1	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA		
2	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES		
3	HOUSE URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE		
4			
5	POINT PARK UNIVERSITY		
6	LAWRENCE HALL, 3rd FLOOR BALLROOM		
7	PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA		
8			
9	WEDNESDAY, MAY 28, 2008		
L 0			
L 1	PUBLIC HEARING - CITY OF PITTSBURGH-ALLEGHENY COUNTY		
L 2	CONSOLIDATION		
L 3			
L 4			
L 5	BEFORE:		
L 6	Representative Thomas C. Petrone, Majority Chair		
L 7	Representative John Taylor, Minority Chair		
L 8	Representative Paul Costa, Subcommittee Chairman on Cities, Counties - Second Class		
L 9	Representative Karen D. Beyer, Subcommittee Chairman on		
20	Cities, Counties - Second Class		
21	Representative Jim Cox		
22	Representative John Maher		
23	Representative Michael H. O'Brien		
2 4	Representative Thomas W. Blackwell		
25			

- - - -

1	ALSO PRESENT:			
2	Representative Dan Frankel			
3	Representative William Kortz			
4	Representative Mark Mustio			
5	Representative Randy Vulakovich			
6	Representative Nick Kotik			
7	Jon Castelli, Democratic Executive Director			
8	Christine Goldbeck, Republican Executive Director			
9	Heather Saxelby, Research Analyst			
10	Mary Gingrich, Legislative Assistant			
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25	Reported by: Lisa Ann Bauer, RPR, CRR, CMRS			

\underline{I} \underline{N} \underline{D} \underline{E} \underline{X}

3	NAME_	PAGE
4	Dan Onorato	12
5	Luke Ravenstahl	19
6	Thomas VanKirk	56
7	Audrey Russo	63
8	Helen Hanna Casey	67
9	John E. Murray, Jr.	90
10	Edward K. Muller	97
11	Enzo Santilli	103
12	Brian K. Jensen	107
13	M. Richard Dunlap	123
14	Robert Powers	128
15	Herbert J. Hartle	128
16	Suzanne Broughton	130
17	Erin Molchany	135
18	Court Gould	139
19	Nancy Washington	141
20		

- - - -

2.3

(10:14 o'clock a.m.)

REPRESENTATIVE PETRONE: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to today's public hearing of the House of Representatives Urban Affairs Committee's Subcommittee on Cities and Counties of the Second Class. I am Thomas Petrone from the 27th Legislative District, Allegheny County, and I am chairman of the Urban Affairs Committee.

I would like to introduce my co-chair,

Representative John Taylor from Philadelphia, who is
the Republican chairman.

And, next, would all the members of the Urban Affairs Committee introduce themselves and identify the district they are from, from my left to my right, please.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACKWELL: Good morning.

I am Thomas Blackwell, representative of the 190th

District in Philadelphia County.

REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Good morning. Mike O'Brien, $175^{\mbox{th}}$ Legislative District, Philadelphia.

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Good morning. I'm Paul Costa, 34th Legislative District, City of Pittsburgh and eastern suburbs.

- - - -

2.3

REPRESENTATIVE BEYER: Good morning. I'm Representative Karen Beyer. I am from Lehigh and Northampton County, 131st.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Good morning.

I'm Representative John Taylor from Philadelphia. For all the Pittsburgh folks here, you can thank us Philadelphians on the way out for allowing our Flyers to warm up the Penguins for the Stanley Cup finals.

REPRESENTATIVE MAHER: I'm Representative John Maher in the 40th District right here in Allegheny County and Washington County.

REPRESENTATIVE COX: I am Representative Jim Cox from western Berks County, and that's the $129^{\mbox{th}}$ District.

REPRESENTATIVE FRANKEL: I am

Representative Dan Frankel from Allegheny County, City
of Pittsburgh. I'm not a member of the committee, but
based on the good graces of Chairman Petrone and
Chairman Taylor, members from the Allegheny County
delegation were invited here to participate. We're
very grateful for that.

REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Good morning,
everyone. My name is Bill Kortz, state
representative, 38th District. Likewise, I am not a
member of the committee, but I am obviously interested

- - - -

in the outcome of the consolidation.

2.3

REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: Good morning,
Representative Mark Mustio, Allegheny County, and not
a member of this committee.

REPRESENTATIVE VULAKOVICH: State
Representative Randy Vulakovich from the 30th
District of Allegheny County. I am not a member of
this committee, but all of us have an extreme
interest, all the Allegheny delegation, because of the
importance of looking for the best interests of our
region, and we have a great place to live.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRONE: Next, I'd like to introduce a very talented staff. On my left, Mr. Jon Castelli, who is the executive director of the committee. Over here we have Heather Saxelby, our research analyst, and Mary Gingrich, who is committee secretary, and they do all the work for the research that we get, all the good information. Ryan Douglas, my assistant, to their left. And to my right, Christine Goldbeck, the Republican executive director of the committee.

Today's hearing is to consider the option of the City of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County consolidating governments. This hearing is an initial step in considering the possibility of a merger of

- - - -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

these two entities. Further hearings will be held regarding the issue and enabling legislation will need to be passed in order to make a city-county consolidation a reality.

I've been a long-time supporter of efficiency in government and efforts to make the Pittsburgh region a better place to live. During my 28 years as a legislator, I have been personally involved in many different projects that have benefited the City of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County. From 1980 to the present, I have supported, first as a member of the Appropriations Committee, things such as the Carnegie Science Center, the first project I worked on, Strategy 21 programs, including the beautiful new stadiums, our world class airport, Soldiers and Sailors Hall, the convention center, and things that we felt would be extremely beneficial to the city and the county and the region. And, also, I was a strong supporter, I should point out, of the county executive and the county council, which established that position with a government change not too many years ago.

With this year being the 250th anniversary year of the City of Pittsburgh, this is an opportune time to make Allegheny County and Pittsburgh

- - - -

2.3

governments more streamlined. That being said, the idea of merging the City of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County is not a new one. The concept is in consideration due to the many changes that have occurred throughout Western Pennsylvania over the past three decades. The biggest change for the City of Pittsburgh has been the decline in population, sadly, which has resulted in a loss of considerable tax revenue, and, of course, a large portion of properties are tax exempt.

Although the number of residents has decreased, the price of services has increased, particularly for the health insurance of city employees and the pension obligations of the city. The goal of the merger would be to help reduce the duplication of services between Allegheny County and the City of Pittsburgh, which would help reduce costs for the residents of both the city and the county. Today's hearing is a result of the establishment of the Citizens Advisory Committee on the Efficiency and Effectiveness of City-County Government. This committee was commissioned by Allegheny County Executive Dan Onorato and City of Pittsburgh Mayor Luke Ravenstahl, who will be here to testify shortly. In fact, I think they are here presently.

- - - -

2.3

The committee commissioned a report by the RAND Corporation focusing on the economic impact of the city-county merger. The study reviewed the merger done by Jefferson County, Kentucky, and the City of Louisville. The type of merger done by Jefferson County-Louisville is most likely the model for Allegheny County and Pittsburgh. The merger did not affect outlying municipalities in the county.

Instead, an urban services district was established and the county subsequently took over the city government's responsibilities. We will be hearing more about the RAND study today.

We have many knowledgeable testifiers here to further explore the concept of a city-county merger. For the benefit of the court reporter, would all the testifiers please identify themselves before speaking.

At this time, I would like to turn the meeting over to Representative Costa, who is the chair of the Subcommittee on Cities and Counties of the Second Class.

Representative Costa?

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Before I begin, I would like to thank Chairman
Petrone and Chairman Taylor for allowing us to have

- - - -

2.3

this meeting. When the report came out about a month or so ago, my co-chair Karen Beyer and I approached the two chairmen and asked them if we could get this meeting under way to get as much information out there as possible. We know if anything is going to happen, we in the legislature have to act on it, and we want to be as much educated on the issue as possible, and this is just a first step of hopefully many along this process, so I want to thank all of you for being here.

I want to thank Point Park for letting us use their ballroom. I think Point Park is one of the most exciting jewels in our city. It's growing all the time. I may be biased. I am a graduate of Point Park and also a board member, so anything that Point Park does I can't be more proud of, especially allowing us to be here today. I also would like to thank all the testifiers who have come here today to educate us on this.

And with that, I'd like to ask Karen if she has anything.

REPRESENTATIVE BEYER: Good morning, everyone. I may represent the City of Allentown, but I was born and raised here in the Pittsburgh area, so I'm awfully proud to be home again.

So, Paul, I'm really looking forward to

- - - -

2.3

hearing all the testimony we're about to hear. I don't know if the County Executive and the Mayor know that when they're late for an Urban Affairs Committee meeting, we make them stand in the corner for five minutes.

But anyway, I look forward to the testimony.

I don't think this will be the first and only hearing on this proposal, but I look forward to hearing anything. Chairman Taylor, would you like to say a few words?

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: (Shaking head negatively.)

REPRESENTATIVE BEYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: I also forgot to thank the members of the Allegheny County delegation. As they all said, even though they are not part of this committee, they do want to be educated like the members of our committee, so I thank all of you for being here today.

Karen reminded me to say, "Go Pens!"

Our first two testifiers are Dan Onorato, the

County Executive of Allegheny County, and Luke

Ravenstahl, the Mayor of the City of Pittsburgh.

As they are approaching the table, I read the

- - - -

2.3

report, scanned over it, but I thought there was one pretty interesting statement that was made by Chancellor Nordenberg, and I think that's why we're here today. "It was prepared to stimulate constructive consideration of the most efficient and effective structures for City and County government as we move to meet the challenges and seize the opportunities of the 21st century," and I think that's what this hearing is about. Let's get some constructive consideration.

And with that, I don't know if you guys tossed a coin on who is going first.

MR. ONORATO: Good morning,
Representatives. I appreciate you bringing the
committee to the City of Pittsburgh/Allegheny County.
It's good to see all the local reps here today. And
the out of town reps, we welcome you to an issue that
I'm sure is going to require a lot of debate,
discussion, not just here, but in Harrisburg, since
it's a two-step process and Harrisburg is the first
step and the local legislation would be the second
step.

I do not have a typed prepared speech today, but I want to talk about this process because I've been dealing with it for a long time on the

- - - -

2.3

consolidation issue, and you should know that the Mayor and I, along with the committee that we established -- and that's the report you have here, and the members are listed here in the back. I'm not going to list all the names, but it was chaired by Chancellor Nordenberg.

The Mayor and I put together a committee to look at this issue of city-county consolidation and to look at what other cities and counties have done, what methodology existed that worked, and what we discovered and what they discovered is there is no one right way to do it. If you look at places like Indianapolis, Charlotte, Louisville, Jacksonville, areas that have done consolidations, they have all done it a different way. And the reason is that they all had different local governments, they had different setups when they went for the consolidation, and we're no different.

