Our people, it created a lot of jobs. A lot of jobs. We ran out of people. We used people that were in the commercial side.

Ourselves, we invested in the new training

- - - -

2.0

center over in Campbells Run, state-of-the-art
training center for carpenters that was done jointly
with our contractors and the union. It was their
money and ours. Also, there is a training center in
Lebanon, there is one in Gallitzin. We got one
throughout the state. We are investing not in jobs,
but in careers for our people. Our guys come in, they
start building bridges, they retire after 30 years.
So we're very interested in trying to get a fix.

How do we fix it? I mean, we know the work needs done. We know we need to create jobs. Where does the money come from? That's going to be a tough vote. Can you do a two-cent semi-annually, two cents in January and two cents in June, and factor that in there? I wouldn't see two cents at the pump, that's for sure, especially the way things been lately, but I know it's a tough vote.

It doesn't matter if you vote for one penny or if you vote for 15 cents. You're still going to get labeled as voting for a gas tax increase. It's a user fee. The work needs done and it's going to create jobs. Thank you for your time. If you have any questions, I'd be glad to take it.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay, Mr. Welsh. Any questions? Thank you both. Very good. Very good

- - - -

testimony. Thank you.

2.0

I see we've got Joyce Driben is ready to testify. She has to catch an ACCESS bus, I believe, so we moved her up a little bit here on the program. She is with the Blind Outdoor Leisure Development group.

MS. DRIBEN: Good afternoon and thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Joyce, before we start, we saw Dan came up here. Who is your other friend?

MS. DRIBEN: Oh, okay. This is Tudor, T-u-d-o-r. Did everyone get a look at him who wanted to?

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: We saw him when you came up on the stage.

MS. DRIBEN: He is not exactly tiny. In fact, I had talked to somebody that, in fact, he is the biggest dog I ever had.

MS. DRIBEN: All right. And I have submitted written testimony, which I hope was received, so I'm going to make just some summary

- - - -

comments.

2.0

I am Joyce Driben, and I live in the City of Pittsburgh and have been a resident of Pittsburgh since 1963. One of the reasons I have stayed in Pittsburgh is the transportation. Quite obviously, I don't drive a car. Frankly, nor do you really want me to even try. I'm a retired clinical social worker, and both for work and community meetings, entertainment, shopping, and many other activities, the transportation, both public transit and the paratransit have been invaluable. Without that, I could not be in the city.

By the way, Blind Outdoor Leisure Development, I am president of the group currently. We are a recreational group. About two-thirds of our members are blind, so it's about 75 people who are blind that participate in local recreational activities and rely on transportation. If it were not for that, they could not get out, many of them, and participate.

Just in case you're curious, we hike. Many members have met using buses for hiking. Some people take buses to Mt. Lebanon to do some ice skating.

Some of us participate in a walking group. In fact, thank you very much, Chamber of Commerce people. We really do enjoy Monroeville Mall, which is accessible

- - - -

by bus and paratransit, and if it were not for that, we would not be here.

2.0

Just very quickly, the transportation means freedom, choice, and independence. Freedom to go where you want to go when you want to go, choice about how you get there, and independence so we're not always needing to rely on other folks.

I'm going to leave it at that. I think the rest of the testimony you should have and I'd be open for any questions.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you. Any questions, anybody?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Joyce, thank you very much, and take care of Tudor there, as well as Dan.

Speaking of the Port Authority, we have Steve Bland, who is the chief executive officer. Steve?

Good morning, Steve.

MR. BLAND: Good morning.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Five minutes, please.

MR. BLAND: Thank you. Good morning,
Mr. Chairman and members. My name is Steve Bland.

I'm the CEO of Port Authority of Allegheny County, and
I wanted to assess the statewide transportation

funding crisis, but also specially how it affects us

- - - -

2.0

here in the Pittsburgh region. Frankly, nowhere else in the state is the crisis so imminent and potentially so damaging.

As you might know, the Port Authority of Allegheny County is the public transportation system for Pittsburgh and the surrounding area. We carry roughly 230,000 riders each day on bus, light rail, paratransit, and incline. The Port Authority serves both Pittsburgh's urban core, including downtown and Oakland, the Commonwealth's second and third busiest commercial centers, as well as the region's sprawling suburbs. And any of you who are familiar with Pittsburgh know that our topography is unique, so a straight line does not necessarily connect two points here in Pittsburgh.

Our system is extensive, spanning 730 square miles, about 15,000 stops, 62 park-and-ride lots, nearly 20 miles of dedicated busway, 26 miles of light rail, including our downtown subway, 23 busway stations, 26 light rail stations, the Mon incline, and more than 80 bridges. What you may not know -- although I know Representative Kortz is aware of this -- is that while most our bridges are located on our transit system, our rail system, and our busways, 11 of our bridges are highway bridges that we're

- - - -

2.0

responsible for, so we are in the same boat as PennDOT in that regard.

The Port Authority's operations aren't perfect, but the agency has certainly come a long way in the last few years. We embraced Act 44 in 2007 and stood behind all of you when you took a bold step forward for Pennsylvania in trying to find a dedicated and reliable stream of funding for transportation and the transportation network. We also embraced the reform and efficiency recommendations spelled out in Governor Rendell's Transportation Funding and Reform Commission report.

In 2006, the TFRC report asked transit agencies statewide to cut out waste and find efficiencies. The Commission believed the state's transit systems could accomplish \$60 million in annual savings. Since that time, Port Authority alone has found \$52 million in annual operating budget savings. This has been achieved by eliminating more than 400 positions, cutting unproductive service, restructuring the remaining service to be more efficient, achieving landmark concessions in our collective bargaining agreements, and sharply reducing benefits for our non-represented employees. In addition, the Authority has generated \$14 million in new revenue annually by

- - - -

2.0

increase in fares in 2008 and 2010 and achieving almost a doubling of our institution contract income over the past four years, as well as engaging in some joint development real estate activities.

So we've answered the Commission's call, we've answered the legislature's call for reform and efficiencies. So have our riders. So have our employees. Now, frankly, it's time for the state to live up to its end of the bargain.

It's unfortunate that Act 44 did not live up to its expectations. The inability to toll Interstate 80 was certainly a major setback. However, the law also fell short in achieving an equitable distribution of public transportation funding statewide. As I've said publicly over the past several months, the collapse of Act 44 is not the legislature's fault, but, unfortunately for you, that problem to solve now rests squarely on your shoulders. I'm here to pledge the support of the Port Authority of Allegheny County in helping you find acceptable solutions.

Immediately after the passage of Act 44, Port Authority saw a 1.9 percent decrease in state operating funding when you compare the last fiscal year prior to Act 44's adoption to the first year after passage. Since the passage of Act 44, we've

- - - -

2.0

seen an average annual increase of 0.25 percent, while in the upcoming year, we'll face 30 percent increases in fuel prices, 10 percent increases in health insurance. Without the state's help, we'll have little choice but to make further drastic changes.

Today we face a \$50 million operating deficit, not to mention ongoing capital struggles that I won't expound upon today, but they are included in my written testimony. I'm here to tell you that without action by the state to remedy the collapse of Act 44, we'll be forced to solve those fiscal shortfalls by ourselves, and we will do that as we have in the past. However, to do so will be devastating to many lives and it will damage, perhaps permanently, the economic competitiveness of our region and the Commonwealth.

Our board will consider cutting service by 25 or more percent, significantly increasing fares, and eliminating hundreds of jobs. Our board will also grapple with the possibility of having to take money out of protected accounts for our long-term success in trying to bridge short-term problems. We don't want to do those things. We not only understand the impact those changes would have on people's lives, but we also fear it will be another regional loss at a time when the region is trying to thrive.

- - - -

2.0

The time to act is now. You've heard several users very eloquently speak on the need for the system, and we are here to work with you on solutions to adequately fund that system. Every thriving metropolitan region in the world has a solid public transportation system. That's not a coincidence. The Pittsburgh region can only thrive if we are successful, and that includes our surrounding areas, including the outlying counties.

Anyone who doesn't think public transportation benefits them will find out very quickly how much a role it plays in their lives, and, in fact, I hear from them daily: A baby boomer who drives to work but whose retired mother relies on the bus to get to the doctor; suburbanites who also drive to work but whose children get to school on a Port Authority bus; the business executive who has never ridden a bus or train in Pittsburgh in his life but only found out after service had to be cut that quite a few of his employees do.

Members of the committee, frankly, I think it's more important that you hear from these folks than that you hear from me, but I stand ready to answer any questions and work with you on an ultimate solution.

- - - -

2.0

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you, Steve. I think, under the circumstances, you've done a pretty darned good job, considering resources have really not been there or where you would like them.

Paratransit, ACCESS program, roughly how many rides do you think? Do you have that off the top of your head, say, in a month, year?

MR. BLAND: Sure. The Port Authority fixed system ridership, bus and rail, is about 69, 70 million rides a year, and ACCESS is up about a million and a quarter, million and a half rides per year. So on a daily basis, between 10- and 15,000 trips are taken on ACCESS, and as you heard from our previous person, it's absolutely life critical.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Representative Chairman Stan Saylor.

REP. SAYLOR: Steve, it's good to see you again. I'm glad to see that you brought some of your York County fiscal responsibility back to the Port Authority.

MR. BLAND: We haven't painted the buses red and put rabbits on them here yet.

REP. SAYLOR: I understand. They tried to get me to wear a rabbit costume in York, and I wouldn't do it.

- - - -

2.0

One of the things I guess I would ask you for is where -- you made a lot of reform here in Pittsburgh, but I also read in the news clippings and everything that people are calling for additional reform. Could you outline some of the things that some of the people -- or what you are working on beyond what you've already done to try to improve, because not only your agency, but SEPTA has come under sharp criticism for mismanagement and so forth, and I know you're trying to do the best you can.

MR. BLAND: Sure. Well, the first thing I'd point out is agencies like SETPA and ourselves and certainly PennDOT always come under the microscope because the dollars and the numbers are just so huge.

The biggest thing that we're working on now is our complete system redesign. A major focus is improving service efficiency, generating greater productivity, but also improving the quality of service in key markets. The biggest gain that we made in our last collective bargaining agreement, frankly, is not one we'll see for some years, and that is really reining in the cost of post-employment benefits through restructuring those benefits in the last collective bargaining agreement. On an annual basis, we recognized an immediate reduction of about

- - - -

2.0

\$23 million in future expense. So, unfortunately, they are not dollars we're saving today, but five, ten fifteen years out there are reduced expenses.

So those are some of the key areas. There are probably literally hundreds, if not thousands, of individual actions taken. Some of the major elements of cost increase lay beyond our control. As I mentioned, fuel prices up 30 percent next year. We are engaged in the whole national healthcare debate. Health insurance is a huge part of our budget, and those costs continue to well exceed inflation. Over the last ten years, if you took out pension and health insurance, pension due to the market collapse of a couple years ago, the average rate of increase in our expenses has been about 1.8 percent. So if Act 44 could have carried through on its promise to grow, essentially, with the economy, we'd be in pretty good shape.

REP. SAYLOR: Last question. I know

State College Transit System runs on natural gas.

Have you looked at it and would it be any kind of cost savings for the Port Authority?

MR. BLAND: We have looked at it. We are looking at it. We're working closely, actually, with the gas carriers here to look at it. The biggest

- - - -

2.0

impediment for us, as it would be for any other system that isn't using it now, is the tremendous up-front capital expense to retrofit facilities and put in fueling stations. We've estimated that -- we have five bus operating divisions, plus an overhaul shop, so to do it system-wide -- you could obviously do it on a smaller scale -- we've estimated about \$70 million in up-front capital.

Probably the main advantage -- it's really hard to predict over a period of years whether it might save money, but, frankly, one of the biggest advantages is reducing volatility. Volatility in natural gas pricing has been much less than what we're seeing in the petroleum markets, number one, and, obviously, reducing reliance on overseas sources would be a key issue.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Representative Chris Sainato.

REP. SAINATO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Bland. I just have a quick question.

What are the cost of fares in Port Authority and how does that compare to fares throughout the country?

MR. BLAND: Sure. Our base fare, which is what most people would compare, is currently \$2.

- - - -

2.0

It's relatively high. We look at about 31 peers around the country when we do all sorts of different benchmarking, and I believe there are probably about four systems around the country that have a higher base fare, quite a few with us at \$2, including SEPTA in Philadelphia, and then quite a number below. So we're not the highest, but we're in the upper end of that spectrum.

REP. SAINATO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Representative Paul Costa.

REP. PAUL COSTA: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. Steve, thank you very much. Hopefully,
we can do this very brief.

We know there is a lot of controversy about the North Shore Connector. Can you explain to the people the difference between capital budget and operating budget and why we really couldn't pass up that opportunity?

MR. BLAND: Sure. A couple of issues -- and Representative Costa touched on it. Our operating budgets -- and this is due to state program policy, as well as the federal program policy. There are unique pots of money for both sides, operating assistance as well as capital assistance. The North Shore Connector

- - - -

falls well into that capital assistance program category.

2.0

The challenge with especially large-scale capital projects really is something that should be addressed in any final packages. Those types of projects takes years, not only to build, but to conceive, plan, and get through federal and state process. The North Shore Connector, which will open in March of 2012, started out in 1995, so a long-term planning process.

Frankly, at the point in time when our decision was made to move forward on it, a much rosier picture at both the federal and state level. Because those projects take so many years to develop, it's really hard to deal with a very volatile funding stream. The Connector itself -- and watching Mr. Cessna's presentation on the highway side, we got hit with the same bid price index challenges that PennDOT did. We saw a huge increase in costs due to bid pricing.

Since that time, we've actually been able to remove quite a bit of cost from that project. We are now currently 72 percent complete, and the change orders on the project have actually been a net reduction in cost of about \$2 million. So we intend

- - - -

to have that facility help us improve our service productivity. Certainly, the urban vitality of Pittsburgh, anyone who has seen the booming construction on the North Shore, it will connect Station Square, the Golden Triangle, and the North Shore.

2.0

And, frankly, speaking to the Regional Council of Carpenters testimony, it brought in well over \$300 million of federal money that would not have been available for bridges, would not have been available for road construction, that would have gone to places like Denver and Phoenix to employ, at the peak of construction, 3,000 construction people and construction-related industries all over the Commonwealth, not just in Pittsburgh. Ironically, the steel that we used to put up the bridge was not made in Pittsburgh. It was actually made in Williamsport, for example.

REP. PAUL COSTA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Representative Mark Longietti.

REP. LONGIETTI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Question: You mentioned approximately 230,000 riders a day between all the different modes of transportation. Do you have any estimate on what

- - - -

2.0

percentage are commuters going back and forth to work?

MR. BLAND: I don't have it off the top
of my head. It is certainly more than half. That's
information, certainly, that we could get to you,
Representative. I wouldn't want to venture a guess
right now, but virtually over half. We are very much
a commuter-oriented system from places like here in
Monroeville.

REP. LONGIETTI: Also in your testimony, you mentioned that actually after the -- immediately after the passage of Act 44, there was a little bit of decrease in your state operating funds and now you're getting a little bit of an increase, not much, and I think it touches on Representative Costa's comment to you. Is that because the bulk of the money that you're getting through Act 44 is for capital needs and is there significant dollars that are coming there for capital?