Allegheny County and Pittsburgh is a unique situation. We have 130 municipalities. We have a city in the middle. For the people from the eastern part of the state, the county is a little under 1.3 million. Philadelphia has one mayor for all of the 1.5 they represent. We have 130 municipalities and the County Executive and the Mayor of the City of

- - - -

Pittsburgh all within the 1.3 million in our county.

2.3

But I keep referring to the Louisville model, only because it's the closest example we can see that's similar to what we had, because Louisville had 80 municipalities. And they did merge the city and the county and they left the municipalities alone, and I believe that's the way we're going to go if we're going to get this done, because the city and the county could actually merge and have one elected mayor of the new Pittsburgh and one legislative body for the new Pittsburgh and leave the municipalities and school districts alone and achieve all the efficiencies by doing that merger.

As you know -- if you don't know, the city and the county both have a public works department, parks and recreation department, IT department. We both have our own housing authorities, and I can go on and on with the departments that we duplicate. There is no reason to have two of those departments. There is no reason to have the Mayor's office or the County Executive's office the way it is right now.

In talking with Mayor Abramson, who is the former Mayor of old Louisville and is currently the mayor of new Louisville, he was telling us -- and in talking with county executives, too -- that when they

- - - -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

were both in existence, they got along very well. That wasn't the problem. The issue was that you spent half your time making sure that the Mayor's office in the city and the County Executive's office are all on the same page on everything that we do, and we spend a lot of time and energy doing that. It's the efficiency of putting that all under one roof, having a political leader for the area of 1.3 million people, having a legislative body that will deal with the issues in the core of the old city, the urban service district, and deal with the county issues that I deal with and having it all under one political structure. There is efficiency there; there is political clout there. It just makes good sense and good governance to step back a second.

If you look at Allegheny County, it's easy to forget our history. Forty years ago, 75 percent of Allegheny County lived in the City of Pittsburgh.

Today, it's just the opposite. Seventy-five percent of Allegheny County lives outside the City of Pittsburgh scattered around those 129 municipalities outside the City of Pittsburgh, yet our government forms haven't adjusted for the population swings that have taken place over the last 40 or 50 years. We want to catch up. We want to get this done. We want

- - - -

to fix it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Mayor Ravenstahl and I work closely together. We've got a great relationship, but we've both come to the same conclusion. After this report, the two of us stood up and embraced it and said we'd like to get this question to the voters as soon as possible. believe the earliest this could possibly happen would be the fall of '09, because the two-step process is having the state legislature pass a bill that gives us the authority to do this and also just the parameters of what the question could be or how we arrive at a question, establishing a committee that could be formed that would craft a question, do the public hearings, and once you pass a bill to allow us to do that, we'll do what we have to do and then the Mayor will have to get it through the city and I'll have to get it through the county.

But, ultimately, the voters will make this decision. This is a referendum question we're looking for, and it will be up to all of us, at least the people in this room and outside of this room that think this is a good idea, to put on a campaign and to take it to the voters and to educate the voters of why we believe this is the right thing to do. Because if we can't get the votes, it's not going to pass. It's

- - - -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

going to fail and go down in flames. The Mayor and I feel very strongly about this. For this region to survive, for this region to move forward, for this region to be competitive, this is very important to us.

You should also know that we've been slowly consolidating over the years. The functions have already been consolidated. In Philadelphia and the big cities across this country, it's not unusual to see the mayor in charge of the airport, the mayor in charge of transit, the mayor in charge of the human services department, the mayor in charge of the health department. They have all been shifted to the county already in this area. It's happened over the last 40 or 50 years. The County Executive runs the Airport Authority, the Port Authority, Community College, the Health Department, Department of Human Services. Those functions have already been consolidated for 130 municipalities under the county government already. The Mayor's office isn't part of it and neither are the 129 municipalities.

The city and the county and the Mayor and I have been working closely to consolidate functions as we work closely together now on our terms. We're looking at joint bulk purchasing. We have a

- - - -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

telecommunication agreement we work together. In my short tenure of four years and six months as County Executive, we've consolidated row offices from ten elected offices down to four. We had five 911 centers for a county of 1.3. We now have one. We saved three and a half million dollars a year. There were five separate political public safety fiefdoms that were nice, but we didn't have the luxury of the money to pay for five of them. We have a state of the art 911 center now that provides that service to all 1.3 million. We saved three and a half million dollars a year by doing that, and our taxpayers are getting top of the line service.

I was also in a position where, when the city was in bankruptcy four or five years ago, the Supreme Court abolished the city court system. They didn't abolish it. They shifted it to the county and put it in the county's unified court system. It was a hard thing for us to accept. We struggled with it a little bit. The state helped us with funding, but it was the right thing to do. There was no reason to have a separate court in the City of Pittsburgh. It should be under a unified court system in the county. made sense that we continue to do that. The county provides specialty policing for all 130

- - - -

municipalities. These are homicide, special investigations units, because we can provide quality services over a broader base.

So I just share those examples with you to say that we've been making these moves over the last 20 to 30 years. We now have a different government structure up to speed of where it should be to reflect what exactly this region is doing. And I want to make it very clear -- we also have made it clear in this report and the Mayor's and my statements -- that this does not include the school districts. This does not include the 129 municipalities. We are talking about the City of Pittsburgh, we're talking about the County of Allegheny, the two largest governments that duplicate many of the departments in getting efficiencies in creating a political structure that will allow us to be competitive for the 21st century.

I'll end there and turn it over to Mayor
Ravenstahl, and I look forward to if you have any
questions for us. And I assume you want to hear from
both of us first before you have questions, so at this
point, I'll turn it over to Mayor Ravenstahl.

Mayor?

2.3

MR. RAVENSTAHL: Thank you, County

- - - -

2.3

Executive Onorato, and thank you, Chairman Petrone and Subcommittee Chair Costa and all the representatives for being here today. I do have prepared remarks that I will share with you, many of which will be similar to the County Executive, and I've joked now on probably a half a dozen different occasions that the main reason I want consolidation is so that I don't have to say the same thing Dan does every time I speak.

Let me begin by extending my thanks to you for the opportunity to come before you today to discuss this most important issue. I also wish to express my sincere appreciation for your continued interest in matters that impact cities and counties of the second class, namely, of course, Pittsburgh and Allegheny County.

For years, we have heard that the meaningful reform that Pittsburgh needs in a county fragmented by 130 separate governments is the merger of the City of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County into one government. Since the early 1900s, the debate on merger has consumed this region. From the 1923 Commission to study municipal consolidation to the 1996 ComPAC 21 report to the report recently issued by the Nordenberg Commission at the request of the County Executive and

- - - -

2.3

myself, the region has seen study after study over the course of decades.

In the meantime, despite desirable incremental improvements, many of which the County Executive has already mentioned, we've continued to lose population and face areas of decline. Potentially meaningful solutions to the problems that haunt our city and our region have been held hostage to decades of vigorous debate over how to foster higher levels of regional growth and how to restore Pittsburgh to the prominence of our past. No matter what policy or idea we discuss, the last question asked is whether or not the city and county should merge. That debate and that unanswered question has further stymied our ability to bring about meaningful change and reinvestment in Pittsburgh.

Merger has been and remains the overwhelming issue on the mind of community leaders, Harrisburg, and the media. We must answer this question to move forward. It is clear -- and it's become abundantly clear to me -- that something must be done and it must be significant enough to fundamentally alter the future of Pittsburgh and our region. We must embrace change in an historic way, a way that serves the best interests of the city and our people, creates a more

- - - -

2.3

efficient and effective government, and delivers a higher quality of service to our residents. That is why I recently, along with County Executive Onorato, announced my support for that whole change to merge the governments of the City of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County into one.

I must admit that at the beginning of this process, I wasn't necessarily a supporter of structural consolidation. In fact, it was my original inclination to oppose it, but my actions and my positions have been governed by one overwhelming responsibility. That responsibility to the residents of this great city demanded that I remain open to whatever reform made the most rewards for our people.

All that being said, it was not easy for me to come to the conclusion that merger is needed for bold reform. I debated in my own mind, as I'm sure you are today, the same discussion that's been held in this community for so many years. What has been weighing on me heavily and what ultimately convinced me that merger is the right thing to do is the knowledge that we must do something to transform Pittsburgh and to chart a new course. What we have been doing for decades has not been working.

My decision is a result of a realization that

- - - -

2.3

we need drastic change to keep future generations of Pittsburghers here. My position is built on a belief that we cannot simply work through today. We must build a better tomorrow through real, fundamental restructuring.

I believe that the residents of both the city and the county deserve the opportunity to decide their future. Whether you are a proponent or opponent to city-county merger, I believe it's in everybody's best interests that the issue come before the voters for them to decide in the form of a ballot referendum. I also acknowledge, as the County Executive did, that there is still much work to be done and plenty that is unknown. I anticipate a great deal of public discussion to take place around this subject.

The concerns raised and the questions posed can't be answered unless we bring them to the taxpayers and hear the voices of the people.

Specifically, we must ensure that any merger plan adequately protects the needs of the residents of the City of Pittsburgh. We must make sure that the end result leaves our city residents at least as well off as they are today, with better and more efficient services. We must make sure that we have equity in our new government and ensure that minority groups are

- - - -

2.3

not unfairly disadvantaged by change. We must take care of our existing employees and ensure that they are treated fairly, with respect, as the hard working public servants that they are.

While there is much work to be done, one inevitable conclusion that we must reach together as a community is that we can no longer afford the status quo. We must change if we are to grow again. These questions and others cannot, nor will they, be answered prior to the issue coming before the voters. History has taught us that much. The role of the legislature in this process will be to decide whether or not residents deserve the opportunity to vote on their own future. I respectfully submit that the taxpayers have every right to make that decision.

As I previously stated, the legislature must decide whether or not the voices of the people should be heard. You all must decide. I know that some of you may have concerns about the true impact that could be made through this consolidation, but as quality public servants, you must also realize that until the issue comes before the voters, before all questions, whether debt, representation, or equity are resolved, you must resolve to bring this issue before the voters.

- - - -

2.3

I don't ask you to take this step in a cavalier fashion. Steps must be taken, but the first is authorization. Steps moving forward from there will include the formation of a charter drafting committee. That committee must hold multiple rounds of public involvement. It must tackle head-on some of those touchstone issues that concern us all. There must be and will be ample opportunities to discuss, debate, and resolve the critical public policy issues that concern residents, be they debt, representation, or other issues.

One thing is for sure, however. Until
Harrisburg recognizes that it must provide the voters
an opportunity to decide, little will change. We will
be relegated to making incremental improvements,
improvements that the County Executive and I are
already making daily. That's why I respectfully urge
you to grant the city and the county an opportunity to
pass judgment, to vote on our own future. That's all
I ask for you today. I thank you for your attention
to this matter and look forward to working with you in
the future.