MR. BLAND: I would tell you that in the capital elements of Act 44, certainly we would say that the funding that PennDOT -- particularly, the funding that was discretionary that PennDOT basically was choosing among projects, they've certainly been very fair to Allegheny County. They've allocated quite a number of funds, certainly not approaching the

- - - -

180 million or so that we get in operating assistance.

2.0

The challenge on the operating side was Act 44 -- and we all think appropriately so -- moved to a performance funding formula, and the particular measures by which that funding is divided up frankly don't really do well for Allegheny County, in large part due to the City of Pittsburgh is half the population of, let's say, 40, 50 years ago. Even though our system is still very robust -- between 40 and 50 percent of our downtown workforce uses transit to commute to work -- those numbers are still down compared to what they were 30 or 40 years ago compared to, for instance, Representative Saylor referenced State College, which has seen enormous growth and expansion in ridership in those years.

So that's really been more the driving force on that particular issue.

REP. LONGIETTI: Last question: You mentioned a 31 transit system peer group to compare your base fare to and there are four systems that are higher than the \$2 base fare that you have.

Do you know what those four systems charge or what the range is?

MR. BLAND: I had a feeling the question might come up. The highest in the peer group is

- - - -

2.0

Sacramento. They were 2.50. And then there were three -- I know Cleveland was one of them -- at 2.25, and now I can't find it. Cleveland and Sacramento were two. In fact, I'll probably be able to find it before I leave today.

REP. LONGIETTI: Was Denver in that group?

MR. BLAND: Their base is actually two. They are down with us. Obviously, all systems sort of have premium pricing. You know, we have a zone fare system, as certainly does SEPTA and many of the other systems, but Denver is in the peer group that we look at.

REP. LONGIETTI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Representative Randy

Vulakovich.

REP. VULAKOVICH: Thank you. Hi, Mr. Bland.

MR. BLAND: Good morning.

REP. VULAKOVICH: Quick question: The 11 bridges that -- I had this discussion with you some time ago. The 11 highway bridges that you have that you must maintain --

MR. BLAND: Right.

REP. VULAKOVICH: -- how did you get

- - - -

those bridges?

2.0

MR. BLAND: Well, we got them the same way we got many of the challenges that we work on a day-to-day basis. Port Authority was formed by state legislation in 1959, and, essentially, it was when 33 former private, for-profit carriers were going bankrupt and out of business. So the Port Authority ended up assuming, you know, really all the assets and liabilities of those operators, and some of them operated trolley service all over the region. So the 11 highway bridges largely are old trolley bridges that, when the trolley tracks were taken up and streets were put down, we, for, whatever reason, retained ownership and responsibility for the bridges.

Now, our 11 highway bridges we get -- quite frankly, we cooperate on a lot of projects with PennDOT District 11 and get terrific support from their staff. PennDOT is responsible for the inspection of the bridges. We reimburse for it, but then if there is a finding, we are responsible for dealing with the bridge. In fact, just a couple months ago, the Center Avenue bridge in Emsworth, which is a roadway bridge, had to be weight restricted down to 5 tons. So the irony of that bridge is we own it, we're responsible for it, we pay to maintain it,

- - - -

but as of this moment, we're not allowed to operate any service over it.

2.0

REP. VULAKOVICH: Do you have any annual cost figures to maintain these bridges?

MR. BLAND: Yeah. And it's thought -the main annual maintenance expense is the inspection
program, and it's in the half million dollar range.

REP. VULAKOVICH: That's probably not a fair question, because a bridge can be in good shape and then in bad shape.

Are there any bridges that have to be totally replaced by you?

MR. BLAND: Well, the couple now that we have primary concern with, one is a transit-related bridge. We have a pedestrian bridge at our Negley Avenue station on our East Busway, one of our busiest stations on our busiest facility. That pedestrian bridge had to be fully closed about three years ago. It really has no prospect of being reopened. It's just not something we've been able to move up to the top. And then most recently the Center Avenue bridge has been weight restricted. That's purely a highway bridge, for the lack of a better word.

REP. VULAKOVICH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you. Steve,

- - - -

1	thank you very much.
2	MR. BLAND: Thank you all. Welcome to
3	Pittsburgh and Monroeville. The 67A gets you into
4	town, for anyone who is
5	CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: The bus driver is
6	next, I guess, Pat McMahon, who is the president of
7	Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 85. Pat, welcome.
8	Is Rick Bloomingdale here today?
9	MR. McMAHON: I didn't see him, to be
10	honest with you.
11	CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Come on down, Rick.
12	MR. McMAHON: He is here.
13	CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Rick is the new
14	president of the Pennsylvania AFL-CIO. So,
15	congratulations.
16	You don't mind if Rick sits up there with you?
17	MR. McMAHON: Not at all. I'd be
18	honored.
19	CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Mr. President,
20	welcome.
21	MR. BLOOMINGDALE: Thank you,
22	Mr. Chairman.
23	CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Pat, five minutes,
24	sir.

MR. McMAHON: Thank you. First, I want

25

- - - -

2.0

to thank everybody on the panel for giving me the opportunity to come here today and speak on this very important issue of transportation in our Commonwealth.

My name is Patrick McMahon. I'm the president and business agent of Local 85 of the Amalgamated Transit Unit. In that capacity, I represent all the transit workers who work for the Port Authority of Allegheny County. I also chair the Pennsylvania Joint Conference Board of the Amalgamated Transit Union, which, in that capacity, I represent and speak for 17 other communities across the Commonwealth that are also represented by the Amalgamated Transit Union. So, again, I'd like to thank you for your efforts here and the opportunity to speak.

As we all know, currently in the Commonwealth we are facing a \$1.7 billion a year shortfall that the state needs just to maintain Pennsylvania's existing highway, bridge, and public transit systems.

Adequate, efficient transportation systems are critical for the citizens and employers of the Commonwealth. Failing to deal with the existing crisis will significantly reduce the quality of life across this Commonwealth.

As we know, transportation funding shortfalls is not a new issue in our Commonwealth, and

- - - -

2.0

particularly in public transit. We have never had a reliable dedicated funding resource. A few years back, our Governor, Ed Rendell, put together a Transportation Funding and Reform Commission and charged them with finding solutions to our transportation problems.

In 2007, the product of the hard work of that committee and our legislators at the time was the passage of Act 44, which was an historic day in Pennsylvania. For the first time, mass transit had a predictable, dedicated revenue source that it could depend on.

I'd like to point out that during that process, many legislators have approached our union and myself promising that the state would do its part, but they expected the transit workers to do their part, and we did exactly that. As the chief executive officer of the Port Authority of Allegheny County pointed out in his comments in the Post-Gazette on Monday, June 14th, our last collective bargaining agreement that was negotiated with the Amalgamated Transit Union Local 85 in 2008 saved the Port Authority of Allegheny County an estimated \$93 million in retirement benefits over the next four years. It raised contributions to our health care and pensions.

- - - -

2.0

In the words of Mr. Bland, the contract produced one of the largest gains in the history of public transit and the Port Authority of Allegheny County.

And although we know, as the president of the union, those sacrifices we made were painful, we believe that they had to be done in order to show that we -- to show the Commonwealth that we, as the workers, are participants in helping in public transit and we definitely have a stake in the game.

But as we all know, the law passed in 2007 relied heavily on toll revenue from Interstate 80 and we appreciated to this day and still appreciate what the legislature did in enacting Act 44. But, unfortunately, the promise of funds from Act 44 has evaporated with the Federal Highway Administration refusing to allow the tolling of Interstate 80. As a result, the fixed promise by the legislature no longer exists.

Due to the current shortfall of funding in transit, transit agencies throughout the state have already been forced to raise fares, cut services, and now are planning additional fare increases and employee layoffs. The citizens most affected by these cuts in service are the people who need public transit the most. These are the people who depend on public

- - - -

2.0

transit to survive. The majority of the transit riders are college students, people who do not own private vehicles, the handicapped and disabled community, senior citizens, and the average and lower income workers who must depend on transit to travel to and from work. For these people, public transit is their only means of transportation. If the proposed cuts were to go through, these people would be disconnected from life.

It is very important for everyone to recognize that transit is the lifeblood of the citizens of any community. All citizens benefit from mass transit, not just those who use it. Some examples is transit reduces the number of vehicles on our roadways, which helps with congestion, traffic congestion. The environment, there are fewer cars on the road, which results in less exhaust fumes and cleaner air. It helps lessen our dependence on foreign oil. Public transit plays a vital role in the economic development of any region.

So what do we do now? We need solutions and it's not easy, and we all know that. Simply put, we must find new revenues to fund transportation, and there are a myriad of revenue sources out there that other states have used, gas tax, oil franchise tax,

- - - -

2.0

real estate transfer tax, and there are many, many other tax resources that could be considered for additional revenues, but I believe that that is something that our legislators, it's your job -- our job to help you, but your job to figure that out, what best fits our Commonwealth.

One thing that concerns labor is, from time to time, we hear comments that transportation be turned over to the public enterprise through private/public partnerships. With respect to transit labor, our primary efforts have focused on promoting unbiased decision making in order to avoid artificially imposed cost models and antilabor motivations. We have sought to bargain against job losses and ensure the delivery of safe and efficient transit services consistent with local policies and agreements.

We believe that before the Commonwealth enacts any mandates on transit privatization, it must ensure that any potential cost savings are properly measured and weighed against potential adverse effects on safety and service. Based on our experience within the ATU across the country with privatization in the transit industry, we urge our legislators to be very careful in this area.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Sum up.

- - - -

2.0

MR. McMAHON: In conclusion, we know this is a very difficult problem, but the reality is if we want a viable transportation system, we must pay for it. And I know, especially in an election year, it is very difficult for an elected official to raise taxes, but the alternative to do nothing is an even more difficult choice to make, because it would be devastating to our Commonwealth. As an elected official myself, I understand the difficulty in the task our legislators are faced with. It was not easy for me to take a concessionary contract back to my members, but we knew that it was the right thing to do and we did that to help out and do our part.

On behalf of all the transit workers in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I thank you for your time here today, and we also pledge our support to all legislators who have the political will to do the right thing in supporting a solution for transportation in our Commonwealth.

And I thank you again and I would be more than willing to try to answer any questions, if anyone would have any for me.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you, Pat. I think we're okay for now, so I'd recognize President Bloomingdale.

- - - -

2.0

MR. BLOOMINGDALE: Thank you and good afternoon, Chairman Markosek and Chairman Geist and members and staff of the committees, various committees that make up this joint commission. Thank you for conducting these hearings to address our Commonwealth's grave transportation crisis.

I'm Richard Bloomingdale, president of the Pennsylvania AFL-CIO, and by the way, this is the first hearing I'm using that title at. The Pennsylvania AFL-CIO represents more than 950,000 workers in Pennsylvania. All of them depend on transportation to house, feed, clothe, educate, and access healthcare for their families, to share leisure time with their families, and other members of their communities, not to mention getting to work.

Of the nearly 6 and a half million workers in Pennsylvania, thousands of the workers that we represent construct, maintain, operate the various transportation modes. For them, our Commonwealth's transportation crisis started several years ago. For them and millions of our workers, our nation's recession started about three years ago. They are the front-line casualties of stalled transportation and neglected funding, as many other speakers have mentioned, through no fault of the legislature. You

- - - -

2.0

all took the responsible actions of passing Act 44, and, unfortunately, key pieces of it were denied by representatives of the federal government from both political parties. We know from firsthand experience that we cannot revitalize our economy until we revitalize our transportation infrastructure.

Personal testimonies and preponderance of testimony at these hearings sends the same urgent message: Pennsylvania's transportation infrastructure requires comprehensive revitalization and long-term sustainable funding. Legislative inaction is not acceptable. Instead, legislation to generate long-term sustainable funding for transportation revitalization must be enacted now or the crisis will get progressively worse.

The Pennsylvania AFL-CIO advocates a level of sustainable transportation funding that enables

Pennsylvania workers to restore, maintain, and enhance our transportation infrastructure so our Commonwealth can propel itself into prosperity once again.

Testimony rendered at these hearings has proffered many revenue sources that can be invoked individually and collectively to accomplish this goal. Pennsylvania AFL-CIO will support funding proposals that equitably share responsibility and benefits among

- - - -

2.0

all stakeholders. Let me emphasize equitably share and equitably benefit. Most of the funding will come from Pennsylvanians; therefore, all benefits of the funding should go to Pennsylvanians, especially jobs.

The Pennsylvania AFL suggests a mix of these revenue sources presents the most equitable formula for procuring sustainable transportation funding.

Such a mixture would spare any one group of stakeholders from bearing an inordinate share of the responsibility for funding. Such a mixture, therefore, would not include what are normally called P3, privatization or private/public partnerships.

Pennsylvania AFL-CIO opposes privatization.

We disbelieve that private/public partnerships are viable responses to this crisis. Privatization and P3s do not eliminate nor reduce our taxes, fees, and tolls. Alleged savings from privatization and P3s frequently are based on unfounded and sometimes false assumptions, skewed cost factors, and faulty calculations. The reason is simple: Partners have conflicting goals. The public partner, government, strives or should strive to provide safe, dependable, comfortable transportation for all persons. Private partners, as private companies do, strive to maximize profits. P3s seek only public service opportunities

- - - -

2.0

that are most profitable to them. The private companies and P3s have been associated with cutting jobs and services, risking public safety, and hiking their tolls to protect their profits. Privatization and P3s are not substitutes for responsible government.

Fortunately, the government uses these hearings to state our case for responsible government. These hearings have helped illuminate the distinction between fiction and fact and the difference between talking points and reality.

This is rather long. I'm going to skip ahead here, because I see that my time is running out, but I did want to mention that one of the basic needs of business is move their goods to markets, and one of the basic needs of businesses is to have workers show up for work. You can only do that through a good transportation system, and as I said earlier, we support the need to fund an adequate transportation system, good infrastructure. Obviously, we want Pennsylvania workers, union workers, to do those jobs and to build those roads, drive the buses, make sure that we have good, middle-class incomes for our workers in the state and a good transportation system for our businesses to deliver the goods to their

- - - -

markets.

2.0

Thank you for your time, and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay, President

Bloomingdale and Pat, President Pat. Any questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Gentlemen, thank you very much. Well said. Well spoken. Thank you.

Slight change in the schedule. We have some folks that have to catch an ACCESS transportation, so Lucy Spruill. Lucy, she is with the United Cerebral Palsy of Pittsburgh/Community Living and Support Services.

MS. SPRUILL: Thank you, Chairman
Markosek, members of the Transportation Committee, and
everyone gathered here this afternoon to address the
important issue of transportation in the Commonwealth
of Pennsylvania. Thank you for the opportunity to
testify this morning.

UCP/CLASS, formerly United Cerebral Palsy of Pittsburgh, is the third-largest nonprofit organization serving people with disabilities in Western Pennsylvania. We serve approximately 3,000 people with disabilities daily in Allegheny County alone, most of them receiving daily living support in

- - - -

2.0

their own homes. We have approximately 600 employees who provide assistance of all kinds to our participants.

Most of our participants, and, in fact, most people with disabilities in Pennsylvania, rely solely on public transportation for all of their transportation needs. In addition, many senior citizens in our Commonwealth who can no longer drive also rely on public transportation for at least some of their transportation needs. This is a substantial number of citizens, because we have the second oldest population in the country and people over 65 are the fastest growing sector of our population in Pennsylvania and across the nation.

In Allegheny County alone, at least 4,000 people with disabilities and over 98,000 senior citizens rely on public transportation for a substantial part of their transportation needs. In addition, over half of our employees rely on public transportation to get to the homes of the people they assist. Without public transportation, our ability to assist people with disabilities to get to work or school or to receive long-term care in their own homes would be severely compromised.