Thank you very much.

much, Mayor. Executive, thank you very much.

- - - -

2.3

I guess one of the privileges of being the chairman of the committee is we can ask the questions first. First of all, I want to thank both of you guys for at least putting the idea out there and to get people talking about it and try and move the region forward. I commend both of you for that. But I have two quick questions. They may not be quick answers.

What happens to the city debt? When I read the report -- the pension debt, particularly. When I read the report, it kind of looks like they expect the state to pick up that. Is that what the expectation is, or is there another way? Are the savings from the city and county together going to take care of the pension debt?

And then the second question, if you can answer them together, what happens to the other municipalities? I know they are not part of this compact, but what happens to them?

MR. ONORATO: I'll go first on the broader question of the debt and the unfunded pension. The Mayor, I know, is having some subcommittees statewide and meetings statewide with other mayors.

When I testified that the municipalities and the school districts are not part of this, we made it very clear, too, that the suburban voters in no way

- - - -

2.3

will pick up the debt of the city for the unfunded pension of the city. That's why you have the urban service district. Again, that came out of terms from the Louisville model which was the boundary of the old city, because there will be certain services and certain functions of the old city that will still be in place. For example, the police, the fire, liabilities like debt, an unfunded pension, so they will not be part of the merger. They will not be spread over the larger base. They will have to be dealt with in the urban services district.

I think the issue over it looks like the state is going to pick it up from what you've been reading, Representative, is coming from what the Mayor has been working on, and that is what we're both discovering is this unfunded pension problem, for example, and some of the debt is not unique to Pittsburgh. You can be in Erie, Wilkes-Barre, Allentown, Bethlehem, Tarentum. It's a common issue around the state that the state might have to deal with, just in general, how to deal with these old urban areas that are struggling.

So that's sort of an issue we sort of pushed off the table as it relates to the merger of the city and county and it's not part of the merger.

MR. RAVENSTAHL: Let me just add, it's

- - - -

2.3

not part of the merger, but the discussion -- and I know at least those of you from Allegheny County that I've had the opportunity to meet with since becoming the Mayor have heard me, and I know Representative Frankel, for example, is involved in the Institute of Politics Committee that is looking at the pension issue.

We have been looking at that issue, and as the County Executive mentioned, it's not singular to Pittsburgh. It's not singular to Allegheny County.

Many municipalities throughout the Commonwealth are in significantly unfunded positions. Act 205, I will argue, needs some changes to help cities like Pittsburgh and urban areas throughout the Commonwealth, and so that has been something I've advocated for in many forums before I even announced my support for city-county consolidation.

I've met with mayors from throughout the state twice already to discuss our positions on this issue. We will meet, in fact, again next month at the Pennsylvania League of Cities and Municipalities conference in Gettysburg to further our discussion on the issue, and we believe that at some point, you all will be faced with dealing with Act 205 and the pension crisis throughout the state, and we want to

- - - -

2.3

make sure, as mayors of urban areas, that we are prepared, if and when that discussion takes place, to state our position, and so we are attempting to do so and craft that position as we speak, not necessarily in conjunction with this issue, but it will be something that I continue to raise as I look at the future of the City of Pittsburgh.

MR. ONORATO: And, Representative, one part of your question was what happens to the other municipalities. We should point out this to the committee, we did ask Dick Dunlap to sit on the committee, who is the executive director of the Allegheny League of Municipalities.

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: He is one of the testifiers here today.

MR. ONORATO: The reason we wanted him on here is because we know this is a very sensitive issue as relates to the independent municipalities and a lot of them don't want to be part of this merger, and that's fine and we're not asking them to do it. We're looking at the two big governments, the city and the county.

However, I think in this debate, if there are municipalities -- and I would argue that there is a handful of municipalities in Allegheny County that

- - - -

are, in theory, financially bankrupt, if not legally financially bankrupt. They are lucky if they have one dump truck for public works or one police officer, that if they voluntarily would want to be part of it, maybe there is a mechanism. But in no way are the municipalities part of this discussion, but if there is one or several that would like to be, that's something we can look at, but right now, this is just city and county, our proposal.

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Thank you.

Representative Beyer?

2.3

REPRESENTATIVE BEYER: Thank you, Paul.

I guess I am wondering why the school district wouldn't be a part of this. You mentioned that in your opening remarks that the school district wouldn't be, but if we're using any of the models that you suggest, I can't imagine the school districts aren't involved in the Louisville model or any of the others. If you look at Philadelphia, certainly the city structure has everything to do with the financing of the school district. So can you comment on that at all, why the school district wouldn't be?

MR. ONORATO: The school districts are not included for several reasons, Representative. First, let me talk about the political reason why they

- - - -

2.3

are not included. To achieve the efficiencies of the city and the county consolidation, which are the two largest governments where we duplicate the departments, it would be very difficult to flow the school district into that mix, to even think about getting a positive vote from the voters is number one.

From a practical point of view, I'm not so sure it's the right thing to do, either. You're right. There are models like Philadelphia and other cities that have one big urban school district. I personally don't believe that's the right answer, either. We have 43. The issue is what's going to make sense, and we can probably argue and have 20 different answers on what makes sense, but I don't think one urban district is the right answer.

We have a lot of good, competing school districts and choices within our county that I think is healthy. The question for us is what about the two or three that are financially struggling right now, what do you do with them? And that's sort of a big question mark out there right now, but it's not part of this discussion.

So to start with, we don't start with the premise that one school district is the right answer. I don't believe it is. And from a political point of

- - - -

2.3

view, why throw that on here that it could actually stop the efficiencies of the two largest governments coming together and we can achieve that and let's do that now while it makes sense to do it and run the region better and still have competitions with school districts within that framework. So they are the reasons why I don't think they are proper.

REPRESENTATIVE BEYER: So you told me -you said in your earlier testimony that you have
consolidated a number of row offices already. Can you
give to the committee how much money you have saved
the taxpayers of Allegheny County? Do you have any
idea? Paul whispered that it's only been four months.
Can you talk to me about the level of projections that
you're expecting?

MR. ONORATO: Let's start with the 911 centers. For example, Philadelphia and other counties that are over a million, almost all of them have a 911 center, one center. We had over 20 at one time. They consolidated them eventually to five, and when I took office, we had five regional centers, plus the county's. And my first couple months in office, I had a lot of these centers come and lobby me for more money to help subsidize and keep open these regional centers from the one dollar fee we get on the land

- - - -

2.3

lines. That's how we fund the 911. I told them, we're out of money. I can't subsidize two systems; however, why don't you come into the county's 911 system, which is state of the art, and you won't have to pay twice.

Let me even narrow this down to a specific municipality, Wilkinsburg. Wilkinsburg is struggling financially right now. Wilkinsburg was paying \$150,000 to be in the Monroeville/eastern regional 911 center. They came into the county and they don't pay a penny, because they are already paying for it. So Wilkinsburg, small municipality, saves \$150,000. They are virtually bankrupt. They save \$150,000 every single year in their operating budget, which is a large percentage, and they still get 911 service, top of the line.

Across the 130 municipalities, that was three and a half million dollars annually they are saving.

I don't get it at the county, but the municipalities collectively are saving three and a half million every single year by not duplicating the centers.

When we did the row office consolidation, we saved a little over a million a year with the consolidation of the six offices. But one thing we learned from Louisville and the other consolidations,

- - - -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

we will never sell this to the voters on the argument that we're going to save a lot of money. There will be some savings, but the sale is efficiency, pro growth, companies that want to be here, one stop shop. How do you develop the region, how do you make it more business friendly so we keep those jobs here. all of those reasons why Louisville got this to pass. It never passed in any of these areas based on X amount of dollars being saved, because there are going to be some hurdles when you make this merger. is going to be some growing pains when you do the merger, but even with those growing pains, every area that we've talked to, nobody ever says we should go back to the way it was. Even with those growing pains, it's just a more efficient form of government. That's how we're going to sell this.

MR. RAVENSTAHL: Let me just briefly piggyback. We recently announced an energy purchasing model where the county and the city, as well as some authorities and other non-profits, are purchasing energy together. We believe that that will save us in excess of a million dollars annually combined between the two of us.

We in the City of Pittsburgh reached a historic agreement, I guess it was last year. We now

- - - -

2.3

pick up garbage for Wilkinsburg, the same municipality that the County Executive mentioned. If my memory serves me correctly -- don't quote me on the exact specifics, but I think they were paying roughly \$1.5 million annually to a private hauler to pick up their garbage. We were able to provide them that same service for between \$900,000 and a million dollars, so it saved that municipality about a half million dollars. On our end, this was our first example of it. We didn't make any money on the deal. We simply wanted to provide an efficient service.

So that's a good story, and I can tell you as a result of that, we've continued to receive inquiries from other municipalities about refuse, et cetera.

And, in fact, while we're talking about consolidation here today and the bigger picture, we still on a daily basis are trying to find ways to deliver services to other municipalities, and on June 10th, I believe it is, we are having a shared services meeting where members of my administration, whether it's the refuse department, water authority, IT, energy, fire, police, are all going to come together and host these neighboring municipalities around the City of Pittsburgh and talk about future ways that we can continue to share services.

- - - -

2.3

So that discussion and dialog continues on a parallel track to this one. And so I think it's important to note that we are not putting all our eggs in this basket. While this is very important why we're here, we're continuing on a daily basis to show that we really believe in this stuff and we're trying to merge services as well.

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Representative Blackwell?

REPRESENTATIVE BLACKWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning. It's good to see you again, Mr. Onorato, Mayor.

MR. RAVENSTAHL: Good morning.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACKWELL: I want to piggyback on what Representative Beyer said about the school district, and I find it somewhat -- I won't say troubling, but uneasy about the school district not being a part of this, and I'll tell you why. The levels of dollars that are spent per student in the southeastern part where I'm from in Philadelphia, as opposed to the surrounding counties, I think it's very unfair. And understanding the political nature of what you said of why it wasn't -- the school district was not included, I find in most urban areas, the

- - - -

dollars that are spent per student are far less than the dollars per student in suburban areas, so I find that somewhat troubling.

2.3

You mentioned the transportation authority,
SEPTA in Philadelphia, in terms of the board being
consolidated now through the counties. Well,
respectfully, we say that in Philadelphia, most of the
residents are not too happy about that. We are
basically 80 percent of their ridership. We pay the
majority share of the funding into SEPTA, the
transportation authority, but yet the board is
dominated by county representatives. We do have veto
power that lasts for one week. So we veto this week;
next week, they take another vote and we lose.

So everything is not as rosy a picture as some may have thought you would say. I'm not saying you were saying that by you saying that, because that's not the case. And I might just get straight to the point. A lot of minorities are not happy with a lot of the consolidation of things that have gone on in the southeastern part of the state where I am from, because as you said, the political nature of it is that 75 percent of the population was in the city at one time and now 75 percent is out of the City of Pittsburgh.

- - - -

2.3

In talking to someone, an African American woman, prior to this hearing this morning, African Americans are not too happy with what's going on now. And, Mr. Mayor, for you to mention that minority groups have to be -- I don't remember the exact words you used. They are telling you there is a problem. That lets you know there is a problem that they are not too happy. I may be wrong.

But, still, I understand duplication. I'm not in favor of duplication of services. I think it's just crazy, frankly. It should be consolidated where it can be, but to exclude one aspect that I think is very important, which is the school district, because of the disparity of dollars that are spent per student, I don't want to see the same thing happen here that happened in the southeastern part of the state, because what it means is there will always be a second class, a tier system where students are concerned, and I believe that every student should have the right to a good quality education.

I don't see that happening out where I'm from, and I don't see that happening here. I think in Philadelphia we're improving, but I think the dollars that are being spent per student should be level, where they are not. I don't want to see that happen.

- - - -

2.3

I find it troubling that the school district is not -understanding your answer, I still find it troubling
that the school district is not part of it, but that
tells me that is the political nature of it.

Usually the people that are benefiting from a system that favors theirs, they would think that dollars are being taken away from theirs in order to satisfy another group, and that's not necessarily always the case. But whenever you have someone who is always at the bottom of the ladder trying to catch up, there is always going to be that problem.

The Mayor had mentioned that minority groups have to be filling their part, and that tells him there is some dissatisfaction there, and I want to know this is going to be talked about more. I think the more you talk about it, the better it will become. People are afraid about what they might learn when you talk about each other when you have different cultures. So I think the more you communicate, the better understanding you have of one another. I think that will have to be paid close attention to. I think it needs to be closely watched, and I will be watching.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. RAVENSTAHL: Thank you,

- - - -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Representative. Just real quickly to respond, the reference to the minority community, is, in fact, in the Nordenberg report, ensuring their representation. I don't know that it's necessarily a problem. reference to it is simply being very clear that that's something I'm going to advocate for, and if we can't have that question answered, then we're not going to be successful. I think that's clear and evident. That's my only reference to it was that it's something that needs to be addressed. If you look at, for example, Louisville like we did, it was a major issue in that community, diversity and representation. I'm just simply acknowledging that that's something that's going to have to be addressed in order for us to even further this discussion towards a positive resolution.

MR. ONORATO: Representative Blackwell, good to see you again. I found out we have something in common today, at least. My people don't like my transit agency, either, out here in the west. I can tell you that. I'm not sure if it matters if it's consolidated or not. Maybe it's just transit agencies, in general.

Let me just comment on the minority issue, first of all. Another reason why I use the Louisville

- - - -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

model -- and the Mayor and I call it the Louisville model -- ironically, their numbers were almost identical to our numbers. Old Louisville was about 30 percent African American. New Louisville is about 15 percent. They are almost identical to our numbers. The City of Pittsburgh right now is about 30 percent African American and the county is 15, 16 percent African American. So we'd be dealing with the same percentages as it relates to the African American community if we would do this merger and maybe learn from what they went through and how they dealt with it, because they actually did deal with the old urban district and the minority issue through the new legislative body that was put together, because they waived certain functions toward the old urban core, and that is also where minority representation was made sure it was part of the whole process. I look forward to that debate, as you said, to keep talking and figure out what would make sense.

Let me just end again with the school issue.

I don't know about Philadelphia, but the Mayor and I were talking, and we're pretty sure that the city school district actually does get a significant amount of money as it relates to the surrounding school districts. So the urban core is getting a lot of

- - - -

money, number one.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

25

Number two, the other thing, because of our 130 municipalities, we have several municipalities that are a majority minority, and some of those municipalities are so fiscally distressed, yet they don't get the attention from the media because they are not Pittsburgh. They are just small municipalities of 8,000, a municipality of 7,000. if the county doesn't intervene to help with economic development or to clean up a brown field or to come into an old industrial site, nothing will happen because the municipality is literally broke. They have no resources, no money. This will allow with this merger, again, the efficiency of the larger government to step in for economic development purposes and to help out a lot of those smaller municipalities that just -- unfortunately, it's not a result of what they've done. They find themselves in circumstances where there is no tax base left. So it would help actually on those issues, too.

21 REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Representative

22 Maher?

23 REPRESENTATIVE MAHER: Thank you,

24 Mr. Chairman.

Good to see you both again. Most of your

- - - -

2.3

testimony seems to have been focused on the third final recommendation of the Nordenberg committee, and I wanted to go back and take a look at the first two for a moment.

The first one is to continue, intensify
efforts to achieve efficiencies through cooperation,
and I'm applauding the fact that some steps have
happened, but there is a very, very long list, I would
imagine, of things that could be done.

Do you need any legislation to accomplish the long list of things that can be done just by cooperation of the city and the county, or can't you just decide to move forward?

MR. RAVENSTAHL: To continue on the service mergers, the answer is yes, we can absolutely do that. We have and will continue to do so.

REPRESENTATIVE MAHER: That's what I thought, and I would encourage you to recognize that you need not wait for the 253 legislators and the governor to wake up one morning and say the sun is shining. You can certainly move forward with this report, and there is a very long list of things you can do without moving towards a referendum.

I also ask, the second goal was to establish a formal cooperation compact, I think to ensure some

- - - -

permanency to the good work that's undertaken for streamlining. Where does the compact stand?

2.3

MR. ONORATO: The Mayor and I, we talked about the compact the day of the announcement of this report, and we're working on how detailed we want it, because we want it to be as broad and as inclusive as possible, which could include your first point, which is the continuation of the efficiencies of departments, the whole laundry list, and even the question of consolidation itself, the third point, we can actually have that in a compact that our ultimate goal is to get to that point. So we're trying to figure out what exactly the compact should look like, because it was written to be as broad as we want it to be.

Representative Maher, I agree with you on number one, efficiencies. It's amazing. Five years ago, I was in the middle of a hotly contested race -- you followed it closely and people from Allegheny County -- where at that time, the big issue was consolidation of row offices. And when I won, I remember people saying they are just incapable of getting that done, it won't happen. And here we are, we went from ten to four overnight. The 911 center said it was impossible. We're almost a victim of our

- - - -

2.1

2.3

own efficiencies and how quickly we got it done, but I would argue that the laundry list, while the Mayor and I can definitely do them without any legislation from any of you on the panel and we'll continue to chip away at them, if you get the referendum question and we can consolidate our two offices, that laundry list gets done overnight because our governments are together and you have one leader, one legislative body, just wrapping it up and rolling it up. Again, as long as the voters get to vote on this and we get to push it, it does become a local issue.

REPRESENTATIVE MAHER: I'm not sure I agree with the premise that a referendum will make folks more clever about how to get things streamlined, but I will observe when Louisville entered into its cooperation compact, it required approval or permission from the legislature. I don't think you require that kind of permission, but I just want to check. You can go forward on that without any steps from us.

MR. RAVENSTAHL: Correct. We are.

REPRESENTATIVE MAHER: Louisville entered into a cooperative compact in 1986. When did they put a referendum to the voters?

MR. ONORATO: My understanding is it took

- - - -

them ten years, and they went through at least two or three votes.

2.3

MR. RAVENSTAHL: I think they had the question on the ballot numerous times. It failed two or three times, I believe, before it ultimately passed a few years ago. So if '86 was the year the compact was struck, I guess it would be roughly 20 years later that the referendum was ultimately passed.

REPRESENTATIVE MAHER: I remember well when we went to Home Rule in Allegheny County. I wasn't in office then and you weren't in office then. Dan, you were city council at that time.

MR. ONORATO: Yes, yes.

rounding up the usual suspects. Everyone seemed to be overwhelmingly in support, a million dollar campaign to educate the voters, and it won by less than 500 votes, and that was with an awful lot of ground work done, an awful lot of spade work done. I would suggest that if a question proceeds to the voters with less than that amount of ground work, it will fail.

And I think there is an awful lot of ground work to be done. I'm not convinced that by a year from now, you're going to be in a position to make the compelling case to those outside the City of

- - - -

2.3

Pittsburgh. I'll leave it up to you if you can get it done in the City of Pittsburgh, but I think outside the City of Pittsburgh, you will find that there are an enormous number of questions that are if this is going to work so great, why don't you just do the ones you can already do without setting up a structure, which no matter what we want to say about here is one bucket of money that will be the city service district and here is another bucket of money that will be a county service district, as a good CPA, I understand money is like water and it's sort of like on those overflow days with ALCOSAN. Once it's in the river, you can't really separate one drop from another. It's there.

And, you know, I think we've got a lot of work ahead before there is a referendum, and my guess is the best way to doom progress would be to get the referendum too quickly. So I would strongly encourage moving forward on numbers one and two with an eye towards number three, because I think by the time you get a true cooperation agreement, you will understand better what's necessary in terms of a structure for number three.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Representative

- - - -

1 Frankel?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE FRANKEL: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.

Mayor, County Executive, welcome. Thank you for being here. I will say at the outset, I conceptually support the idea. The devil ultimately is in the details of how it plays out. There are many benefits and some of them are intangible. The image of our community, how we are portrayed to the rest of country, the rest of the world, would be enhanced in my view. The area of economic development, in particular. Having sat on the board of the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Pittsburgh for 12 years, I always recognize the fact that not having the seamless organization for the economic development of the county was a problem. There were times we were competing against each other between the city and the county, and that doesn't serve any purpose.

But, also, being a veteran of the effort to fix the city, if you will, the legislative effort, I know that there is an extraordinary amount of scepticism and distrust, you know, among elected leaders and people, with respect particularly to the city's financial status, which is still obviously in Act 47 and with an oversight board that we established

- - - -

2.3

in the legislature. That effort to restructure the city's taxes, to establish the oversight board for many of us were a very painful process and many of the issues still are unresolved.

To a certain extent, it seems to me that the key issues in order to get a bind, particularly from the county, is that there has to be some level of confidence that the city is financially right sided, gotten itself together, and those issues I think are separate. Some of them are not, I think, ultimately resolvable internally in terms of with the city's management. And both of you addressed some of that, particularly with respect to the city's debt and the city's unfunded pension liability.

It almost seems to me that those things really need to be on their way to being resolved and find some pathway for the city -- have some confidence the city is financially stable, and as you know, Mayor and Executive Onorato, many of us have been working on the issue of unfunded pension liability and we are coming up with some recommendations. I'm not saying that it couldn't be concurrent, but it seems to me that, obviously, I think some of the effort with respect to where we need to be focused has to be resolved in terms of having some level of confidence that the city

- - - -

is financially, you know, viable.