UCP/CLASS strongly supports the creation of a

- - - -

2.0

predictable, dedicated, and growable funding source for public transportation in Pennsylvania, knowing full well that creation of such dedicated funding will involve raising specific taxes or fees for specific services and thus imposing a cost on the citizens of Pennsylvania. We will support legislators who vote for these increased revenues.

At this time, we have efficient, cost-effective, and well-used public transportation throughout Pennsylvania. Public transportation is also environmentally sound and achieves the goal of reducing our use of imported and American carbon fuels. Public transportation can be either paratransit, which is door to door, shared ride, advanced reservation, accessible vehicle service, or accessible fixed route service.

As the saying goes, there is no free lunch.

We can either commit funding to maintain this valuable resource or we will have to commit additional state funding to unemployment compensation, medical assistance, and other forms of relief for low-paid workers and disabled individuals who can no longer get to work without public transportation, to increase medical assistance costs for nursing home care for senior citizens and people with disabilities who can't

- - - -

stay in their own homes because we can't get services to them, and to cleaning up the environmental consequences of thousands more automobiles on our streets and highways.

This year marks the 20th anniversary of the passage of the ADA, federal civil rights legislation which guarantees fair access to employment, public accommodations, government services, public transportation, and communication for people with disabilities. Accessible public transportation is the engine that drives this entire landmark law. Without public transportation, we citizens with disabilities have no way to get to job training and higher education, places of employment, public accommodations, and government programs and services.

If public transportation is reduced below the level that meets real needs or is priced out of reach of most citizens, people with disabilities will again become invisible members of our society.

Thank you for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you,

Ms. Spruill. Very good. Very good testimony. Any questions by the members?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: No? Thank you very

2.0

- - - -

much, and we can exit this way (indicating).

2.0

Next is John Tague from the Pennsylvania

Transportation Alliance. Mr. Tague, you may proceed,
when you're ready, for five minutes.

MR. TAGUE: Good afternoon, Chairman Markosek and Chairman Geist.

Coming out here today, it cost me \$9 and it will cost me \$9 going back using the ACCESS system, so it's a system that's not inexpensive. Somebody had mentioned shared ride before, so I wanted to throw that out.

As I said, good afternoon. I am John Tague,
Jr. I'm here today representing the Pennsylvania
Transportation Alliance, a nonprofit advocacy group
that, for the past 15 years, has advocated for
accessible transportation. The Alliance was the
advocacy voice behind the rural shared ride program
for people with disabilities, a program that provides
rides for Pennsylvanians with disabilities.

I've been an advocate for public transit for over a decade. I was president of the Allegheny County Transit Council, a legislatively mandated advisory committee to the Port Authority. I'm currently a member of the leadership team of the

Forty-five percent of those trips are to go to work.

- - - -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Committee for Accessible Transportation, an advisory committee to the Port Authority and ACCESS primarily on disability issues. I regularly attend Port Authority board committee meetings. In fact, Chairman Markosek, I remember when you served on the Port Authority board. Chairman Geist, I was part of the Pennsylvania Transportation Alliance team that made a presentation to the Transportation Funding and Reform Commission in Harrisburg on the importance of public transit to the disability community. We also knew we had a strong supporter in Jim Roddey, who was a member at that time, who has always been a friend of the disability community. The late senator Jim Rhoads was a key part of the Alliance in advocating for a shared ride program for people with disabilities in every county in the Commonwealth. Secretary Beihler, when he was at the Port Authority, was a strong supporter of our ACCESS system. To us in the disability community, transportation has always been clearly a nonpartisan issue.

I spoke primarily to the Commission about the importance of local transit, over-the-road buses, trains, to Pennsylvanians with disabilities. Other Alliance members spoke on the importance of the shared ride program for people with disabilities. One of the

- - - -

2.0

Commission's recommendations was to see that every rural county in Pennsylvania had a shared ride for people with disabilities, and it was incorporated into Act 44. I am happy to report that shared ride program is active in all but one rural county. Chairman Markosek, that's Westmoreland County. And I saw Larry Morris here earlier.

The funding for this program comes from programs of statewide significance. It is our hope that this committee will continue to support funding for the rural shared ride program for people with disabilities.

Even though I am an advocate for public transit, I recognize that without sufficient revenues for roads and bridges, we will continue to see deterioration of our roads and bridges, the same roads and bridges that the Port Authority buses, ACCESS vehicles, and Greyhound buses use. We will continue to see more structurally deficient bridges, more weight-restricted bridges, and more bridges closed. The Port Authority owns at least one bridge they cannot use. We will continue -- will we continue down this path until we see a Pennsylvania bridge collapse on CNN?

Transit-oriented development is a value-added

- - - -

2.0

proposition which we support. Public/private partnerships, an example, a local partnership between Classy Cabs and the Southwestern Planning Commission in the purchase of accessible taxicabs. The use of technology is a means of improving efficiency and reduces costs. The smart card technology captures fares that we know are being lost through antiquated collection systems and broken fare boxes. The use of E-ZPass on the Pennsylvania Turnpike keeps vehicles moving and reduces backup and wasted fuel. I wonder why we do not have smart card going through the toll stations on the Turnpike.

ACCESS, our local paratransit provider, uses an e-purse to eliminate the need for cumbersome paper tickets. ACCESS now uses a GPS system to track vehicles to provide drivers with the best routes to transport our passengers. These are lessons that can be used statewide.

When I started traveling to Harrisburg in the late '90s, I used Amtrak since, other than flying, it was the only accessible public transportation to Harrisburg. After Greyhound began putting lifts on buses per an agreement with the Justice Department, I started to use Greyhound. It gave me more choices and better on-time performance than Amtrak. I will

- - - -

continue to use the train mostly to go to DC, but I do -- now, over the past five years -- and I'll be closing out -- I've rented a van, so I do recognize the importance of good roads and bridges.

2.0

So thank you for your time and your attention. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you. Very good job. Thank you, sir, and if you could exit that way (indicating).

Next we have our old friend Jonathan Robison.

Jonathan, good to see you again. Jonathan is with the Allegheny County Transit Council. Jonathan, welcome.

You have five minutes, sir.

MR. ROBISON: Be less than three.

Good day, ladies and gentlemen. I am here to ask Representative Joseph Markosek and Representative Richard Geist for leadership in solving the transportation funding crisis. I am Jonathan Robison 154 North Bellefield Avenue, Pittsburgh 15213. I am president of the Allegheny County Transit Council, ACTC, the legislatively mandated citizens advisory body for the Port Authority of Allegheny County.

You are well aware, I trust, how vital public transportation is to the environment, energy conservation, the economy, the region, and ordinary

- - - -

2.0

people's lives. Others are sharing specifics on these needs. You know that the problems of the Port Authority, PAT, are shared by all 38 transit operators in the state. You know that PennDOT lacks necessary funds to maintain and repair our roads and bridges.

You have heard at length about all the changes that PAT has made to make the transit system more efficient and effective. PAT will continue to make improvements and ACTC will continue to support these efforts, but simple arithmetic will tell you that all possible improvements cannot resolve the \$50 million hole in the PAT budget.

I don't have a simple solution in my pocket.

As I say, I am here to ask you for leadership in solving our transportation funding crisis. I have heard perhaps 15 solutions, and I am sure you have heard more. What is needed is leadership to negotiate a consensus around one measure or a package of measures and put together the votes for legislative enactment. Support by citizens and community groups will, of course, be needed, and there we must provide the leadership, and the ACTC is already trying to help, distributing these cards that some people have seen asking people to call their legislators. I have more cards available, if anyone wants to distribute

- - - -

1 some.

2.0

Why do I ask you for this legislative leadership? I believe -- and I'm thinking especially, not exclusively, of course, to Representative Markosek and Representative Geist. I believe that you have the knowledge, the understanding of the situation, the vision, and the connections to assemble a solution and get it enacted. And, we're here together. Please start here and now.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you. Very good. Good testimony. Thank you very much. That was wonderful and you sum it up just perfect. Thank you, Jonathan. If you could go out that way, please (indicating).

I'd like to get back to the regular agenda here. Mr. Andrew Boni, board member, Pennsylvania Association of Township Supervisors. Dave Sanko is with him as well.

Also, the Allegheny Conference on Community Development, Mr. Ken Zapinski. Ken, are you here?

Mr. Dan Friedman is my constituent, so welcome.

Mr. Boni and Mr. Sanko, you may proceed when ready, sir. Five minutes.

- - - -

MR. BONI: Thank you, Chairman, members of the House Transportation Committee and the House Democratic and Republican Policy Committee.

2.0

Good afternoon. My name is Andrew J. Boni.

I'm the township supervisor of Perry Township in

Fayette County, and I'm also on the executive board

for the Pennsylvania State Association of Township

Supervisors. Thank you for the opportunity to appear

before you today. With me to my right is David M.

Sanko, our executive director.

My township was forced to close a bridge that requires emergency responders to take a four-and-half-mile detour, delaying response by eight to twelve minutes. The closure created problems also with snow removal because the bridge is located at the bottom of a steep slope and several homes are located along that portion of the roadway. We evaluated our options, and repair would cost \$1.3 million. To rebuild the bridge would cost over 3 million. Since the bridge is not located over any water, we determined the bridge can be collapsed and the road rebuilt for \$550,000. I just want to remind you that our budget for Perry Township is \$550,000.

The Association believes that local roads, state highways, and mass transit which provides ride

- - - -

2.0

share programs across most of Pennsylvania that allow people to get needed medical care comprise a single transportation network for the Commonwealth's traveling public.

Pennsylvania has more than 117,000 total road miles. Two-thirds of these are owned and maintained by local government, including those in District 11 and 12. Local government also maintains more than 6400 local bridges over 20 feet and a thousand more bridges that are less than 20 feet. These local roads and bridges are a vital link in our transportation network and provide children with safe transportation to schools, workers with reliable access to jobs, patients with transportation to doctors, and farmers with a means to move their food commerce across the state and country. As such, the Association believes local government is essential partners with the state in maintaining our transportation system.

In 2008, municipalities in District 11 spent
165.8 million on local roads and bridges, yet only
received 34.5 million in liquid fuels funds. District
11 has 509 local bridges, of which 27 percent are
currently posted with weight limits. Of all local
bridges in District 11, 8 percent, 42, are posted with
10 tons or less and another 2 percent, 12, are

- - - -

currently closed.

2.0

Pine Township, Allegheny County, has attempted to secure funding for an intersection upgrade at State Route 910 and Pearce Mill Road, two state-owned roadways within the township. In 1991, Pine appointed an Impact Fee Advisory Committee, which allows municipalities to assess transportation impact fees on new developments to partly defray the costs of addressing transportation issues created by additional traffic.

In the 1991 study, the Route 910/Pearce Mill intersection was designated as one of the highest priority projects and funds were reserved. Under Act 209, only up to 50 percent of the total project cost may be paid using impact fee dollars, and the township had a great difficulty securing state share of funding for this project. The township is now attempting to have the project combined with a planned culvert bridge replacement that are adjoining to the intersection which should provide an opportunity for the township the use impact fees to complete this project.

Also in 2008, municipalities in District 12 spent 92.2 million on local roads and bridges, yet only received 24.2 million in liquid fuels funds.

- - - -

2.0

Direct 12 has 507 local bridges, of which 58 percent are currently posted with a weight limit. All local bridges in District 12, 28 percent, 142, are posted at 10 tons or less, and another 6 percent, 32, are currently closed.

Morgan Township, Greene County, has only \$80,000 to buy road materials for the rest of the year for its 50 miles of road. This includes everything from salt and cinders to patch, stone, and Superpave. The bad winter was particularly difficult on the township, and in a recent bid, the cost of emulsions alone came in at \$60,000. This does not include stone. Clearly, the township will not be able to undertake the tar and chip projects that it was planning to do this year. Additional examples of transportation needs in District 10 and 11 are included in our printed testimony.

The Association believes the local roads, state highways, and mass transit comprise a single transportation system and that the Commonwealth must maintain the predictable and reliable fund methods for this system. PSATS has gone on record supporting a gas tax, realigning the cap on the oil franchise tax, tying Pennsylvania's registration fee structure to the consumer price index, and the use of public/private

- - - -

2.0

partnerships. Any solution should include at least a 20 percent share for local government, use of a restricted account, and linking any fees to the consumer price index.

And at this time, I'd like to thank you for testifying in front of you today and would be more than willing to attempt to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you, Mr. Boni. I have said at other hearings that I feel that any solution that we do have has to include local sector municipalities, counties, cities. We mention about all those statistics about deficient roads, bridges, transit, et cetera. Those are mostly PennDOT, but we have almost an equal number of local bridges and roads that are in dire need of repair and replacement.

I'm going to just ask you, as an elected official -- I've asked this before, too -- are you willing, and other elected officials in your organization, to publicly support legislators who represent you in Harrisburg or senators with their very difficult votes that they may have to do in order to raise this kind of money in order to help you?

MR. BONI: We most certainly would. You know for sure, Joe, that Deberah Kula, she walks on water in that county. She is great for us, and

- - - -

Senator Kasunic, also. So whatever we can do to help you, if you help us, we'll greatly appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you. All right.

2.0

Next we have Tim Zapinski. He's with

Allegheny Conference on Community Development. They
just had a group in Harrisburg this week from the

Allegheny Conference.

Sir, five minutes. You may proceed.

MR. ZAPINSKI: I appreciate the opportunity to speak today and I appreciate your dedication to this important issue. And it's clear that people on this panel, the representatives here today, really understand the scope of the problem.

I'm Ken Zapinski, senior vice president for the Allegheny Conference on Community Development. Or behalf of the conference and the more than 300 employers across Southwestern Pennsylvania that make up our Regional Investors Council, we urge the entire legislature and the Rendell administration to grapple with the state's transportation problem in a serious and creative way. Election year "business as usual" is no longer good enough.

The Allegheny Conference and its affiliate, the Greater Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, are

- - - -

2.0

prepared to seriously consider any proposed package that, one, addresses the problem, and, two, has committed legislative champions willing to bring it to a vote.

Any solution set has to include changes that gives the state and counties and cities additional tools that they can use to be more efficient in how they provide transportation solutions. One such tool is public/private partnership legislation that permits more flexibility in building, designing, financing, and operating transportation facilities to get work done more quickly, more efficiently, or for less money. P3s are not a solution for everything, but it makes no sense to tie our hands and not have all the tools possible at our disposal.

There may be other ways to change the structure and process of how we provide transportation services in the state that will save money and/or make things more efficient, and everything should be on the table for consideration.

Finally, any proposed solution has to address transit funding in a way that maintains the viability of the Port Authority of the Allegheny County. Act 44 did not do that. The Port Authority was alone among transit agencies in seeing its state aid decline under

- - - -

2.0

Act 44 compared to the state aid authorized the previous year. Since that time, the Port Authority's state allotment has been flat, while other agencies have seen their funding increase.

Often in the past, the Port Authority's dire financial conditions were largely self-inflicted, stemming from a well-meaning lack of managerial discipline to live within its means. It simply wanted to provide more transit service than the community could support. That is no longer the case. Over the last four years, the Port Authority has undergone more radical improvements than any other big city transit agency in the country, bringing its expenses and its operations in line with reality.

And every part of the community has contributed something to that painful, yet necessary process. Passengers have paid the fares as fares have been adjusted to keep pace with inflation and as inefficient routes were cut from the system. Port Authority workers have seen layoffs, wage freezes, and its transit union bravely passed a groundbreaking contract which helped turn the corner on long-term labor costs. Port Authority management has reassessed its entire network and is in the process of wholesale changes that will respond better to the needs of the

- - - -

community, and Allegheny County has rallied behind the changes, supporting the local poured-drink tax and rental car tax to provide its own dedicated transit finance.

Even with all that, because of the problems with state transit funding, the Port Authority is falling farther behind and is now contemplating a 30 percent service cut that would be devastating to the region's economy and some of its most vulnerable residents. Transit must be addressed and the Port Authority needs to be treated fairly compared to the rest of the state.

Thank you, and I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you.

Representative Mike Carroll.

2.0

REP. CARROLL: Thank you, Ken, for your testimony, and I share your view that public/private partnerships need to be a component as part of the comprehensive solution.

I'm wondering if the Allegheny Conference has contemplated or considered the position taken by the Pennsylvania Chamber with respect to supporting a fuel tax increase.

MR. ZAPINSKI: We have discussed

- - - -

2.0

internally a number of options. We're waiting to see what sort of package can get presented to us. I can say, historically, the Allegheny Conference and the Chamber, when the need for a fuels tax increase has been made and linked to specific improvements in the transportation system, historically the Conference and Chamber have supported increases of gasoline tax.

REP. CARROLL: Seems to me the

Pennsylvania Chamber has made that linkage already, so

I urge your group to take a close look at that.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: No other questions? (No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you.

Dan? Mr. Dan Friedman, who is a group rental manager, Enterprise Rent-A-Car.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you very much,
Chairman Geist, Chairman Markosek. I appreciate the
opportunity and I appreciate you hosting these
hearings so that we can discuss the issues in depth.

My name is Dan Friedman. I'm the group rental manager for Enterprise Rent-A-Car's Western

Pennsylvania operations. Enterprise Rent-A-Car -- or Enterprise Holdings, which includes Enterprise,

National, Alamo, is Pennsylvania's largest rental car company. We employ 2300 people in the Commonwealth

- - - -

2.0

and have 245 locations. We provide service to

1.1 million people annually in Pennsylvania. Our
customers are primarily residents, residents of the
state who rent from our network of neighborhood
locations. Many do so because they need a temporary
replacement vehicle while theirs are in the shop.
Those who utilize public transportation rely on our
network of home city locations in places like
Wilkinsburg, Oakland, and Monroeville, and local
businesses rent as an affordable alternative to air
travel. Regardless of their reasons for renting, they
all share one thing in common. They pay a \$2 a day
tax towards the public transportation assistance fund.

In 2007, the legislature and county council spent months debating and designing a solution to the Port Authority's fiscal issues. Ultimately, this led to another \$2 a day tax on the residents of Allegheny County. As a result, taxes now comprise an average of 23 percent of an individual's rental car bill in the county, the highest rate in the Commonwealth.

Despite this enormous investment of time, energy, and resources, not to mention tens of millions of dollars in additional dedicated revenue, we've heard there is now a \$50 million deficit. And actually just to correct a couple of the other things

- - - -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

that have been mentioned here today, going off my script a little bit, the Port Authority actually was given the opportunity to raise an additional \$45 million. So the discussion about not getting extra money or getting a decrease in funding is not Those two taxes that Mr. Zapinski mentioned raise \$45 million annually. \$28 million of that is transferred to the Port Authority. 17 million of it is moved away from it to the general fund or wherever it's used as part of the county budget. There is \$17 million in dedicated funding that you passed as a part of Act 44 that could and should be used for the Port Authority. That 50 million deficit is about a \$33 million deficit that is ballooned to 50 as a result of those funds being used in a way other than you have all told me they were intended to be used.

The goal of these hearings is find out how the current transportation funding crisis is affecting residents and businesses in Pennsylvania. I'm speaking on behalf of the millions of Pennsylvanians and Pennsylvania businesses who have spent tens of millions of dollars on taxes designed to support public transportation or a public transportation system that appears to be out of money anyway. The current situation proves that taxing individual

- - - -

industries, and especially unrelated ones, is both ineffective and unfair.

2.0

I encourage everyone here to consider scrapping these regressive and stagnant taxes in favor of broad-based solutions with long-term potential for success and revenue growth. Enterprise is committed to working with the General Assembly on this issue and we ask that you use us as a resource in your discussions. We commend the legislature for convening these meetings and for its commitment to finding a viable solution to Pennsylvania's transportation funding issues and would be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you. Thank you, Dan. You had mentioned in your testimony about working with us for some broad-based solutions to our transportation problem, and would you like to elaborate on what some of those may be?

MR. FRIEDMAN: No. I would be happy to work with you on discussions, which was an opportunity we were denied when these previous two taxes were passed that have proven to be failures and have been sort of misused, frankly, and we'd be happy to be a participant in those conversations, but we were excluded before, and the conversations that took place

- - - -

2.0

after the fact, the feedback that we received from elected members, including people on this council, are largely that had they had more background information in 2007, they would not have approved the rental car tax as one of the proposed solutions.

So I would simply say that we would be willing and happy to work with whomever is interested in spending some time with us, but as it pertains to specific solutions, not at this time.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. That's fair enough. Thank you. Gentlemen, thank you.

American Concrete Pavement Association.

Charlie Niederriter is the chief operating officer of Golden Triangle Construction.

MR. NIEDERRITER: Chairman Markosek,
Chairman Geist, and members of the Transportation
Committee, good afternoon. My name is Chuck
Niederriter. I'm the COO of Golden Triangle and serve
on the board of directors of the Pennsylvania chapter
of the ACPA. I'll keep this brief. It's almost happy
hour on Friday afternoon.

Golden Triangle has been in business for over 50 years. During the peak of the construction season, we employ about 300 salary and hourly craft workers who build highways, airports, and utility projects in

- - - -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Pennsylvania. One of the largest segments of our work has historically been the concrete paving work that we do. Unfortunately, we are facing a time of reduced funding for roadway construction and repairs, in general, and making this worse for our company is the fact that a lesser proportion of those funds goes to concrete paving.

Our company has built many miles of concrete paving, including a section of I79 that has required zero maintenance in over 20 years. Today, the primary projects keeping our company working, our paving division working, are the Mon-Fayette projects and the first major concrete overlay of a highway in recent Pennsylvania history. We thank Joe Szczur and the staff at District 12 for taking the initiative to look at other states to develop new solutions to our infrastructure problems. If not for these projects, many of our employees would be looking elsewhere for the limited work available. Without action soon, the concrete paving industry, along with the cement industry and equipment manufacturing industry, steel industry, and all the related industries will be forced to lay people off and have difficulty supporting their families.

Over the past several weeks, you've heard a

- - - -

2.0

lot of members of our industry. Pennsylvania has had a long and successful history of using concrete pavements. We have a product that is derived from materials mined and manufactured right here in Pennsylvania, a product that is sustainable, cost competitive on a first-cost basis, and a product that meets and exceeds one of the most stringent ride quality specifications in the nation. Our product is durable and long lasting and can be restored to like-new condition when needed.

When you include all the contractors, concrete product manufacturers, and the cement industry, we are an industry that collectively employs over 39,000 hard-working Pennsylvanians. Prior to this recession, we collectively generated over \$6 billion annually in economic activity for Pennsylvania, contributing \$300 million in sales tax and 400 million in federal, state, and local income taxes. The concrete paving industry, as members of the Transportation

Construction Industry and the Keystone Transportation Funding Coalition, is in full support of a \$4.8 billion annual transportation program to address these unmet infrastructure needs. We will support traditional and innovative methods for reaching this ambitious but much-needed level of investment.

- - - -

2.0

It's probably said that this type of funding is somewhat self-serving for our industry, as well as others in the construction industry. Perhaps this is true to some extent, but it's also true that we care about the employees and families that work in these industries. A long-time commitment -- a long-term commitment to the infrastructure will keep Pennsylvania citizens, union and nonunion alike, working with good-paying jobs and benefits and keep them out of the unemployment lines.

With this type of investment in our infrastructure and in our people, we will be able to build viable transportation products that will be enjoyed by our children and grandchildren. We would, for example, be able to complete the entire

Mon-Fayette southern beltway corridor, spurring development of old mill sites and thereby also creating good jobs for thousands of Pennsylvanians who do not directly work for our industry. A long-term investment in our infrastructure will make our system safer and less congested and it will help the economy of the Commonwealth recover and once again prosper.

On behalf of our concrete paving industry, we sincerely appreciate having this opportunity to testify before you for these past several weeks. I

- - - -

will be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you. First of all, I know the Concrete Association has been at all of our hearings, and we really appreciate that.

You've been wonderful as far as supporting -- trying to support what we're trying to do. You've been front and center and we certainly appreciate all you've done.

We had the committee, in fact, up at Essroc Cement in Lehigh Valley a month, two months ago,
Nazareth, PA, so we've become very familiar and we've worked a lot with John Becker in Harrisburg. So we really appreciate that.

Any questions?

2.0

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: No. Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. NIEDERRITER: Thanks. Thanks a lot.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Lynn Manion from the Airport Corridor and also Mr. Bill Newland, who is the chair of the Committee for Accessible Transportation.

Hi, Lynn. Good to see you again. Hold on, please. Mr. Newland is coming up.

Ms. Manion, when you're prepared, you may

- - - -

begin, please. Five minutes.

2.0

MS. MANION: Thank you. My name is Lynn Manion. I'm the executive director of the Airport Corridor Transportation Association, ACTA. We are a transportation management association, a nonprofit membership group representing private businesses and public entities with an interest in transportation issues in the airport corridor, western suburbs of Pittsburgh. Our mission is to reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality in our area.

Over the past several years, we've worked with the Port Authority to create a system that gets workers to their jobs, students to school, and shoppers to the retail areas. With the transit hub at IKEA in Robinson Town Centre and our on-demand RideACTA shuttle service that provides last mile shuttle service between the bus stop and hundreds of local job sites, we are on our way to a model suburban shared ride system, one that is unique in the Pittsburgh region. Over the past year, we have seen our ridership increase well over 200 percent.

The anticipated cuts in service and increases in fares that will occur if a sustainable funding solution is not found for Pennsylvania transit agencies will devastate the model that we've tried to

- - - -

create.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

These are a few of the reverberating consequences of the elimination or reduction of service for people who live and work in the airport corridor: Cleaning crews who work overnight in offices and at the Mall at Robinson, many of whom are dependent on public transit, will not be able to get to work. Retail and restaurant workers in the Robinson/North Fayette retail center, many of whom also work nontraditional hours, will not have a way to get home. RideACTA shuttles for employees at Penn Center West Office Park that meet up with Port Authority service to take entry-level workers to their jobs will have to be discontinued. The impact extends beyond bus riders. With more people using their cars to commute, travel time on the Parkway West will increase definitely. And, of course, ACTA's future plans to build our suburban model and on-demand service will be put on hold.

ACTA is committed to working with the Port

Authority and all our regional transit agencies until
a dedicated source of funding is found. We ask our

state legislators to make the same commitment, to make
funding for transit and an overall sustainable

transportation system in Pennsylvania their first

- - - -

priority.

2.0

In closing, I would like to submit the following statement from some of ACTA's members and friends. The statement is this: We, the undersigned friends and members of the Airport Corridor

Transportation Association, are writing to express our support for a sustainable funding solution for the Port Authority of Allegheny County. Many of us have employees who depend on the bus to get to work. We recognize the importance of adequate bus service to maintain the economic vitality of the airport corridor.

And the signers are Allegheny County Airport
Authority, Armstrong Telephone Company, Giant Eagle
Market District, Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, Robert
Kimball & Associates, Mackin Engineering, Maguire
Group, Mainstay Suites by Choice Pittsburgh Airport,
the Mall at Robinson, NCO Group, Pittsburgh Technical
Institute, Smokey Bones Restaurant, and Vital Signs.
That's it. And the Township of Moon. I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: The Smokey Bones
Restaurant stood out in my mind. I don't see any
questions, so thanks very much. I know I spoke to
your group out at the country club, South Hills
Country Club lunch that you had. It was, I thought,

- - - -

very good, very informative. You laughed at my jokes, stuff like that. But thank you.

MS. MANION: Thank you.

2.0

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Mr. Bill Newland.

MR. NEWLAND: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: And you have a guest with you.

MR. NEWLAND: Charles Hitt, who is also a member of the Committee for Accessible Transportation. And I, as chair of the committee, would like to, first of all, thank the committee for the opportunity to express our concerns.

And the Committee for Accessible

Transportation has worked with the Port Authority, as well as ACCESS. We've done this over the past several years to ensure that those who are disabled are able to use both modes of transportation.

I submitted the testimony, so I'm going to give you the abridged version. And our concerns are -- and many of these have been mentioned already -- the employment situation. Those who are disabled, many use public transportation, such as buses and the rail system, in order to get to work, and many of these individuals have low-paying jobs. So the Port Authority bus and rail transit has been --

- - - -

it's made it important for them to afford to get to and from work. And in addition, we need public transportation in order for a number of us to get to appointments, as well as other activities.

2.0

Now, it's been suggested to me that one way that I could -- that we could solve this problem, should there be a reduction in bus and rail service, is to use ACCESS. And while that may sound like a good idea, this obviously would put a burden on the ACCESS system and, unfortunately, the disabled individual would have much more difficulty getting to and from his or her activity, or, for that matter, their jobs.

Also, reduction in service, in addition to causing the difficulty in getting to and from work for the disabled person, we also realize that this would cause severe congestion in traffic, because those people -- just the people, in general, who use public transportation would have to obviously resort to using their private vehicle.

We do support whatever measures might be taken within reason to get dedicated funding, which is what we're looking for, dedicated funding for public transportation. We've also encouraged both members of the Committee for Accessible Transportation, as well

- - - -

as our Golden Triangle Council of the Blind, to let their legislator know of the need for dedicated funding for public transportation.

Again, thank you very much. And if you have any questions or if there is additional information you'd like us to provide, I have indicated on my written testimony that my past testimony is available. Thank you again.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Newland and also the gentleman with you. And Representative Paul Costa has a question.

REP. PAUL COSTA: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

2.0

Actually, my question is, I was watching you read. Was that bullet points or was that actually written out that way?

MR. NEWLAND: Actually, it was my own notes, and thank goodness most people can't read Braille.

REP. PAUL COSTA: I was just commenting to Representative Carroll that it was just amazing to watch you do that. God bless you. Thank you for coming today.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you, gentlemen and Ms. Manning.

- - - -

2.0

The Pennsylvania Public Transportation

Association, PPTA. I know Mary Jo Morandini, general manager of the Beaver County Transit Authority, and you have some guests with you. I don't see Dennis LaRusse. You know Dennis, right?

MS. MORANDINI: Oh, yes, we know Dennis very, very well.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: And Rich Farr, some of those guys.

MS. MORANDINI: Both our colleagues.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify at today's important hearing on public transportation funding needs. My name is Mary Jo Morandini, and I'm the general manager of the Beaver County Transit Authority. I'm here today representing the nine counties in Southwest Pennsylvania outside of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County whose members comprise the Transit Operators Committee of the Southwest Pennsylvania Commission.