2.3

I have no objection to putting a referendum out there. I just am concerned, quite frankly, that putting a referendum out there prematurely does not make a lot of sense. And I'm prepared to move forward to enable it, but to say we're going to do it in a year, to do it in six months or whatever without having some of these other questions resolved seems to me to be problematic. So, ultimately, I'll say I'm supportive of this effort, but it depends where you put the horse before the cart. Maybe you'd like to discuss that.

MR. RAVENSTAHL: Just specifically on our financial situation, you know, the frustrating part for me as I took over the role of the office of the Mayor was that these problems weren't created overnight and, therefore, are not going to be able to be solved overnight by myself or anybody else, for that matter. So we've tried to do what we can -- I'll give you one example -- to deal with our debt. As you all know, it's \$800 million. That's something we walked into. But as a result of the strong fiscal discipline and the help of the individuals seated in front of us from the legislature, some new revenue streams, we've been able to build a surplus for the

- - - -

first time in quite some time.

2.3

So rather than just sitting on a surplus, we decided to use \$60 million of that surplus to fund our capital budget and not issue debt for the next five years. That's a small step. A significant step, I would argue, but one that will reduce our debt burden over the course of our debt by \$100 million. So that's a commitment my administration has made and we're going to stick to it and not issue debt over the next five years. It's something we voluntarily did. It wasn't required by Act 47, nor was it required by the oversight board, but it was something I felt we needed to do to show you all and show everybody that we're trying to do what we can.

Same with the pension issue, as I know you and I have worked on. These are tough issues to tackle and get your hands around, but I would welcome any opportunity to have a dialog, Representative. Maybe it's important for us to share with the public all of the progress that the City of Pittsburgh has made, because I think in many cases, people don't appreciate how efficient our city government is. We had 4,000 employees pre-Act 47. We have 3,000 now. It's a 25 percent reduction in our work force. There is a good story to tell. Unfortunately, I'm not sure it's

- - - -

2.3

always told in the way that it should be, but I think as a part of this process -- and I don't disagree that's something that's going to need to be expressed, and specifically for those in the suburban communities, that comfort level has to be there, that they understand city government.

So we would welcome any opportunity that you would provide us to share with you whether it's our pension status, where we're at with our pension obligations, our debt obligations, our operating budget, our capital budget. We'd be happy to open up the books in our authorities, et cetera, because I think a lot of times there are misnomers out there that could be answered perhaps more clearly if we just have good old dialog.

MR. ONORATO: Representative, you're absolutely right that the people will want to see that the city is on sound financial footing and the county is on sound financial footing, and last week alone, I think it's very important, as you might have read in the paper, the two Wall Street rating agents, Standard & Poors upgraded the country from an A to an A plus, and Moody's changed us from stable outlook to positive outlook. And in both of those reports, it lists a lot of reasons why they are upgrading the county, but in

- - - -

both reports in the story, they talk about the consolidation of 911; they talk about the turnaround of the Kane hospitals from a \$10 million loss to break even now; they talk about the row office consolidations, savings we're making. This isn't a political speech given by the County Executive. These are the raters from Wall Street that have upgraded us for the first time in five years.

We did all this in an environment where we froze property taxes, haven't raised them in six years, the only county in Southwestern Pennsylvania who hasn't raised property taxes, and the rating agents are responding to this. They see that we have tight fiscal controls. And in my four years as County Executive, we have written down the outstanding debt of the county \$58 million. We're down from where we were when I took office. So we're writing down debt, we're not raising property taxes, we've eliminated government, we've found efficiencies, and Wall Street is responding to it.

21 REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Representative

22 Kortz?

23 REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Thank you,

24 Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Chief Executive Onorato, Mayor

- - - -

2.3

Ravenstahl, for your testimony. I applaud your efforts for moving this process forward, because I personally believe there are synergies to be gleaned through consolidation. It makes a lot of economic sense to do that. We've done it in the steel industry, so I applaud your effort.

The question I have is this: If we give you the enabling legislation you need and the voters give you the affirmative vote on a referendum to move this process forward, obviously the first consolidation would be the executive branch and the council. Would that take a special election or would you have to wait through an election cycle? What is the process for that? I don't know what Louisville did. I don't know if you have any thoughts.

MR. ONORATO: It would all depend on what the wording of the referendum question is. It would deal with all those issues. The Mayor and I have testified several times, many times over the last couple months, that the County Executive's office and county council would be eliminated. The Mayor's office and city council would be eliminated and there would be a new office of Mayor of the new Pittsburgh created and a new legislative body created, whatever that number would be, how the districts look. All of

- - - -

2.3

that would be spelled out well in advance of a referendum question, and then the effective date of a referendum would be in there and the setup for when our terms would expire and when the first race of the new Mayor's office would take place, all of that would be spelled out leading up to the vote.

So when the voters go in to vote, all those questions would have been answered. We don't have them today because we don't have the legislation, but that would all have to be dealt with before the voters get a chance to vote on it.

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Gentlemen, thank you very much. We appreciate your time.

MR. ONORATO: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Our next panel of speakers are Helen Hanna Casey, president of Howard Hanna Real Estate Services, Audrey Russo, president and CEO of Pittsburgh Technology Council, and Thomas VanKirk, chairman of the Pennsylvania Economy League of Southwestern Pennsylvania.

Before we continue on, just to remind my colleagues and to the testifiers, we only have this room until 1 o'clock and we're already about a half hour behind, so if we can expedite our speeches and questions, I'd appreciate it. Just please make sure

- - - -

that you introduce yourselves.

2.3

MR. VANKIRK: Thank you very much. I appreciate the audience before you.

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Please speak into the mic and identify yourself.

MR. VANKIRK: I appreciate the opportunity. My name is Tom VanKirk. I'm here in my capacity as the chairman of the Pennsylvania Economy League of Southwestern Pennsylvania and also a board member for the State Economy League.

As many of you know, the mission of the Economy League since 1936 has been to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the government across the Commonwealth. That mission has been in place and we have made many efforts to try to improve the efficiencies of government, but one thing we have found in those 70-some years is that changing the status quo is not easy. One of the easiest things to do, as Representative Maher suggested, just let's wait and see. Let's do nothing. And the status quo is just very difficult to change and it does take vision, leadership, and community support, and in this case, the support of the legislature.

On behalf of the League, I would like to commend the leadership and Chancellor Nordenberg, a

- - - -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

very committed group of people of the Citizens Advisory members to study this complex issue and make their recommendations, which I do think show a very real vision for how this could take place, including addressing the many issues that Representative Maher did address, which is to, in fact, encourage consolidation of different government functions, which is a very important element of that report and a key element of that report. I would also like to very much commend the leadership shown by County Executive Onorato and Mayor Ravenstahl in appointing the Advisory Committee, number one, to examine the issues, but, also, their response to that, which was to set forth, as you just heard, the bold and ambitious idea of the question of consolidating the two governments before the voters.

I would also like to thank this committee, because without this committee meeting and looking at it, we can't start the examination that was very much contemplated by the Chancellor in making his report so that we could frame the issues and get a very real public debate going on what does make sense for this area.

As many of you know, the League has done a lot of research about government function and structure at

- - - -

2.3

all levels. Most recently, we've looked at all city and county consolidations in other places since the end of World War II, and I believe we have submitted a report to this committee which is "A Comparative Analysis of City/County Consolidations," which was done by us in 2007, and it really does provide a comprehensive look at how other regions have consolidated their city and county governments in the last 60 years. This was also available to the Citizens Advisory Committee, and I think it will be an excellent resource for all of you.

One of the key findings in this that we found to be very important is that there is no one size fits all. We can't look at any one area and say, this is what will work here. Every place it has been successful, this bold and ambitious step was done in a way to meet the needs and expectations of its own communities, including the school districts and all of the citizens of the area, and no one way is the way to do it.

We do believe that we have the opportunity before us now to create a city-county government that meets the needs of the residents and taxpayers of this area into the 21st century. Communities that have consolidated their governments have grappled with many

- - - -

2.3

of the same issues we face, how to grow jobs and population. They've come up with ways to consolidate the city and county governments, save tax dollars, provide for effective and efficient services, and represent all their citizens, and they have done so by taking the step we're talking about today, which is letting the voters decide about their local government and how they want to be governed at the local level.

One of the communities, as you've heard several times, that has consolidated most recently is Louisville. It did so in the year 2000, consolidating the City of Louisville and Jefferson County and leaving the remaining 83 cities, 21 fire districts and school districts in place. While every place is different, the consolidation in Louisville did focus on unifying its leadership with one vision and one agenda to raise the profile of Louisville, both in Kentucky and on a more national scope, and also to improve broader economy and promote economic growth.

Louisville shares some of the challenges that we are seeking to grow and prosper in the 21st century as we are in Pittsburgh and Allegheny County and it does provide a very good vehicle, because last year, the Economy League was pleased to arrange a trip for County Executive Onorato, Mayor Ravenstahl, the

- - - -

2.3

members of the Citizens Advisory Committee to visit
Louisville and to meet with various officials there to
see what their real experience was. I would say that
as part of that they met Joe Regan, being head of the
Greater Louisville, Inc. He is not able to be here
today, but he has asked me if the committee will
permit me to read certain remarks that he had
regarding the Louisville experience.

Dear Representative Petrone and Distinguished
Urban Affairs Committee Members: On behalf of Greater
Louisville, Inc. and the Metro Chamber of Commerce,
please accept our congratulations on the thoughtful,
transparent approach you have taken to study this
proposal to draft a charter to consolidate Pittsburgh
and Allegheny County. In the spirit of that
discovery, we share our experience of merger as it
relates to business and economic development.

On January 6, 2003, Louisville, Kentucky, officially became America's sixteenth largest city as a result of a much anticipated merger of local city and county governments. Overnight, the city limits expanded from 61 square miles to 386 square miles and the population skyrocketed from about 260 to nearly 700,000.

The merger resulted in a number of impressive

- - - -

2.3

and proven efficiencies in Metro Louisville's government, administration, processes, and services, such as consolidated government. Officials cut about 700 positions, about 150 of which were occupied at the time of merger but remain balanced without raising taxes or cutting basic services. There is now a one stop shop to develop through the merged offices for planning, design inspection, and licensing, which previously had been divided among several locations. These unified services under a single leader have enhanced the community's competitiveness in a race for new economic development.

Louisville's police department merged with Jefferson County Police. The police merger eliminated some bureaucracy, resulting in an additional 100 officers on the street today than there were five years before the merger took place. The City Hall, which allowed citizens to phone or e-mail queries or complaints about city services, was expanded to a 24/7 service called Metro Call available through a single phone number. Paramedic services were merged, adding another 50 emergency medical professionals plus ambulances without tax increase. The park system is expanding, downtown is growing, and an approximately 450 million riverfront arena have all moved forward

- - - -

dramatically since the merger.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Jefferson County is better prepared today for a major disaster than previously, as Metro government has centralized emergency dispatch, allowing responders to communicate with each other. The sheriff and city police are now on the same radio frequency.

The merger has not only elevated the perception of Louisville and changed the way others look at us, but also the way we look at ourselves. are even benefiting tremendously from a renewed sense of purpose and excitement about the unlimited possibilities ahead for our communities, such as: Since the merger, the city's bond rating has climbed to AA plus from Fitch Ratings, second best among cities. Metro government's bond ratings are now higher than the two previous standalone governments ever had. Louisville is now perceived as a top tier city, putting it on a list of more site selection consultants. Over 40 other communities, including Pittsburgh, have visited Louisville since the merger to study the processes we used and the positive results. The community speaks with a stronger and single voice in the legislative halls in Frankfort and Washington, and regional cooperation is increasing

- - - -

with surrounding Kentucky counties, as well as neighbors across the river in southern Indiana.

2.3

As you can see, merging city and county governments positions Louisville to be more efficient, more accessible, more economically competitive, and ultimately far more successful. These factors were essential to the staff and members of Greater Louisville in our leadership role supporting merger. As a result, the merger will benefit the prosperity of our community's citizens for years to come. We commend these results for your review as you consider the future of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County.

And he did repeat that he is happy to provide any additional information and to appear before the committee, if he can, but I was happy to read that into the record.

And with that, I'll turn it over to Audrey.

MS. RUSSO: Good morning, or, really, good afternoon, almost. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as we mentioned, I'm Audrey Russo. I'm president and CEO of the Pittsburgh Technology Council, a regional trade association representing more than 1400 member companies from the 13 county region of Southwestern Pennsylvania. Also, we are the largest trade association for technology companies in

- - - -

2.3

the U.S. In addition to that role, I'm also a proud resident of both the County of Allegheny and the City of Pittsburgh.

Since our creation in 1983, the Pittsburgh
Technology Council has grown to become the largest
regional technology trade association representing
innovative firms in the fields of advanced
manufacturing, life sciences, and information
technology. Our firms range in size from Fortune 500
companies to sole proprietors who are still working to
commercialize these inventions.

If I were to identify one common characteristic that is shared across the majority of our membership, I would describe our firms as passionate ambassadors for innovation and problem solving. Truly, the products and technologies that are being developed in this region are solving some of the world's most daunting challenges.

It is with this spirit of innovation in mind that I come before you today to applaud the leadership of this committee, as well as County Executive Dan Onorato and Mayor Luke Ravenstahl, for exploring opportunities to solve some of the most significant challenges facing our joint constituencies. As elected officials, you know all too well about these

- - - -

2.3

challenges. You know that our region must improve the way in which we compete internationally for families to sustain jobs. You know that we must recommit ourselves to providing world class services to our residents, and you know that our existing tax base is already overextended and, quite frankly, overtaxed.

As we look to address these challenges, you must examine every possible solution. Today, we are here to discuss the passage of enabling legislation that would create a charter committee to develop a new form of self-governance that will help us to better address the challenges facing our community.

Though I stand before you today to support the passage of this enabling legislation, ultimately, I will reserve my final judgment on any new formed government based upon how I believe it will position this region to do the following: Offer world class services to its residents and businesses; how it positions us to compete internationally for family sustaining jobs; and whether or not it can result in a more competitive and fair tax climate. The success of any entrepreneur is based largely on his or her ability to create market-disrupting solutions that can cost effectively solve real and immediate problems facing various marketplaces and industries.

- - - -

2.3

Just as entrepreneurs rely on the value-added characteristics of their products to help win market adoption, so, too, must the proposed charter committee recognize the need to produce a proposed form of governance that accomplished more than merely merging two governments, but instead creates the ability of our citizens, through a new form of self-governance, to address the very real world challenges that are impacting their quality of life. Said differently, if it were to win passage, this new form of government will need to address the collective and sometimes selfish needs of the voters.

So as we look to develop the charge for this charter committee, I hope that we will not lose sight of our goals to improve the quality of services to create a fair and competitive tax climate and to enhance our ability to attract and retain family sustaining jobs in this region. This is how the Pittsburgh Technology Council will evaluate the proposal, and I suspect that we should expect nothing less from our voters.

So my message this morning, short and simple: Give us the ability to be innovative with our form of governance, but please don't lose focus on the real end. The end is not merged government, but more

- - - -

effective governance.

2.3

Finally, as we move forward with this important step, I hope we will not lose sight of the significant actions that already can be taking place now to help advance the aforementioned goals. Efforts to consolidate and enhance services, reduce costs, and develop coordinated economic development strategies must not be ignored or placed on the back burner during this process. If that occurs, we will have done significant disservice to our community.

Thank you again for allowing me to share my thoughts, and I applaud your work in this area. I look forward to future conversations and being part of this discussion.

MS. CASEY: Thank you. Good morning. My name is Helen Hanna Casey, and I'm the president of Howard Hanna Real Estate Services.

Many people don't realize we operate in four states, have 3600 sales associates, and we're in 22 counties, including Allegheny County, and in Pittsburgh itself, we have five locations, 25 total in Allegheny County. But what surprises most people is that we're the third largest real estate company in the United States, privately owned, and the fifth largest full service company in all aspects. That

- - - -

2.3

surprises people, because when you say that our base of operations is Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, this city, this region, people are amazed to believe that we can do that in an area which is not a growth area.

Last year, we hosted 100 top real estate companies from across the country. They were amazed at the beauty of our region. They were overwhelmed with the speakers who came from Pitt and CMU and our local governments, including the Governor. The knowledge, the growth that we have within this region is overwhelming, but we don't have job growth and we don't have population growth, and that's really what we're here to talk about.

As a real estate professional, I get a little better view than most people as to what is missing here and what we need in other locations. That lagging job growth, population growth, we're behind nationally. Although we've slowed in population growth, we are continuing to lose. The advantages of living and working and investing here are great, but how do we let the world know that as our population diminishes? It's clear we must take bold, decisive action to grow those jobs and the population of our region. I commend the House Urban Affairs Committee and all the members of the General Assembly here today

- - - -

for their interest in considering the possible consolidation of city and county government.

2.3

As we've just heard, County Executive Onorato and Mayor Ravenstahl are supportive of creating a new, combined government that would be more effective and efficient, save tax dollars, and most of all, have a unified vision and leadership. From my perspective, consolidating our government is an important step to putting Pittsburgh and Allegheny County back on the radar as the place to do business, get a job, invest, and live.

Combining, we can rebuild the infrastructure and work together to create a climate to allow businesses to move here and businesses that are here to expand and grow all within this region. We've already passed row office reform and Home Rule, but in each of these cases, voters, through a ballot question, decided to modernize their government. Now we have the opportunity to put that question to whether we consolidate city and government to the voters again, enabling the legislature that would write and pass in the full house. We're facing a crucial decision about how we will grow and govern ourselves. Once again, it is time to let the voters decide.

- - - -

1 Thank you.

2.3

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Thank you all very much.

Chairman Petrone?

REPRESENTATIVE PETRONE: Thank you very much for your testimony. It was extremely interesting.

My question is to Mr. VanKirk. Do you know, sir, of any other areas of the country and other states that are considering what we're talking about today? Are there others in the process of trying to do what we're trying to do?

MR. VANKIRK: The City of Charlotte, which we also made a benchmarking trip to, has proceeded along the route of more of the functional cooperation and consolidation, so they continue to study the overall issue. Louisville, I think we mentioned, is complete, and I do not know of any other active areas in the country right now.

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Representative Beyer?

REPRESENTATIVE BEYER: Thanks, Paul.

Ms. Casey, I hope you don't mind if I call you Helen. That's actually one of my sister's names. I'm so impressed with the fact that you're leading such an

- - - -

incredible real estate company. I'm very proud of the fact that it's a woman leading it.

MS. CASEY: Thank you.

2.3

REPRESENTATIVE BEYER: And having been a native of this area, I'm very familiar with your company as well.

Do you think -- maybe this is just a stretch, but do you think that the consolidation could potentially affect -- how could it affect the real estate market, in general? I'm just curious about whether or not you've seen -- seeing the Louisville model, if we take a look at that, whether or not the real estate values and the market itself in that city when they started consolidating and having more efficient government, what kind of impact that had on the real estate arena, in general. Do you know if there has been any?

MS. CASEY: Louisville, like Western

Pennsylvania, has not been as affected by the housing

downturn as many parts of the country. So it's really

hard to evaluate competitive markets right now, but I

will say that they have stimulated job growth, and

from the perspective of where we come from, looking at

how we can increase the values of our house -
everybody has to brag how you get so much house here

- - - -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

for your money, and you do -- we'd like to raise those prices. There is only one way to do that, to create jobs.

So when we look at this, we look at the stimulus being business growth. In market areas where you have a continued business growth and where you have had more job opportunities, your housing prices rise. So we can take that all over the place and show what is the magnet that draws business, that creates This is an interesting market, also. I think people are surprised that we have people who want to move here that cannot move here. They cannot move here because we don't have enough jobs. companies that we work with that are interviewing to bring people into new job creation, they may have three, five people that want the job, because it's a great place to live and raise a family, unlike other markets today, not just because of housing prices, but many reasons, and there aren't enough jobs to meet that need. So that will drive prices, unquestionably.

If you look at the Cleveland market, as an example, which is a bigger market than we are, the city has 125, 140,000 more people in the City of Cleveland. The SMSA is a million plus more than Pittsburgh and the prices average about 18 percent

- - - -

more than here.

2.3

REPRESENTATIVE BEYER: So through the consolidation here, we know, then, the tax structure changes, and we hear consistently, I think all of us as legislators, from businesses throughout the Commonwealth and throughout the country and even businesses from overseas that want to relocate here in Pennsylvania that our business tax structure is not competitive enough and then we here about the property tax situation. Certainly from businesses less, but from people who want to move hear, say, from towns like Louisville.

So do you have any thoughts or comments on that? I would imagine that your industry would be heavily involved in trying to take, I would imagine, a hard look at how the tax structure works here in Allegheny County and the city.

MS. CASEY: Well, the property taxes I'd be happy to discuss for the next five or six hours, if you'd like to, but, actually, we've done a lot of comparisons. We've sent a lot of things to many of you legislators on the transfer tax issues and property tax issues. Property tax issues are just in the way we pay taxes in the state of Pennsylvania. It's not that people pay more tax in Pennsylvania.

- - - -

2.3

They just pay more property tax, and Allegheny County is more of that than other places, so I think that's important to understand. It's just very hard to do analysis for somebody moving here from Louisville to show them that at the end of the year, they are not going to pay much more taxes, but they are going to pay it in one lump sum for their property, rather than spread out over sales tax, et cetera.