The transit systems in the region include small urban and rural, fixed route and shared ride transportation providers including Allied Human Services in Lawrence County, the Beaver County Transit Authority, Butler Transit Authority, Butler Community Action and Development, Fayette Coordinated

- - - -

2.0

Transportation, GG&C Bus Company, Indiana County
Transit Authority, Mid-County Transit Authority, Mid
Mon Valley Transit Authority, New Castle Area Transit
Authority, Washington County Transit Authority, and
the Westmoreland County Transit Authority.

These transit systems combined provided nearly 4.6 million rides annually in the Southwest

Pennsylvania region. Of this total, over 3.6 million rides are provided annually on fixed route services and nearly 1 million on the shared ride systems.

Nearly 1 million commuters travel in to Pittsburgh from five outlying counties every year.

There is rich diversity in ridership in the region and a strong transit-dependent population.

Since the passage of Act 44, the fixed route providers have achieved an average 20 percent ridership gain, with a nearly 40 percent gain in Pittsburgh-based commuter services, even though the population in our region has been on a decline.

The anxiously awaited, predictable, dedicated funding provided under the Act 44 framework allowed agencies to advance their vision of transportation services in their own unique way and finally position them to meet the growing demand for transportation services. Rural Fayette County was able to begin

- - - -

2.0

commuter services to Pittsburgh. The small city of

New Castle transported over 1 million riders last

year. Butler Transit recognized significant rider

gains this year and created a service plan for rapidly

growing Cranberry Township. Beaver County is

anticipating its eighth consecutive record ridership

year and also lowered its cost per trip in each of

those eight years. Indiana County partnered with the

university to make service accessible to the student

population. Mid Mon Valley, Washington, and

Westmoreland County Transit Authorities were finally

able to meet the ever-growing needs for commuter

services to Pittsburgh.

In addition, facilities have been constructed or renovated, new buses have been placed in service, transit-oriented development projects are being undertaken by several transit authorities, coordination of human service transportation is more prevalent, and the regional transit agencies are working together to make the transportation network more seamless and easier to use. Performance standards are being established to ensure the most productive and cost-effective services.

The loss of Act 44 funds exacerbated by the prorated 3.7 percent decrease in state operating

- - - -

2.0

assistance will lead to service cuts, layoffs, and fare increases, reverse ridership gains, and prevent agencies from keeping buses and facilities in a good state of repair. Low-income riders will not be able to get to their jobs, human services clients will not be able to get to the services they need, and seniors and disabled people could very well become isolated in their communities.

The timetable will vary by agency. However, I can note that in approximately one year, our agency will likely implement a 25-cent fare increase for fixed route service and a dollar increase for shared ride services and our cumulative deficit will still reach \$4.1 million by 2018 and 4.8 million the following year. This large deficit is in spite of an excellent safety record that results in a 33 percent reduction in fleet insurance premiums over the last five years, \$100,000 earned dividends in workers' compensation, and a nearly \$290,000 reduction in administrative and operating costs since 2008 achieved through the advancement of the new technologies and employee attrition.

Public transit is a very labor- and capital-intensive business. Unfortunately, the need to maintain facilities and buses, coupled with

- - - -

2.0

uncontrollable increases in other operating costs, including fuel and health insurance, can often negate most cost-reduction efforts in our industry.

It's also extremely important to note that the loss of Act 44 has even greater ramifications if state capital funds are not available to match federal formula and potential discretionary funds that flow into our region. Without the required 16 and two-thirds percent state share, our nine counties stand to lose millions of dollars in federal aid. These federal dollars would flow into other regions across the country that place great emphasis on public transportation infrastructure and are willing to provide the required matching funds. The impact on our transit systems would, of course, be devastating. The Beaver County deficit situation becomes even graver if state matching dollars are not available.

I brought numerous quotes from bus riders to share with you. They appear as an attachment to this testimony. I won't read all of them. However, they are considered an important part of this testimony. Let me emphasize that these are riders from all walks of life who rely on public transportation more than ever. Their fears expressed in these quotes are understandably real. Two of these quotes I do want to

- - - -

share with you.

2.0

Myself. I am also saving money for the state and my country because I am not putting one more set of tires onto an already depleted highway system." And Therese: "My mother and I do not drive. We need this service very badly. Please do not take it away."

I do have to admit being surprised at the number of riders who rode the bus for the environmental benefits to the region. I am not so surprised by the number of people in BCTA public hearings who tell us that they have chosen a place to live because it's on the bus line.

It's more important than ever that we all recognize the important role of public transportation in rebuilding our distressed communities and reducing our reliance on foreign oil, creating an environmentally friendly alternative to the automobile, and providing a way for families to save their hard-earned dollars in this economic downturn. Therefore, we recommend funding levels consistent with the Pennsylvania Funding and Reform Commission.

On behalf of the small urban and rural systems in the Southwest Pennsylvania region, I would again like to thank you for this opportunity and sincerely

- - - -

hope that you can find a viable solution to the current funding crisis for highways, bridges, and the preservation of our public transportation systems.

Thank you.

2.0

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you,
Ms. Morandini. Would you, for the record, introduce
your fellow guests there with you?

MS. MORANDINI: This is Valerie Kissell, to my left, from the Mid Mon Valley Transit Authority, Larry Morris from the Westmoreland County Transit Authority, and Sheila Gombita from the Washington County Transit Authority.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you.

Representative Mike Carroll.

REP. CARROLL: Thank you very much,
Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate you being here today.

I represent an area in the northeastern part of the state, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, and part of the Poconos, and I think we all have to do a better job so that people in the government and in the community understand the needs of local transit agencies that aren't SEPTA and Port Authority. The fact of the matter is that there are real transit needs in other regions of this state besides just Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, and I would urge you to please work with

- - - -

2.0

your local legislators, both in the Senate and House, to make sure they are aware of the collective needs in all your various counties.

The fact of the matter is that transit is not just a Pittsburgh and Philadelphia matter. It really is important in all regions of the state, and so I hope that you'll reach out individually to House and Senate members so they are aware of the transit needs in your regions.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Representative Geist.

REP. GEIST: Thank you. Just a quick question. We've asked some of the smaller groups like yours in shared ride, how many trips a year are made in your organizations -- you can answer one or together or however you want to -- are made for hospital and medical trips on your shared ride. I know that number just knocked our socks off in Crawford County.

MS. GOMBITA: Speaking for Washington County, our annual shared ride trips are about 280,000 a year and about 25 to 30 percent of those would be for medical.

MR. MORRIS: Westmoreland County Transit does not directly operate the shared ride, but we do operate a couple of paratransit programs. One is a

- - - -

2.0

medical assistance transportation program, and that is all hospital and medical related. And in shared ride alone, there is 125,000 of those folks a year in Westmoreland County that are using a taxi service in the shared ride network.

MS. KISSELL: The Mid Mon Valley transit authority operates a very small paratransit service, but I would venture to tell you that probably 80 to 90 percent of those rides are medical.

MS. MORANDINI: The BCTA paratransit system carries about 100,000 riders a year. I don't know the percentage of those riders that are medical, but I do know that it's a pretty substantial figure.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Representative Vulakovich.

REP. VULAKOVICH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Morandini, in your statement on the first page you have "Since the passage of Act 44, the fixed route providers have achieved an average 20 percent ridership gain with a nearly 40 percent gain in Pittsburgh-based commuter services, even though the population" is dropping.

What did Act 44 do for you specifically that brought a 20 percent ridership gain?

- - - -

2.0

MS. MORANDINI: In addition to providing additional funding for transit agencies, Act 44 gave each transit agency a better sense of stability. It provided predictability and a dedicated funding for transit that really enabled transit agencies to think about the bigger vision of the organization and act on that.

When funding is not predictable and stable, a transit agency can become somewhat paralyzed, because it doesn't know from year to year the level of funding that's going to be available. That was the beauty of Act 44 that we really didn't have in any prior legislation, that sense of predictability that there was a dedicated source of funding through the I8 toll revenues, the 4.55 percent share of the sales tax, of course, at the time we thought was very predictable, although there has been a slight decline in that in the fiscal year and probably for the next couple of years.

It's very important that agencies who often have a hard time trying to figure out the expense side in terms of the number of volatile line items there are in the budget, like fuel and healthcare and utilities and fleet insurance and sometimes pension plans, to not know the level of funding that's going

- - - -

2.0

to be available just makes our challenges so much greater, and the beauty of Act 44 provided that sense of stability.

REP. VULAKOVICH: I agree with all of that, but you had to do something different to get a 20 percent increase in your ridership. Did you do a new park-and-ride where people could come to so that more people would use the bus, or did you do better advertising where all of a sudden somebody says, I'm going to ride the bus now, or did you provide more services so that more people were coming to Pittsburgh? What did you really gain from Act 44 that specifically allowed you to say, in your opinion, hey, 20 percent ridership, I know why that increased, because of this.

MS. MORANDINI: Well, the first thing I can say is it kept the service affordable. While I believe that every transit agency should periodically increase fares -- the price of any product and services increases periodically -- it allowed us to keep the service affordable. We really increased service modestly. I think we added an extra express run to Pittsburgh. Gasoline prices also came into play, and when gasoline prices began to fall, we were actually able to sustain the increase that we had

- - - -

achieved when gasoline prices were at their peak.

2.0

In addition, Act 44 provided technical assistance to a number of transit agencies, and I think including some of the ones here, that provided technical assistance to restructure services to make them more efficient and cost effective and more appealing to the rider.

So I think it's a combination of factors, but I think keeping the service affordable is certainly pretty high on my list. I can't speak for the others, but I think they should address your question.

MR. MORRIS: I'd like the opportunity.

Westmoreland Transit had seen double-digit increases in the last three years. This year has been kind of even. We added a significant amount of service, and Act 44 allowed us to do that. And it cost a little bit up front, but as we started to fill those buses up and as we started to develop enough choices for people that they felt comfortable trying transit, we found that those services begin to sustain themselves, at least at significant (inaudible) fares. But that took some time and it took the ability to make the investment in the service and not be in a position where, well, we can fund it for six months, but beyond that, we're unknown.

- - - -

2.0

Act 44 revenue gave us the ability to make those investments that have paid off immensely. And I have to be honest, the price of fuel helped us, but when the price of fuel went down, we didn't lose those riders. They are still riding on buses. We lost very few. And even as we speak today, I will have a trip or two leaving the city to Westmoreland County that will have people standing on commuter buses because we have developed this kind of synergy. And it takes some time and effort.

Yes, we did some marketing. Yes, we did some park-and-ride, but I think the key was frequent enough service operating so people felt comfortable that they weren't going to get left. You can't run one trip in and one trip back out and expect transit to be successful. It has to be frequent enough that people feel comfortable and know they have options, and that's been the key for us, and they have to be willing to subsidize that more up front so a year or two or three down the road, it starts to pay off. And we're seeing that now.

MS. GOMBITA: From the perspective of the Mid Mon Valley Transit Authority, Act 44 enabled us to keep our fares at their current level. We didn't have to raise our fares. Not only that, but we were able

- - - -

2.0

to take a look at our system, which is a very old system operating for 25 years, and able to invest in some new ideas to attract riders of choice. Much like Westmoreland, we're at a double-digit increase for this year, also.

REP. VULAKOVICH: Thank you. One other question, Ms. Morandini. On your second page, you have "Low income riders will not be able to get to their jobs, human service clients will not be able to get to the services they need, and seniors and disabled people could very well become isolated within their communities."

Now, in the next paragraph, we talked about deficits, and you say in 2018, you'll reach a deficit of 4.1 million. Do you have a deficit this year? You say "our agency," so I think that's the one you represent.

MS. MORANDINI: Well, that depends on the level of funding that's available this year, but what happens to build that deficit is that we have peaks and valleys in our capital replacement program. So all of the fixed route buses, the coach buses and the 40-foot transit buses, come up for replacement about the same time, so our transit agency has to start reserving funds for that critical year when those

- - - -

buses come up for replacement. Otherwise, we would never be able to come up with capital funding for 25 fixed buses that average about \$450,000 each.

years to make absolutely certain that when we reach that critical point that the funding is available, or we're going to be at a point of no return. So what happens is we take federal funding, and if the operating funding isn't there, if there is a decline in state funding, we have to start spending some federal money on operating funds through a special provision in the FTA regulations. And then we are spending those capital dollars for operations, and when we get to that critical point, the funding is not available for the fleet replacement needs.

And that's exactly what happened a few years ago when the MPO flexed a million and a half dollars to BCTA and also a significant amount to the Port Authority. We had reached that peak where we were kind of robbing Peter to pay Paul and we needed that large influx of funding in that given year to balance our budget.

REP. VULAKOVICH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you, all. Very

good. Great.

2.0

- - - -

Mr. Mike Edwards, Pittsburgh Downtown

Partnership. Jack Machek, 10,000 Friends, and also

Commissioner Trisha Kirkpatrick from Armstrong County

Board of Commissioners. Is Mr. Machek here from

10,000 friends? No? It's 10,000 less people.

Mr. Edwards, five minutes, sir.

2.0

MR. EDWARDS: Thank you very much,
Representative Markosek, Representative Geist, members
of the House Majority and Minority Public Policy
Committee. Welcome to Pittsburgh and thank you for
holding the statewide hearings on such a critical
issue as transportation. I am the president and CEO
of the Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership that represents
the interest of 350 property owners and 4500
businesses, along with 5,000 housing units that make
up the downtown central business district.

Transportation may not typically energize the public to inundate their legislators with e-mails and letters calling for action, but we and you, our elected officials, know this issue is important and we cannot afford to wait until after the November elections to solve the transportation funding crisis. The consequences of postponing decision making are too dire for the state's roads, bridges, and public transit systems. We encourage the legislature to act

- - - -

now.

2.0

The organization I lead, the Pittsburgh

Downtown Partnership, is a not-for-profit organization which provides a consistent voice on issues relating to the vitality of downtown Pittsburgh, one of the most important of which is downtown's continued economic well being.

In 2009, despite the deepest recession since the great depression, downtown Pittsburgh continues to have success in its evolution into a 21st century city. Today, downtown Pittsburgh makes up 21 percent of the city's total property tax base and is critical to the ongoing health and well being of our entire city. Anything that negatively impacts the central business district would have a ripple effect that would negatively impact the City of Pittsburgh as a whole.

Today, downtown is home to over 8100 residents and the workplace to over 140,000 daily commuters. We are the second-largest employment center in the state of Pennsylvania, and Oakland, a neighborhood within the city limits, is the third-largest employment center. Most of our downtown commuters live within a 10-mile radius of downtown, and as a result, we have the fourth-largest day surge into downtown in the

- - - -

country, comparable to Denver, Colorado.

2.0

We know from research we conducted in 2003 that public transit is the key to this job and residential density. We also know from research we are conducting now that the number of downtown employees using public transit has increased 10 percent since 2003 and that more people, approximately 11 percent, are commuting with fellow commuters in their cars and no longer driving alone.

At this point in time, public transit takes approximately 45 percent, or 60,000 people a day, into our downtown corridor. If the Port Authority implements their proposed 30 percent service cuts, many employees who are using public transit now will be forced the take their cars to work or to find another job closer to home and likely outside of the downtown corridor. In a short period of time, you will have serious traffic congestion downtown due to increased commuter trips, plus employers who depend on employees who use public transit face the loss of those employees and need to look outside of downtown for suitable workplaces, further decreasing property values and property taxes.

Several years ago, Act 44 appeared to have solved the funding problems identified by the

- - - -

Transportation Funding and Reform Commission.

Unfortunately, we know better now. Increased costs and the reliance on tolling I80 as a revenue source have resulted in even larger budget deficits than originally thought. Now the legislature must do the hard work of identifying the revenue sources to meet the needs of our entire statewide transportation system.

We urge the legislators to sit down and work together on a bipartisan basis to solve this issue.

We have too much to lose to let this issue drift until after the November elections.

Thank you.

2.0

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you very much. Thank you.

Commissioner?

MS. KIRKPATRICK: Good afternoon,
Chairman Markosek and members of the Pennsylvania
House of Representatives Transportation Committee. My
name is Patricia Kirkpatrick, and I am chairman of the
Armstrong County Board of Commissions.

Armstrong County is a part of PennDOT District 10; however, I was unable to be at yesterday's hearing in Clarion due to a scheduling conflict with the commissioners' public meeting. Armstrong County is

- - - -

2.0

also a member of the Southwestern Pennsylvania

Commission, and I appreciate the opportunity to offer comments at today's hearing.

In the guidelines for providing testimony, the first question posed was, do you believe that our public transportation and state highway and bridge systems are in a financial crisis? One only has to look as far as the recently released 2010 Report Card for Pennsylvania's Infrastructure, the State Transportation Advisory Committee's transportation funding study, or the Infrastructure Status and Needs in Southwestern Pennsylvania report compiled by the University of Pittsburgh Institute of Politics Infrastructure Committee, which I co-chair with Representative Paul Costa -- nice to see you, Paul -- to answer that question with a resounding yes.

Our bridges received a C grade, while our roads and transit infrastructure each received D-minus. Nearly one in five Pennsylvania bridges are deemed functionally obsolete and over one in four are structurally deficient. We have made some strides in reducing the number of deficient bridges, but the special emphasis on bridges through the Accelerated Bridge Program, though absolutely necessary, has meant that fewer dollars have been programmed for

- - - -

maintaining and upgrading our road network.

2.0

The current Armstrong County TIP has

133 million of program projects. Of this amount, only
about 23 million was able to be programmed for highway
improvements. While 107 million was programmed for
bridges, only 6.1 million of this was for county
bridges and none was for local bridges. That means
that only 6.1 million was programmed over a four-year
period to address the needs of 67 county and local
bridges. And the picture only worsens in the draft
TIP that will be accepted by SPC later this month. In
the draft TIP, that 6.1 million is reduced by 200,000.

Doing nothing is not an option as we consider solutions to this crisis. The failure to find ways to maintain and upgrade our transportation system will have dire impacts on the safety of our citizens and our ability to remain economically competitive.

A study released last year by the Pacific

Institute for Research and Evaluation illustrates how
the cost and severity of accidents caused by roadway
conditions far exceeds those caused by alcohol,
speeding, and unsafe driving habits. The study
estimates that roadway-related accidents cost
Pennsylvanians 874 million in medical costs and
2.3 billion in productivity lost annually, placing us

- - - -

among the highest in the nation.

2.0

We must clearly find solutions to this mounting financial crisis and those solutions must address the growing needs of county and local governments. There are over 77,000 miles of local roads and 6,400 local bridges in Pennsylvania. The Armstrong County Commissioners support the position of the County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania, which calls for revenue allocation to counties based upon each county's relative bridge responsibilities. We also suggest that funding solutions include more than simply considering tax increases. Other options, such as tolling that is equitable in all regions of the state and increased use of public/private partnerships, should be explored in greater detail.

I will leave you with the impact of limited financial resources. Route 422 is the major east-west artery through central Western Pennsylvania. For many years, we have been working with Indiana County officials, as well as the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, in an effort to upgrade the Route 422 corridor between Indiana and Kittanning. In 2003, the SPC completed a study of the corridor. It revealed that there were 14 segments where the crash rates are higher than the statewide averages, and this is over

- - - -

2.0

just a 25-mile section. The entire corridor section had higher-than-average truck volumes and numerous areas where the horizontal and vertical geometry does not meet current design standards.

For the past seven years, we have been working diligently to fix this corridor. Through the extraordinary efforts of our fellow commissioners in Indiana County, Senator Don White, Representative Jeff Pyle, and the work of SPC and PennDOT, work will soon begin on the first segment of this highway. It will be ten years between the time the projects were identified until just one of them is completed.

So while that segment will be improved, the others will continue to be unsafe to the traveling public. Not for lack of effort, not for lack of community support, not for the lack of cooperation from PennDOT. It is simply the lack of funds.

I'd like to close by recognizing the extraordinary work done by PennDOT. We work closely with District 10 Executive Joe Dubovi and his staff, and I can tell you firsthand that they have raised doing more with less to an art form.

And I thank you very much for the opportunity to offer these comments to you today.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you very much.

- - - -

We had Joe Dubovi at our hearing yesterday up in Clarion, and he did a very good job there, too. All the district executives I think have been doing a really wonderful job.

2.0

I'm going to ask you the elected official question that I ask every elected official. Since we're fellow elected officials, we know what the caldron is like out there and we all need the funding, and it's no fun, especially in this economy and this political environment, et cetera. Are you willing, as an elected official and perhaps with your Board of Commissioners, to publicly back your -- you mentioned Representative Pyle and Senator White, et cetera -- if they have to make some of these tough funding votes?

I know and you've testified that we need to think of things other than the gas tax, and we don't disagree with that, but the lift is so heavy that it's probably going to have to include some things that we'd normally not like to include.

So I guess my question to you is, as an elected official, will you support those kinds of fundraisers, if you will, for lack of a better term, and support your elected officials in putting up those votes?

MS. KIRKPATRICK: Representative, we work

- - - -

2.0

Closely with our senators and our representatives in Armstrong County. We have five representatives in Armstrong County that cover the entire county. I cannot speak for my fellow Board of Commissioners. I can speak for myself that, yes, I would stand unified with my senators, with my representatives. Every day, county government must make executive-level decisions on funding all the county operations. The transportation, bridges, roads are one segment of that. County commissioners stand up every day and make funding decisions across our general fund budget. So, yes, we would.

MR. EDWARDS: As a voter in Pennsylvania,
I would support the increase in gas tax.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you. Thank you both.

Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group,
Mr. Chris Sandvig, project manager, and Genevieve
Barbee, community organizer here. I'd also like to
call up Bike Pittsburgh, Mr. Scott Bricker, who is the
executive director, and Mr. Phil Ameris from the
Laborers International Union. Is Phil not here?

Mr. Sandvig and Ms. Barbee.

MR. SANDVIG: Well, Representatives, thank you, first off, for holding these hearings. I

- - - -

can tell we're getting very close to happy hour, because we've lost a few along the way.

2.0

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: We've been here a lot longer. Some of these other ones have gone a lot longer.

MR. SANDVIG: I've been reading the news, which is also very interesting. So, yes, I appreciate that. It's great to see you continuing to deal with this very important issue.

I had submitted some testimony that I'm not going to read to you from. I trust the intelligence of the people who are in this room. They understand that there is an issue here and there is inquiring minds that want to know. I am going to hit some of the high points of this, because I think it's very important that we have that in consideration, and I do have the PowerPoint behind me. Again, we're going to go through things pretty quickly here, because it's important to see some stuff, but at the same time, keep things moving around.

One of the things that you've heard today is that transit affects a lot of people that we don't necessarily think about on a daily basis. We often talk about bridges and roads and public transportation. This is the SPC region of our

- - - -

2.0

metropolitan planning organization. As you can see, there is transit in just about every single county, which our gentlemen from Armstrong and Butler Counties or Armstrong and Indiana are still here to see that. It's not just within Southwestern PA. It's across the state.

The counties in blue have some form of public transportation beyond ACCESS, so, clearly, this is a statewide issue. But it has an economic side, that I don't think people quite realize, that we've been talking about today. First off, let me say that Mr. Zapinski, I echo every single one of his comments with regards to what the Port Authority has done and that needs to be supported, because we've certainly taken a lot of work into account in Allegheny County to make this happen.

In Allegheny County, we spend \$8100 a year more per person to drive somewhere than to take the bus. We have a system that the vast majority of our riders use to get to and from work. Those are taxpayers, those are voters who use the system to get to and from their work, including places like Monroeville, which has a very transit-rich environment.

One of the things that was on the first slide

- - - -

that I had failed to mention, we have a lot higher ridership in this region than regions of the same size. We are 23^{rd} in metro, 17^{th} in ridership. That's very important to keep in mind.

2.0

This \$8100, though, is crucial for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the fact that if you take that and you consider we are going to lose at least 55,000 of our riders through transit cuts, that increases the cost to taxpayers in Allegheny County by \$420 million. Now, the question I have is, how is saving \$50 million in running a system worth costing taxpayers \$420 million over the course of a year?

This is a capacity issue as well, because as you have heard, all of our jobs are in downtown and Oakland. We have 130,000 jobs in those two areas alone. The city alone has 60 percent of the jobs within Allegheny County. Downtown Oakland alone have more jobs than all the suburban centers combined. When you consider that 40,000 of the people who work downtown take the bus or the trolley to get to work, that's huge. That also means that when it comes to getting people to jobs and having jobs remain in the region, the likelihood goes down because we have a hub-and-spoke system. Everything goes in.

What is also important about this, though, is

- - - -

2.0

that additional money we are spending does not stay in Southwestern Pennsylvania. It leaves. It goes to companies like British Petroleum, it goes to places like Saudi Arabia, it goes to automotive companies. It does not stay here. It does not improve jobs.

So while we're talking about 50,000 riders, the thing we should also keep in mind is there is roughly 40,000 jobs that are always at risk because, as a region, we do not traverse the region. We have one of the highest job concentrations in the country.

Seniors are another part of this that we often neglect when we talk about this, but they are highly reliant on transit to continue their lives. Isolation is a huge issue within the senior community. AARP has come out on a number of occasions for a robust transit system to support seniors. When we get into situations of home isolation, we get into problems of dementia, we get into problems of medical problems within the homes that people can't get to. You can't get people who have medical problems to the doctors in a timely manner. It's a cascading effect. As you can see from the yellow here, we have a lot of seniors.

I would just close by saying that it's very important that we look at this from the economic perspective. Is it really worth costing Allegheny

- - - -

So million? Do we really need to add two more lanes to our Parkway so that we don't have traffic from Monroeville taking an hour and a half to get to work? And where is the \$2 billion for that going to come from?

Thank you.

2.0

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: That's why we're here, I guess. It's great testimony. Thank you. Very good. Very well done. We need to get those numbers.

Any questions?

REP. GEIST: Can we revise that in a way that our guys would all understand?

MR. SANDVIG: I'm sorry?

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: The Chairman mentioned that we need to put the numbers in a way that our members can understand. The ones that are here understand.

MR. SANDVIG: Yes, yes. We definitely have the people who get it in the room. I'm happy to work with Representative Geist and Representative Markosek to do that. My contact information is on the presentation.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Very good.

- - - -

2.0

Mr. Bricker. Oh, I'm sorry, ma'am. I thought you two were together.

MS. BARBEE: No. My name is Genevieve Barbee, and I'm from Community Human Services, which is based out of South Oakland in Pittsburgh.

What I think has been interesting today -- and I've submitted my testimony, but I'm just going to briefly speak about it and not from it -- is that getting here, we took a car. Taking a bus is pretty unrealistic, to be completely honest, from where my office is located. Getting around the city is very difficult for me, an able-bodied, 24-year-old woman, so I just need to kind of put that out there.

The system we have in place is a good system.

It's one of the reasons why I stayed here in

Pittsburgh. But the reality it's also broken and

there is a lot of people that are suffering because of

it, so I'm here to represent those people.

In my testimony, I have comments from people in our programs and also people that receive our services. One comment -- the first three comments I have are actually from our homemakers. "The changes in the routes, the times on those routes and the names of the buses themselves changing make it very difficult to get to appointments with my clients on

- - - -

1 | time."

2.0

"Bus changes prevent me from getting to certain clients on time or at all. I don't feel everything was taken into consideration when they made rider changes. This could directly impact my job security as a homemaker if I'm continually late."

"The changes in the buses are crazy. It takes two buses now to get to where I need to go where before there was a direct route. This makes it incredibly difficult to get where I need to go on time. This impacts the amount of time that I spend with each of my clients."

What I've noticed in talking to the people that I work with and the people that I serve is that they aren't aware of meetings like this. They are not aware of the issues. They don't know what Act 44 is. I had to research it before I came. That's a problem. That's why I came. I came because I'm a community organizer and I feel it's my responsibility to talk to you guys and express what's going on where I'm from, but also for you to tell me what I should be telling the people that I work with every day and the people that I serve.

So, really, I guess I'm here to ask you what can I tell them? What can I go back and say as far as

- - - -

how are we going to fix this? What does all of this mean?

2.0

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Well, I think the whole reason we're here is to answer that question, but I can just sum it up real easy for you, if you want a nice sound bite.

I've said many times publicly there is a word in the English language that really shouldn't be there because it has no meaning, and that word is "freeway." Everything has cost to it, particularly in transportation. There is just no simply free way, and that's a nice, simple thing for you. Maybe you can take that.

Obviously, it's more complicated than that, and that's why we're here. And this is our seventh hearing and averaging four to five hours each, so that's the complicated part and that's what the public doesn't see, either, but that's our job. We represent them. It's our job to show up at hearings and get all this information. So I help that helps.

MS. BARBEE: It does, but I think what is also very important is that these funding issues, they are very complicated, right? Again, like the people I work with every day, they don't necessarily understand as far as paying more in some tax. So I guess what

- - - -

2.0

I'm asking is, is there a better way to kind of package that? Is there a better way of explaining to the public as far as if you raise taxes, this is how it will impact that. Because I feel like when you say raise taxes, people do get upset, and that's because they don't understand that it does fund these very important issues. So I guess is there a better way that I can do my job as far as explaining that to people?

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Well, we struggle with that problem all the time, not just for transportation.

MS. BARBEE: I'm aware of that, but I figured I'd just ask.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Right. I think the fact that you're here today helps us, and that's part of why we're here, to hear from you, too, for these kinds of things. We're open to new ideas. Rick and I have got 30 years plus each in legislature, so we're not new to dealing with the public. And you're right, there are often closed ears until they say, oh, my goodness, my taxes are going up and what is that all about. It is a problem and we try to deal with it every day, but you're testimony has helped me, I know.

Are there any questions or anything?

- - - -

(No response.)

2.0

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: It helped, so thank you.

Mr. Bricker.

MR. BRICKER: Sure. Good afternoon. My name is Scott Bricker. I'm the executive director of Bike Pittsburgh, a 1300-member-strong bicycle advocacy organization. I'll also a board member of Pennsylvania Walks and Bikes, a growing statewide bike/ped advocacy organization. I'm also on the board of national organization called The Alliance for Biking and Walking.

I want to thank you for providing me the opportunity to speak today. It's great to see Chairman Geist here, also, who is know is very supportive of bicycling issues and is a member of the PEPC Committee at the state level. So thank you very much. It's great to see you.

Bike Pittsburgh and PA Walks and Bikes both work to develop policies and infrastructure that will make more transportation choices available to our citizens and make our communities more liveable. We aim to create a transportation system that integrates all modes, one which ensures that Pittsburghers and Pennsylvanians alike can safely travel on foot,

- - - -

2.0

bicycle, and by public transit. I'm here today to speak up for these underrepresented modes of transportation and the many Pennsylvania citizens who either currently walk and ride or would like to walk and ride, if only conditions were safer to do so.