So that's one issue, and, of course, the state taxation problem is a whole other issue for bringing businesses here. But I do think that there are people who want to move here, because when you balance, in the end, it's the total cost of owning a home. It's the total cost of doing business. Can businesses move here and expand here? Absolutely. Because when you look at that total cost, your mortgage payment will still be less than it will be in, say, Cleveland. In the end, your property taxes may be higher.

So that a company that is looking to move here -- and we're dealing with three companies right now moving here with about 50 people or more, plus the big group for Westinghouse. When you look at that, they are analyzing the whole structure, not just one thing, if that's a help to you.

REPRESENTATIVE BEYER: Yes. Thank you.

- - - -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: You mentioned realty transfer tax. When there was a rumor last year that that was going to be part of the budget, we never got bombarded by more realtors. And I see Jennifer is in the audience, and to her credit, I want to thank her, because when I called her and told her that that was off the table, the e-mails stopped. So, again, thank you. MS. CASEY: Only St. Louis and Philadelphia and Pittsburgh have a four percent transfer tax of anyplace we can find. REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: You said Pittsburgh? MS. CASEY: Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and St. Louis. REPRESENTATIVE MAHER: Is that your way of saying we're number one? MS. CASEY: We're number one in that, also. REPRESENTATIVE MAHER: It's good to lead. Tom, I'm disappointed. I confused you, You thought what I was advocating was to apparently.

BAUER COURT REPORTING, INC. WWW.BAUERREPORTING.COM

were saying was it was really two- or threefold, one

MR. VANKIRK: I thought that what you

do nothing. Is that what you though I said?

- - - -

2.3

of which was that we ought to try to show that we can do the various cooperations and consolidations that are possible without enacting an enabling statute and moving fully forward at this time with the consolidation of the city and the county. And my point -- so I think that that was one thing that you were saying that we ought to do that.

And then otherwise, that it also is going to take a lot of public education in order to make sure that the voters would get behind this and, otherwise, there is a risk of failure.

My point is that I think it is very dangerous, frankly, to drag our feet too long, because it is not often that an opportunity comes together such as that which is here now. I think it is very important to have the leadership of the county and the city. And I think what has doomed discussions in the past, I think what has doomed consolidation efforts in the past has been a failure of agreement between county officials and city officials. What we have right here now is a situation where they appointed a committee, the committee reported back with definitive recommendations. The two of them are totally behind it and, therefore, are willing to provide the leadership necessary to try to effect the full

- - - -

2.3

city-county consolidation, and what I would like to suggest is it is worth having the enabling legislation passed so that the voters can then decide it.

REPRESENTATIVE MAHER: Thanks. I think you still sort of missed my point, but we can talk later.

Let me ask you this practical question, Helen: When you're in the business of selling homes and you roll up to some home and somebody sees weeds and peeling paint and junk in the driveway, I think your realtors probably recommend that the homeowner get rid of the junk, pull the weeds, and if they can dab on a bit of paint that they'd be far better off in terms of eliminating issues that prevent a sale from going forward. Is that common sense?

MS. CASEY: Yes. It's a good analogy, I guess, but, yes, of course, a house in better condition always sells more quickly.

REPRESENTATIVE MAHER: The fewer obvious issues there are, the more likely you are to find a buyer. Is that fair?

MS. CASEY: All depending on price.

REPRESENTATIVE MAHER: I guess what I'm trying to suggest is if there is to be any success in the referendum, the obvious issues have got to be

- - - -

2.3

resolved. The people of Western Pennsylvania have demonstrated time and again that they are not too keen on anything they perceive as a pig in a poke, and we need to get rid of the obvious issues, or we'll find in the Home Rule charter could there have been any more of a coalescing of support than we saw there, and yet it was less than 500 votes that separated progress from regress. And I am recognizing it's a tall order.

I'd also suggest in terms of the -- I like your theory about the market-disrupting solutions, and having built a business that was based upon a market-disrupting solution -- and I might add the only nice thing my name has been associated with in the Post-Gazette is when they named the firm the best place to work in Western Pennsylvania last year. My successors kid me that that's because I'm now retired is what made it the best place.

In any case, I would suggest that when you're pursuing market-disrupting solutions, as you suggest, that you don't want to get hung up in the trivial details. You've got to get the housekeeping in order, and if you can't do the basic housekeeping, you won't ever be able to accomplish the market-disrupting solution. Is that fair?

MS. RUSSO: That's fair.

- - - -

2.3

REPRESENTATIVE MAHER: That's sort of what I'm suggesting, too. I recognize, as do you,

Tom, it's unusual that we should have the County

Executive and the Mayor apparently on the same page.

I remember the brief moment in time when there was a joint city-county economic development organization and the growing pains to create it and whatever pains to cast it asunder, and I recognize that these things can be transient, which is one of the reasons I'm very interested in a compact to create an enduring obligation and take care of a lot of the low hanging fruit.

Let's deal with these things. Move, move, move, move, move. And as we get rid of all these obvious concerns and issues, then we can have the market-disrupting solution in a fashion that I believe the voters can embrace. If we don't do those things, I think getting the voters to embrace it will be well nigh impossible.

I guess I'm actually testifying now,
Mr. Chairman. I'm sorry. Thank you for your indulgence.

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Thank you, John.

We have been joined by Representative Nick Kotik from Allegheny County.

- - - -

Next is Representative Cox.

2.3

REPRESENTATIVE COX: I guess my question is for Mr. VanKirk. You mentioned and I glanced through the report that was provided to us here, and toward the back, it discusses the Pennsylvania Municipal Consolidation or Merger Act, and it talks about Philadelphia and Pittsburgh being excepted, if you will, from that. There was no authority given to cities of the first or second class for those types of mergers that we're seeing in other parts of the state.

So my first question -- and I'll try to keep them short, but I have -- mine are on the logistics of things. Are you familiar with why in 1994

Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, cities of the first and second class, why they were carved out saying, no, we don't want you to do that in the same way that we're allowing boroughs and municipalities, et cetera, to merge?

MR. VANKIRK: No, I'm not familiar with that.

REPRESENTATIVE COX: I'm sure we've got some historical experience on this committee I can probably draw from for that answer, then.

My second thing is the types of approval. I know when the municipalities and boroughs that I've

- - - -

2.3

seen do it, even in my own district, there is that dual approval process. One can say yes; the other can say no, and the whole deal is off. What do you see as advantages or disadvantages for the crafting of this legislation as far as the authority that we, as a legislature, give? What is the most effective and most efficient way to go? I like the dual approval process myself, because it gives that veto to the parties that may be negatively affected. So comment on that, if you would.

MR. VANKIRK: I think that the most effective and probably the easiest to be understood is the one vote, but I think as a practical matter that at least -- I can understand how the leader of any one of the groups, whether it be the county or the city, would want to feel and to have their constituents know that they, in fact, were voting on it on their own. So I think that the practicalities may hold over efficiencies as far as what is done. And, clearly, I think it has to be shaped by enabling legislation that you all will be looking at, and I think you have to be governed, in part, by how strongly the two local leaders feel about the particular issue.

REPRESENTATIVE COX: Do you feel one way is better than the other?

- - - -

2.3

MR. VANKIRK: Myself, if I were doing it and I wanted to better ensure the passage, I would want to have one vote, as opposed to try to segregate it into two votes, because I think that that would better enable it to be passed if it was one consolidated vote of all those to be affected.

REPRESENTATIVE COX: Doesn't that take out some of the voice, though, as far as -- if you're having two affected bodies -- and, arguably, that's what we're looking at here -- do we not muffle or silence the voice of one of those parties with a single vote?

MR. VANKIRK: That is exactly the flip side of it. If you wanted to best increase the chance of a successful vote, you would do it with a single vote, but if you want to address the concerns as far as everybody being heard and having the right to vote as their own local government entity right now, clearly you go with the dual vote.

REPRESENTATIVE COX: My comment on that is echoing what I said earlier. To me, I represent people of a district, and as a representative, I know a lot of these ladies and gentlemen are the same way. They want to make sure the voices of their constituents are heard. I don't know that I could

- - - -

2.3

support something that ensures passage but yet potentially silences a portion of my constituency, and so that would be my greatest concern in the single threshold, rather than allowing equal voicing of opinion or opposition, as the case may be.

MR. VANKIRK: That's why I think that although I am a proponent of it and very much believe it is for the good of Allegheny County and Greater Pittsburgh, I think that those of us who are proponents and not elected representatives have to defer to the views of Dan Onorato, Luke Ravenstahl, and, in fact, this entire committee and the legislators who are going to be enacting the enabling statute as to what gives the greatest voice to the voters, as opposed to just ensuring passage.

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Representative Frankel?

REPRESENTATIVE FRANKEL: Thank you. Good morning. One of the differences -- I mean,
Representative Maher really has, I think, expressed, I think, what many of us who anticipate a very difficult process, even to just get through the enabling legislation. I've talked with Mayor Ravenstahl and Executive Onorato. There is, I know, even among my colleagues, a residue of some hard feelings that

- - - -

survive from the city's efforts to restructure its taxes and the oversight board. And it's a challenge.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Even if you take a look at what took place in Louisville, three times it was on the ballot. passed by a very slight majority last time. And in that situation, you had a city of Louisville that was, as I understand it, financially sound. So you didn't have that issue to really deal with that. I think they were even sounder than the county. And I come back to the issue ultimately -- because I do think this is important. I do think it needs to move forward and there are benefits to be had, but not to be dealing with the other issues to give everybody a sense that our city is financially sound, that there is financial soundness to this thing, because I think we all admit that, ultimately, while there are financial benefits in terms of savings, that is not really the major reason to support this, that that is not going to solve the financial problems of the combined entities, ultimately, or the city.

So, I mean, the way that you envision this playing out, I think from what I've heard, did you believe there ought to be in any enabling legislation a time certain to put this on the ballot and, if so, when would that be from your perspective?

- - - -

2.3

MR. VANKIRK: Because so much of the -Representative Frankel, because so much of the
questions and the very difficult questions that have
to be addressed, such as representation, such as
making sure that in a combined government that there
is diverse representation, because of the protection
that I think that the municipalities, the county is
going to want from incurring too much of the city debt
and having an urban taxing history set up, because so
much of that has to really be hammered out at the
charter level where people are sitting down and really
discussing the full details, the devil is always going
to be in the details of this.

So I can't say that it ought to have a time certain by which it ought to definitely be on it.

What I would like to suggest is that enabling legislation be passed so that as quickly as possible, the charter group can be sitting down and seeing how rapidly they can hammer out those issues, how they can take into consideration the various issues raised by Representative Maher as to how is other kind of cooperations taking place, how much of an educational process do you need to have under way, and do it at the earliest practical time. I think that's what the report says.