As we all know, Pennsylvania is suffering from deteriorating road and bridge infrastructure, but let me add that we are also suffering from poor air quality in our urban areas, obesity, and a down economy. Investment in liveable communities and walking, bicycling, and transit will not only over time save million of dollars on infrastructure wear and tear, but also will get our citizens active and healthy, better our air quality, and help us all save money.

Americans across the board want safer bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Time and time again when polled, people say they would ride a bike to work or walk more often if the conditions were safer and state that they are willing to pay for it. However, in Pennsylvania, these modes are often scaled back, cut, or not even thought of in the first place when it comes to our transportation projects.

Currently, Pennsylvania spends less than 2 percent of its transportation funds on biking and

- - - -

2.0

walking infrastructure, even though biking and walking comprise approximately 12 percent of all trips in the state of Pennsylvania. The time has come to stop treating these modes as afterthoughts and proactively invest in them. Millions of Pennsylvanians from all backgrounds walk or bike as part of their regular transportation and recreation choice, and the walkers and bikers among us are disproportionately the more vulnerable members of our society: Our children, the elderly, and the poor, in short, people who cannot drive or cannot afford to drive but who still need safe, viable transportation choices.

We need to make sure that funding is always available for these integral parts to our transportation system and not treated merely as add-ons. I want to commend PennDOT for mandating the use of its bike/ped checklist and for issuing its Smart Transportation guidelines and one time funding stream. But more needs to be done to ensure that these modes are not only just fit into a transportation project when they can be, but actually planned for and invested in as necessary components of a complete system.

One way to build our bike and pedestrian infrastructure is to spend the funding that is already

- - - -

available for these projects, the recent extension of SAFETEA-LU-ensured funding through December 2010 and restored rescissions enacted in 2009. Funding dedicated to Pennsylvania for Safe Routes to School projects was included in this extension. While many states have moved ahead with a call for applications, PennDOT has indicated that they do not plan to allocate Pennsylvania Safe Routes to School money at this time. Part of the solution to Pennsylvania's transportation problem must start with the funds that are available today.

As you discuss the future of our transportation funding and a vision of what transportation looks like in our state, I strongly urge you to consider bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure as a cost-effective and integral part to a complete transportation system. Bicycling and walking are good for our health, our environment, our economy, and our communities, and bicycling and walking are good for Pennsylvania.

Thank you.

2.0

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you. Thanks. Thanks to all of you. Good luck. Thank you. Very good testimony. Hopefully, we gave you some good information.

- - - -

Bob Cronauer of Westmoreland County

Conservation District. Southwest Pennsylvania

Commission, Commissioner Charlie Camp. I see Jim

Hassinger there, too. Hi, Jim.

2.0

Mr. Court Gould, executive director of
Sustainable Pittsburgh. And Mr. Michael Alexander, is
he here, Council of Representatives of the National
Association of Railroad Passengers.

Mr. Cronauer of the Westmoreland County Conservation District, five minutes, sir.

MR. CRONAUER: Thank you very much for your time here today. I have two talking points and I have submitted written testimony.

The first one is with the state's Dirt and Gravel Road Program. You might not be familiar with it, so I'll talk about a couple of the high points here.

established in 1997, and, basically, it's a little bit of the exact opposite of what PennDOT does. The question was asked earlier what they do with asphalt or concrete roads. Well, we do not deal with either of those. Our roads are all dirt and gravel roads, and we implement environmentally sound maintenance practices on those publicly owned unpaved roads in the

- - - -

state.

2.0

\$5 million in annual non-lapsing allocation, and that is part of the reason why I'm here today is to ask for an increase in that \$5 million, as it's lost its buying power over the past 13 years.

The Dirt and Gravel Road Program is not run by road experts; rather, by erosion experts, which I guess I am one of those. The program is important because it's active in 64 of our 67 Pennsylvania counties. One of the guiding principles of the program is local control. I heard the question asked earlier what is PennDOT doing to work with the local municipalities, and I guess I'm part of that answer, as the Dirt and Gravel Road Program specifically works with rural municipalities to handle the dirt and gravel roads.

I'd like to take a minute to talk about how the program actually works in Westmoreland County. In Westmoreland County, we're allocated \$25,000 annually for construction of the program, and we have 134 miles of dirt and gravel roads in Westmoreland County. As you can imagine, \$25,000 does not stretch very far over 134 miles that we have.

We have completed, although, with that small

- - - -

2.0

allocation in the past 13 years, 12 miles of road stabilized, which includes 27 work sites. These work sites are chosen through a database of 137 sites we have in Westmoreland County. The actual work on the ground is much different than what PennDOT might employ. We employ a drainage disconnection. What I mean by this is that we try to reverse the traditional urban stormwater where PennDOT might handle the water within the road right-of-way. We actually try to get the water off of the road, because the water is erosive on the road surface, which then washes the sediment into our local waterways.

The program is different because it is extremely efficient. I have the pleasure of working with a lot of state and federal grant programs, and by far, this is the one that is most efficient and easy to work with. In Westmoreland County specifically, it is 93 percent efficient. Ninety-three percent of the funds we get go directly on on-the-ground projects in Westmoreland County.

It gets even better than 93 percent when you consider in-kind contributions. In-kind contributions are equipment, materials, and labor that the municipality contributes but receives no reimbursement for. Westmoreland County far outweighs the state

- - - -

2.0

average. We have 117 percent in-kind contributions from municipalities. When you put that together with the \$27,000 we get in Westmoreland County, that's \$54,000 per year on the ground that we get in the form of materials and labor.

So why am I here? I'm here because the Dirt and Gravel Road Program is in danger of being marginalized as the value of its \$5 million allocation continues to erode. The program's annual \$5 million allocation began in 1997 and only today has buying power of 3.7 million. I'm here to ask you to consider additional funding for the program. An increase in the program funding of \$5 million would ensure we could probably get most of our work done by 2036.

The program benefits rural municipalities. In addition to on-the-ground projects, municipal officials gain knowledge of practices that produce environmental concerns and maintenance costs.

I see I'm getting short on time, so I'll jump to my last point. That is the Conservation District's role with transportation as a whole. Working within the private sector, the Conservation District regularly meets with developers and local engineers to discuss topics relating to minimizing roadway impacts to water quality and quantity. Typically, we are able

- - - -

to justify some of our time and recoup some of our costs there through the permitting fees that these agencies typically submit to us. That is not such the case when working with the public sector. Much like in the private sector, we offer a lot of technical assistance. Whereas the District is able to recoup some of those costs with a private sector, when working with PennDOT, they are exempt from some of our state fees with permitting.

It was mentioned earlier about the Route 22 construction projects. Construction projects like that we put a lot of time in but aren't able to recoup our costs with permitting fees.

Thank you.

2.0

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Chairman Geist.

REP. GEIST: Thank you very much for your testimony. We've had a tremendous what we call the Dirt Road Program, and it started with Senator Korman and myself and perhaps you all know Kevin Abbey, who did the evangelistic work for Penn State, along with the designs.

These roads are not what you commonly would envision as dirt roads. These are wonderful pieces of work, and as long as I'm around, and others, we really need to grow that program, especially to educate

- - - -

2.0

township supervisors and others in rural areas to the benefit of the programs. And on roads that are even fairly heavily traveled, you can disperse heavy loads and do it much better than you can with a paved road and break it all up.

I'm a real advocate of what you've been doing. You have other advocates and we'll make sure that we try to keep that program going and growing.

MR. CRONAUER: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: We heard real good testimony on this last night in Clarion as well. Very interesting. Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Camp, welcome.

MR. CAMP: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Good to see you again. Five minutes, please.

MR. CAMP: I also am on the board of directors for the Conservation District of Beaver County. Along with being a commissioner now for 10 years and the SPC chair, I followed Dan Onorato as his chair when he was my chairman. I built 12 bridges with Act 26 money. I want to thank you all for that, and I have four bridges under construction for this year, too. So we've been very active in bridge replacement in Beaver County.

- - - -

2.0

The backlog of deficiencies started in the 1960s and continues to grow. The transportation revenue has been static or declining for many years now and has lost ground to inflation. The consumer bid index increased by 80 percent from 2003 to 2008 and flat revenues eroded by inflation translated to about half the projects or maintenance money that's being provided.

The current funding levels on paper, at least, have the capacity to adequately fund our preservation programs, the work that is needed to keep our roadways and bridges in good condition. However, the next two funding areas are not being met: Replacing roads and bridges when they reach their old age and fixing the accumulated backlog of deficient bridges and facilities.

When the preservation is shortchanged, roads and bridges deteriorate sooner than their design life. Roads and bridges that are patched instead of replaced accumulate a growing backlog of deficient roads and bridges. State estimates for fixing the backlog now take the form of reaching our national average of bad bridges over a period of 20 years with current resources. And I'm a father of three, and if my children told me that by the time they graduate from

- - - -

high school or college they'd hit the average, I'd be a happy father on Sunday for Father's Day.

2.0

The realities of this transportation system draw attention to the needs for construction to address growing congestion, like Freedom Road project, Cranberry, safety improvements like Route 28, local roads and bridges, like the Veterans Bridge in Beaver County, and traffic signal upgrades such that are needed on Ohio River Boulevard.

We need to be mindful to not look to blame the state but that the federal government has not done anything about revenues in 20 years. The burdensome federal regulations cause pointless delays while adding little or no value to many projects and the ecosystem they are trying to protect. I have a small bridge going up now for about a million dollars. To acquire some right-of-way property, the landowner was happy with the appraisal of \$1600. The appraisal system cost almost \$17,000 to buy \$1600 worth of property.

We recognize that hand in hand with raising revenues, there is a need to change the current system to one that uses more common sense and local trust, rather than triple federal review and oversight.

Monitoring and grading systems need to be developed to

- - - -

2.0

demonstrate accountability for the funding being provided. The collection, distribution, and use of this money must be transparent to the taxpayer so they can see what their dollars are buying.

We need to show the public that the projects that are being built are the best projects, that the projects are moving efficiently from planning to construction, and demonstrating on an ongoing basis that maintenance and replacement programs are using best practices and are cost effective. In short, we need to add performance measurements to show that money is being well spent.

The SPC is developing such a TIP monitoring system under my chairmanship. And Representative Geist, I heard your comment earlier about bridges with a span of under 20 feet. Chairman Markosek came to my class -- I'm finishing my graduate program at Pitt right now -- and spoke to us, and for that class I wrote an issue brief on replacing bridges with new, cost-effective methods, specifically on bridges with a span of under 20 feet. And I'll e-mail that issue brief to you.

But I want to thank you all for your time. I know it's a lot of hearing and a lot of testimony.

It's not an easy job that lays in front of you, but

- - - -

I'm sure the state is up for the challenge that has been occurring for quite a long time. Thank you on behalf of SPC and all the Western Pennsylvania counties.

2.0

REP. GEIST: Thank you very much and thanks for supporting what we're doing.

REP. CARROLL: Since the Chairman is back, I'll let him ask his own question. I'll just point out we've heard testimony from others -- and I know it to be true -- that the saving grace from Washington is not likely to be on the horizon this year. From what I understand from others that have testified, the reallocation of the federal transportation bill is unlikely in the near future. We're probably into next session of Congress before there is even a chance we can get some relief, and I think that just heightens the need to address the problems here in Pennsylvania, and I thank you for your partnership in that effort.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you, Mike.

Commissioner, I always ask the elected official question here, if you were here earlier.

MR. CAMP: I remember it.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: So...?

MR. CAMP: I'll support what decisions

- - - -

2.0

you make. The money comes. You guys fill the checkbook up. The MPOs write out the checks to approve the projects. Whatever conclusion you-all come to I will personally support. I think there are opportunities right now, though, to change the current system of how we deliver projects with some more commonsense solutions that will be some low-hanging fruit, some real savings, like the small bridges that Representative Geist and I were talking about, which is using concrete, precast products, and culvert pipes and things like that, packaging them up in a package and sending them out right away.

The federal government, the problem there is the environmental review process. It takes years and years to go through there. And down where I live right beside Beaver Falls, there is bald eagles, there is otters in the river, there is native trout in the river. We don't have a water pollution problem. We have an economic job loss problem and a population loss problem.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CAMP: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Mr. Court Gould,

executive director of Sustainable Pittsburgh.

Mr. Gould, welcome. Five minutes, please.

- - - -

MR. GOULD: Thank you very much. It's a pleasure to be here.

2.0

Sustainable Pittsburgh is a nonprofit organization that works collaboratively to accelerate the policy and practice of sustainable development within the ten-county region of Southwestern

Pennsylvania. I'm pleased to have an opportunity and appreciate your time today, although I'm sure we're all a little sorry that we're back here again so soon after the last time that the transportation funding crisis reared its head as recent as 2005.

We really applaud you and the Governor and the whole legislature for convening a special session to address, again, this planning crisis, and we really agree with the Governor on the need for a comprehensive package to fund transportation for at least the next decade. Our deficient bridges and roadways and our failing and ailing public transportation systems are a statewide economic problem whose time is long overdue for a long-term solution.

A long-term, reliable source of funding surely needs to be in step with current mobility trends. As Pennsylvanians are driving less and demand more fuel-efficient vehicles, it's increasingly important

- - - -

2.0

that the state find a new way other than the gas tax to finance our transportation system. It's time, I think, to start the transition from reliance on per-gallon tax on motor fuels to taxing drivers per miles driven. Traditional revenue tied to gallons at the pump are and will be going down -- happily, I might add -- as people drive less and switch to public transportation, as vehicle fuel efficiency is on the rise, and as greater use of alternative fuel and electric vehicles is sure to rise as well.

Other states and metropolitan regions around the country are further ahead in having already deployed pilot programs for pay-as-you-travel programs. And if not vehicle-miles based, at least I think we should be indexing the motor fuels tax to increasing costs and inflation.

Other innovations to be considered include making public transportation reliable and affordable to those who depend on it every day, as we've heard here today, as well as attracting more and more riders out of their cars to switch to public transportation. Strategies to include increase public transportation ridership and decrease regional vehicle miles traveled necessarily entail hastening the pace of smart growth planning and programming to stem the tide of suburban

- - - -

sprawl and the dual pernicious trend of urban decline.

2.0

This can be done by linking land use with investments in public economic development to focus growth on our existing communities.

and to channel growth and development to appropriate places, contributing to resource efficiency. Thus, as advocated by the 2006 report of the Governor's Transportation Funding and Reform Commission, more incentive-based funding programs are needed to coordinate land use development with the transportation system.

In striving to address this crisis, it's recommended that transportation funding solutions be conditioned upon and leveraged to ensure state and regional commitment to -- and I'll give a list of some candidate principles. One, predictability and reliability, including automatic inflation adjustment of funding for public transportation and all forms of transportation in urban, suburban, and rural areas.

Secondly, equity as a major criteria in identification of transit funding sources, recognizing particularly that transit systems provide a major public service benefit that cannot and should not be supported by user fees.

- - - -

2.0

Increased public transportation system operations and efficiencies, avoiding solutions that would negatively impact systems currently operating efficiently and effectively. And as we heard earlier today, of note we really applaud the transit agencies in our region, and, in particular, the Port Authority of Allegheny County for its remarkable gains in efficiency and cost containment that are measured to the tune of \$52 million annually.

Another criteria would be mitigating congestion through added revenues gained by tolling, other market mechanisms, and investment in smart transportation technologies.

We'd be supportive of applying new resources such as tax credits to stimulate development around transit centers and provide increased latitude to local governments to raise local revenues for public transportation while not displacing their payment of their share of mass dollars for federal and state funds.

So thank you very much for the opportunity.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you. No
questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you.

- - - -

Mr. Michael Alexander, Council of
Representatives of the National Association of
Railroad Passengers. Mr. Alexander, welcome. Thank
you and you may proceed, sir. Five minutes.

2.0

MR. ALEXANDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm testifying today on my own behalf as a citizen in favor of increased funding for public transit in Allegheny County. As you all know, the Port Authority is facing an operating deficit of about \$50 million in the upcoming fiscal year, and if it does not get increased funding, our fares will be raised and our service will be cut again. And this at a time when we should be talking about how best to direct increased investment towards mass transit, not what cuts we can manage to live with. Of course, I recognize that transit is just one of the transportation needs facing the Commonwealth.

I live in PennDOT District 11 in Pittsburgh in the Squirrel Hill neighborhood, an area well served by buses. I'm 63 years old, recently retired, and my wife works at Carnegie Mellon University. We have one car and I have an annual subscription to the Port Authority monthly pass. I use my pass almost every day. If Pittsburgh ceases to have fairly frequent bus service, my ability to get around would be much less,

- - - -

for example, to attend this hearing, to which I've traveled on Port Authority buses.

2.0

Passengers do ride Pittsburgh buses. Port
Authority buses are almost always well patronized,
often overcrowded, in fact. This passenger base is
one of the assets that Pittsburgh, unlike a lot of
other cities of similar size, can be proud of. Here,
all sorts of passengers of all ages and economic
groups choose to take the bus, not just people with no
other option. But if service is cut and potential
passengers find there is no bus to take them to and
from their destination at the right times, they will
lose their transit orientation and it will be very
hard to get them back as riders. And, of course, if
service is cut, there will be people who will simply
not be able to access needed services, and, most
importantly, will not be able to get to work.

I think that Port Authority has been making a solid effort to employ its resources more effectively through reorganization of existing bus routes. A modernized fare collection system with some sort of smart card is being planned and will be a major improvement in terms of faster and more convenient operation that will benefit passengers.

So where can we find the revenue to fill the

- - - -

2.0

\$50 million hole, plus invest in needed capital improvement like an improved fare collection system? Certainly, if any areas of waste can be found, savings should be achieved by attacking that waste, but the Port Authority has already been on a diet for a long time. It is now facing a starvation diet. We need to look at increasing revenue, either by increasing fees, possibly the low \$36 annual auto registration fee, and/or raising taxes.

Yes, raise my taxes. I say this not because I am so flush or so generous. In the long run, paying a little more taxes for public transit makes good economic sense for me, because without good transit, my standard of living and my property value are going to go down, and under certain circumstances, my wife and I might need to think about taking on the added expense of a second car.

If you want me to suggest the way to increase tax revenue, here is one: Collect sales tax on out-of-state internet purchases. I commend committee Chairman Markosek and Republican Chair Geist and the other members of the committee for their bipartisan effort to confront our transportation crisis by holding these hearings throughout the state and giving us voters a chance to have our say. I hope their

- - - -

2.0

colleagues in Harrisburg will resist the temptation to kick the can down the road until after the next election.

I know a minority of citizens will raise a reflexive howl of protest against raising taxes or fees or both, but I really believe that most voters will accept the necessity of increasing revenue, as long as they see that this revenue is actually bringing them safer and more efficient transportation.

In this situation, good government really is good politics. Keep Pennsylvania moving and, in particular, keep the Port Authority going with adequate funds for operations and needed capital investment. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Thank you.

Can't say it much more plain than you've said it, so thank you for that. All of you, really. I don't see any other questions, so you all did a great job.

Thank you very much.

Don Dunlevy. Is Don here? Is there anybody that was on the agenda that got passed over or wasn't here when we called them? Because if not, Don is the last agenda speaker, and after that, we will -- I see the mics in the back. Any other citizen that would like to give us their one or two minutes, we'll allow

- - - -

them to do that.

2.0

But anyway, Don, you are the big-time cleanup hitter.

MR. DUNLEVY: On the tail end again.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you. I comment on your op ed piece today. You put it right on the table. I appreciate that and having the candor to stand up and tell people what our problems are and what they need to do.

Frankly, after talking to our own members, I think the more you do that, the more they understand it, too. They don't need to be called. They just need to be told the truth, and that's the way we lay it to them. So I appreciate what you did. That's evidenced in my printed remarks.

I want to talk about passenger rail service in Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania has two extremes of operation here. The Keystone Corridor on the Keystone service to Harrisburg to Philadelphia line, we are the beneficiary of old infrastructure that was done very well and very expensively years and years ago. It was first electrified in 1910 and completed in 1930. In recent years, we've put 145 million extra dollars to upgrade it. It's now 110-mile an hour service, going to 125. In the last five years, we increased

- - - -

2.0

ridership from 640,000 to 1.2 million a year. SEPTA adds another 6-point-some million between Paoli and Philadelphia. That's over 7 million people that would otherwise be on a highway.

Unless people think that that's a big cesspool or dumping hole for money, I want to point out, too, that the procurements for that piece of right-of-way from Harrisburg to Philadelphia, Amtrak spends over \$110 million a year in Pennsylvania in procurements and employs 2700 people with over \$140 million in wages. There is a great benefit there to the people and to the Commonwealth and our economy, as well as to the lifestyle.

However, on the other side of the state, we go west of Harrisburg. We have one train on each way every day, takes five and half hours from Harrisburg to Pittsburgh. The terrain is difficult. This right-of-way was built 150 years ago when there was no interest in high speed. In fact, five and a half hours was pretty impressive at that time.

So with that, we need the look ahead to the future. And recently the federal government's push towards -- policy towards high-speed rail makes that an opportunity for us. While many of the opportunities and programs around the country are

- - - -

2.0

so-called incremental, where they want to go 79 and 110 miles an hour, I think it's our opportunity to go for true high-speed rail, more than 150, more than 200, 250 or better, and we've been working on a Maglev in Pennsylvania for 20-some years. I can say that in the past week, we received the final environmental impact statement. It's been published in the Federal Register, approved by the FRA. It's out for publication and comment, and our next step is to go for a record and decision.

I'd also point out one of the other problems with the incremental approach. Over the years, the freight railroads got rid of passenger service. They first created Amtrak in the '70s, gave them their equipment to get rid of it. It's an interference to their freight operation. We have the best freight railroad system in the world, but they are not compatible, high-speed rail and heavy freight. It's kind of like taking a Mack truck and Lamborghini. The Mack truck ain't going to go too well on a grand prix course and the Lamborghini ain't going to make it in the tar pit. They are not compatible.

And we need to look to the future. We do this. With the federal government's approach now, they pay 80 percent of the cost. That's an

- - - -

2.0

opportunity for us to create infrastructure, just as the Pennsylvania Railroad did back in 1910. Its life cycle was 80 years. There is no annual maintenance cost for it because there is no moving parts in the construction. I attached to this a short commentary on why that is. There is also a pro forma chart that will show you that there is actually a positive cash flow, that there is a billion dollars in about 25 years that will enable us to add further to the system.

What we need to do in the end, three things:
There is \$28 million of money, federal money, in
Washington for this project that requires a \$7 million
match. It's four to one. That's 3 and a half million
a year for two years to match that 28. That gets us
to a record of decision.

The other thing I think we need to do in Pennsylvania is create a high-speed rail passenger authority to focus on moving the project to completion, seeing the expansion of this service. The three states that garnered all the money, California, Florida, and the midwest central states, all had a commission or authority that worked aggressively to get that money, and they each got in the range of \$2 billion apiece. We are the most advanced project

- - - -

in the United States, and we didn't get zip. That needs to be corrected.

The other thing is we need to do work at all levels of state and local government in concert with our congressional delegation, move this project forward, and put some pressure on the Department of Transportation and the federal government administration.

I'd be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Representative Paul

Costa.

2.0

omizium. imittobett. Koprosonousive ruus

REP. PAUL COSTA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Bob, good seeing you. I've taken that train from Harrisburg to Pittsburgh twice. It's not worth it to drive an extra two hours on a train. We do need some route.

I'm just shocked that after September 11th,

2001, when all of our airplanes were grounded that we didn't come to the realization then that we need another form of rapid transportation to get people and move them from place to place. I thought that that was the defining moment for Maglev. I'm a big supporter. I'm praying that one day I can ride that thing to Harrisburg, so keep on fighting the fight.

1	MR. DUNLEVY: Thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay, thanks. Don,
3	you cleaned it up real great here. I couldn't think
4	of a better guy.
5	MR. DUNLEVY: Can you imagine I stayed
6	within five minutes?
7	CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: It was worth waiting
8	for.
9	MR. DUNLEVY: Thank you.
10	CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you, Don.
11	Okay, anybody from the public now? Timekeeper
12	will do two minutes.
13	Would you identify yourself, sir? Two
14	minutes, please.
15	MR. ENGLISH: Yes, Representative
16	Markosek. I was actually on the agenda before, so I
17	expect some latitude with the time. My name is Gary
18	English from Penn Hills. Representative DeLuca is my
19	state rep.
20	I realize that there are infrastructure needs,
21	but there has been no accountability of past policy.
22	I believe that the legislature has created the
23	transportation mess on five counts.

First, the legislature siphoned off \$718

million in general highway funds in 1992 for the

24

25

- - - -

2.0

Mon-Fayette Expressway. Those monies should have gone for the repairing of our roads and bridges and not for the funding and construction of a toll road.

Second, the legislature thwarted the will of the voters on stadiums in 1997 and spent over \$1 million on unwanted, unneeded stadiums, two in Pittsburgh, two in Philadelphia, one in Altoona, and upgrades to the Harrisburg Senators stadium, raising the state's debt ceiling. That money should have gone for needed public infrastructure improvements, and now we have the Consol Energy Center. Bread and circuses, gentlemen.

Third, the legislature uses highway funds for the State Police salaries. This state agency should have been paid out of the state's general fund, not the highway funds.

Fourth was the passage of Act 44 to toll
Interstate 80 with the hope of making it a cash cow
for road and bridge repairs, as well as mass transit
funding. This was the second illegal attempt, as the
Federal Highway Administration guidelines mandate that
tolls must be dedicated for the repair or maintenance
of highways being tolled.

Fifth, \$74 million in matching state funds went to the Port Authority of Allegheny County to

- - - -

2.0

construct the boondoggle known as the North Shore
Connector. Original estimates started out costing
393 million, and it now stands at 528.8 million. The
project will primarily serve sports spectators for the
two stadiums. This will keep fans from walking the
1.2 mile trek while they sit for three hours watching
sporting events and stuffing themselves with nachos
and beers. That certainly does not speak highly on
the President's Council on Physical Fitness.

The Port Authority has the highest paid transit drivers in the nation, along with generous pension packages that combine 44 percent of their budget. So now the citizens are burdened with the Allegheny County drink tax and increased car rental taxes that help the Port Authority.

The Port Authority is set in not raising the basic fare of \$2 and has used scare tactics by mentioning a \$7 fare. Yesterday's Post-Gazette editorial mentions the \$50 million budget deficit and their daily ridership of 220,000 people. So let's crunch some numbers. 220,000 daily transit riders with 52 weeks, five days a week. That's 266 business days. Take 260 times the 220,000 transit riders. That's 57,200,000 annual riders. Increased fares by just \$1 would generate \$57.2 million, in excess of

- - - -

their budget deficit. Any ridership on Saturday and Sunday would generate extra revenue. The Enterprise testimony today talks about \$17 million of the drink tax that's not being used for mass transportation.

2.0

As for the bridge and highway funding, do it without tax increases. It's time to cut the cost of government. Representative Markosek and Representative Geist, your editorial in today's Harrisburg Patriot News advocates five tax increases and offered no cutting, no cost-cutting measures.

We need to reduce the bloated legislature and staffing. Go back to a part-time lawmaking and part-time pay, eliminating walking-around money known as RAMS in the state funding in the DCED. One DCED grant alone this year was for \$59.7 million.

Consolidate PennDOT and the Pennsylvania

Turnpike Commission. Return the \$718 million from the

Mon-Fayette Expressway project and issue government

bonds for this project. The generation of new tolls

will go to pay back the bonds.

And in closing, I believe that Act 44 was lousy legislation, but so were the illegal pay raises of 1995 and 2005. It's time to cut government waste and bloat.

Thank you very much for your time and your

- - - -

consideration.

2.0

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you. Next?

MR. SMITH: I am John Smith from the

Banksville section, 20th Ward of Pittsburgh. Thank

you, Mr. Markosek, Mr. Geist, and people I can almost

see down there, but I think you're there. I'll try to

be brief because I know you're eager to go.

I think you ought to raise gas tax tomorrow by a quarter. I think you ought perhaps to consider raising the vehicle registration -- that is, for the number plate -- on a sliding scale perhaps to the value of the vehicle, the weight, or the newness of the vehicle. They did it years ago in New Mexico and I was there. It seemed to work pretty well.

My main interest is transit. My first job, I walked a mile to Homewood from Point Breeze and picked up 110 newspapers and hopped in the shuttle bus and took them to the top of the route and started downhill. I've been a rider of transit for 60 years since. For the last 15 years since I've been retired on disability, I've been a constant attender, perhaps an annoyer or harasser of the Port Authority and the SPC, particularly on matters pertaining to transit.

And I've come to be very fond of especially the Port Authority, and I think of them essentially as

- - - -

a very well-run agency. Nobody is perfect, but compared to the other parts of the government agencies that I've seen and worked with, I am very favorably impressed by them, both Paul Skatellas and his operations man and Henry Nutbrown, the builder, who got a bad rap for policy decisions that were not really theirs. And I think the current man, Steve Bland, is an excellent man, as is his operations man, Bill Miller. It's easy to put one bus on one street corner in the morning, but to put 800 buses on 8,000 street corners and keep them running and running properly is a tough job.

The answer to funding is more local funding, which is not popular with the current county officials, but early on in the Port Authority's operation, it was thought that the fare box would pick up a third, the state would pick up a third, and the county would pick up a third, and the agencies across the country that seem to be successful have more local funding than we have here in Pennsylvania.

Since you're still as eager to go home as I am, I'll leave it at that, but I certainly hope you'll consider the transit funding and the extension of it.

CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you, Mr. Smith.

25 Very good.

2.0

- - - -

Okay. Wow. I think that's it, not only for today, seven hearings that are ending today. I don't know how many hours. About a hundred hours, it seems. And I know my colleagues up here have done their duty and hopefully now we can take this information and do something with it that's positive.

So I want to thank, first of all, the Gateway School folks here. Thanks, guys. Great, beautiful facility here and you did a good job today. Thank you.

I'd like to thank all the staff, certainly the members, the folks who testified, the folks that sat through it. And, you know, I traditionally ended these by saying when the next hearing is, and I don't have to say that now. So I guess the last thing I should say is meeting adjourned.

Thank you.

(Hearing adjourned at 3:24 o'clock p.m.)

- - -

_ _ _ _

I hereby certify pursuant that the foregoing transcript is a true record of the House Transportation Committee Public Hearing on Friday, June 18, 2010.

The foregoing certification does not apply to any reproduction of this transcript in any respect unless under the direct control and/or direction of the certifying reporter.

Lisa Ann Bauer Certified Realtime Reporter