- - - -

2.3

I don't think it's possible to have any kind of a referendum on this issue any time before November of 2009. I think just by the time any enabling legislation would be passed, a charter put together, the three, four months that it's going to be necessary, at least, to study the issues, I think that it would be foolish to even think that it could be before November of 2009.

Thereafter, greater minds than I have to address the question of whether or not it should take place in a statewide election year where governors are going to be elected or whether or not it be put off until 2009, but I'd like to see the legislation established that would enable it, if the charter commission can reach its conclusions to have it by November of 2009. But if it doesn't finish and isn't able to do that -- let's remember, the Nordenberg report took about eight months longer than any of us thought it was going to -- in order to address it, that it not doom the efforts and that it be up to the charter committee or they be authorized in the enabling legislation to set a date after that November of 2009.

REPRESENTATIVE FRANKEL: Thank you, Tom.

Audrey, one quick question that you addressed

- - - -

in your remarks today, and that is that consolidation would provide an opportunity to create a fair tax system.

MS. RUSSO: I would hope that.

REPRESENTATIVE FRANKEL: Excuse me?

MS. RUSSO: I would hope that.

REPRESENTATIVE FRANKEL: Just out of curiosity, what would be the elements, from your point of view, of a fair tax system of a combined entity?

MS. RUSSO: What would be the outcome?

REPRESENTATIVE FRANKEL: What kinds of things would that include? What would your vision be for a fair tax system in the county?

MS. RUSSO: Well, I think, first of all, is that right now, as in my world, what I work on is attracting and retaining businesses across this region, and what that means is that I have to make sure that capital stock and franchise tax, the things that are really representative that create the imperative, the R and D initiatives, and the actual capability for the single sales tax, all those things.

REPRESENTATIVE FRANKEL: Those are state

23 issues.

MS. RUSSO: Locally, what really impacts businesses locally is the amount of burden of the

- - - -

2.3

city, from working in the city, and the fact of dealing with all the municipalities. It was actually the logistics and the impediment of those logistics where new companies, when they come in, trying to navigate across those waters. Because they can go into other regions where there really is a single shop, where they are able to navigate across that. And that has really become more of the prohibitors. The issues that reign this region are a lot of the statewide tax structure here.

REPRESENTATIVE FRANKEL: I understand that, and I also agree with you about having a seamless economic growth approach.

MS. RUSSO: That was my point earlier in my words when I said let's take advantage of what we can do now simultaneously, because there probably is some low hanging fruit that can occur with or without what we're here talking about in terms of the passage.

And as to representing the business community here, that's what they struggle with day-in and day-out, trying to become cost effective so they can catapult their businesses to become more viable, so we can help the Hanna family and their company in terms of building, you know, viable options for people to come here and live and to thrive. So I think from the

- - - -

state posture, that's very important, but I also think that from the local.

REPRESENTATIVE FRANKEL: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Representative

Beyer?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE BEYER: I just want to -you don't necessarily have to respond, but now as a legislator I'm going to think two things: One, you suggest that it's layers of government that's a real impediment to business, and, in my mind, this consolidation merger doesn't address it at all. have 120 municipalities that are going to remain intact. I'm not sure that that works, and I really frankly don't like that feature. If we're going to be bold, then let's be bold. We have 120 municipalities that could maybe come together. The other thing is I am very reluctant to pass enabling legislation, having had that done last year and a drink tax was established here in Allegheny County. And having family living back here, I've heard about that drink tax extensively.

So those are the two things that I would expect, in all seriousness, to not have the legislature -- don't start gaveling me, Paul. You would not have the legislature jumping to do enabling

- - - -

legislation really quickly without being very cautionary, as Representative Maher suggests.

So, thank you.

2.3

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Thank you all very much. Appreciate it.

Our next group, Brian Jensen, senior vice president, Allegheny Conference on Community Development; Edward K. Muller, professor of history and director of urban studies program, University of Pittsburgh; John E. Murray Jr., chancellor of the university and professor of law, Duquesne University; Enzo Santilli, managing director of MarketSphere Consulting. I would remind the testifiers to please identify themselves before testifying.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman and members of the legislative body, my name is John Murray, and I am chancellor and professor of law at Duquesne University, and I am here in my capacity as former chair of ComPAC 21 and the former chair of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Authority.

And I would like to begin by suggesting that having read the Committee to Enhance Efficiency of County and City Government report chaired by Chancellor Mark Nordenberg, I agree with his conclusions and recommendations. I think the work of

- - - -

the committee is testified in its name to enhance the efficiency and, therefore, to avoid waste.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

As the chairman of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Authority appointed to address the city's financial crisis, I can attest to the fact that our goal is to enhance efficiencies and to avoid waste.

As chairman of ComPAC 21, which recommended the new structure of Allegheny County which we now enjoy, the principal role of that committee is enhancement of efficiencies and avoidance of waste.

When the recommendations of ComPAC 21 were placed in referendum for the citizens of Allegheny County, I was asked to speak to this issue in various forms, and I would typically spend about 15 or 20 minutes talking about our recommendations, followed by questions. And I remember specifically on one of the occasions when I answered questions, a woman raised her hand and said, is anyone opposed to this recommendation? My reaction to the recommendations of the consolidation committee is the same. Is anyone opposed to them? Of course, there is opposition, just as there was opposition to the structural change in county government. About 200,000 voters participated in that referendum, and we carried the day by 564 It's what I call a Lanny Frattare victory. No

- - - -

doubt about it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

The reasons for the opposition to the new structure of county government were essentially vested interests and fear of change. I think we should reject similar reasons for opposition of consolidation. The City of Pittsburgh, I will tell you, can no longer afford to exist in its current structure with only half the population it once enjoyed. The city has an insufficient supply of The Act 47 and the ICA helped the city taxpayers. avoid bankruptcy. This city is more efficient today than it was when it was about to go bankrupt, but any reasonable forecast of the city's financial future in its current structure -- I'm talking about five, ten, fifteen years down the line -- proves that the current government structure is inherently inefficient.

America's most liveable city is not the City of Pittsburgh. It is the seven county metro area. I saw another poll where Pittsburgh was ranked fourth among the best places to live in the country for retirement. Well, again, that wasn't the City of Pittsburgh alone. That was at least the County of Allegheny and probably the region.

As you know, we have just over 300,000 residents in this city now who are bearing all of the

- - - -

2.3

tax burdens, and their tax burden is too high. Each day, we have another 300,000 people who go to work in the city, go to school in the city, go to hospitals and physicians in the city, and go there for other reasons. And each day, they do not pay the taxes that the residents pay. They pay \$52 a year if they work there, not if they go to school or come for other reasons. It's simply not a viable future. It's not 1945.

Obviously, consolidation cannot thrust the debt of the city upon the county, and I do not think that it's realistic at all to suggest that we could ever talk about all the municipalities in Allegheny County merging together in one fell swoop. Among other things, I think I would lose my wife if I advocated such a move.

So why not leave the current structures where they are and simply cooperate? The problem is we are not very good about cooperation. There are some striking exceptions, but as officials change, cooperation may wane. Right now, the Mayor of Pittsburgh and the Chief Executive of Allegheny County appear to be getting along just fine. Will that be true of the next mayor and the next county executive? Will the city council and county council cooperate

- - - -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

fully for the best interests of our citizens? Are citizens relegated to a mere hope that the officials of different government units who preside over us will cooperate? Even if cooperation were perfect, which it never is, we simply do not need duplications. If we were starting today, we would not create such duplications.

One of the realities of governmental units is that we now think regionally. Not simply county wide, but regionally. That's our competition. ComPAC 21 proved this in our report. We looked at counties throughout the entire United States. We intensively studied six counties, and I remember that one of the counties contiquous to Allegheny County has a three commissioner system, as most do, and one of those commissioners came to a meeting, and he was very, very interested in cooperating regionally, but he made a statement at that meeting. He said, if we do this, it will be unique. And I said, why? And he said, because the last time we cooperated was during the French and Indian War. And he was right. Imagine every contiguous county in Allegheny County joining together and simply going to Harrisburg, much less Washington. What kind of stock would we have then? We would then compare for the first time to

- - - -

Philadelphia.

2.3

The purpose of a governmental unit is not to enlarge the number of government jobs and vested power interests, and that's being recognized throughout the country now. Again, we studied these counties throughout America and we studied six intensively, and let me tell you what we found very quickly. This is our competition.

business or moving a business, you walk into a room with a group of government officials and business leaders. Both political parties are represented.

They would provide you with complete information about the opportunities in the county and region. They would provide expertise concerning all of your needs.

They would help you discover the best location. Do you need job training? We'll take care of that. What about licenses, permits, other regulations? We'll take care of these. What about taxes? Our tax rates are highly competitive. That's the competition. We don't seem to understand that, but that is the competition.

We asked these leaders about their competitors. They constantly monitor the counties and regions they deem to be their competitors, and after

- - - -

2.3

listening to them talk about this, we finally said, well, what about Allegheny County? As nicely as they could, they responded somewhat reluctantly, Allegheny County is not really on our list of competitors at this time. That's devastating. It's devastating when you recognize that the people and assets of our county and region are typically much more significant than the people and assets of the places that are eating our lunch.

A highly efficient government structure will not ensure economic development, but without it, such development is impossible in the 21st century. We learned that in our studies, and I think that's empirically verifiable. The region can enjoy vast economic development, our region. I believe our region is on the cusp of being rediscovered by many more Americans as one of the great places to live, work, and retire in the entire country.

The psychological effect of becoming the tenth largest city in America is important. It's also important that we have run out of things to tax in the city and the county. We do not need more and higher taxes. We need more taxpayers. I think we can assure that economic development and the quality of life will occur through this critical step. It's another step

- - - -

of consolidating the city and the county.

Thank you very much.

2.3

MR. MULLER: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to be here today, and I promise you that I'll spare you the typical verbose professorial lecture.

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Excuse me. Please identify yourself for the court reporter.

MR. MULLER: Edward K. Muller. I'm a professor of history at the University of Pittsburgh.

So, anyway, I'll spare you that lecture and get right to the point. And I would like to say that this brief overview that I intend to present builds very nicely on the point that Dr. Murray has just made, and that the bottom line, the import here is that we have really throughout our history always faced changing demographic, economic, and social conditions which local government has had to adjust to in terms of governments. That's been an ongoing theme across America and here as well, and it's usually one in which we have to catch up, just by the nature of the changes that occur around us, and then we begin to look at our structures to see if they are serving us well.

- - - -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

To an historian, the current discussion about the consolidation of the City of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County governments seems like a logical and compelling next step in a long process begun in the 19th century. Annexations of surrounding territory by Pittsburgh began before the Civil War and continued through the initial three decades of the 20th century. These annexations stemmed from the understanding at the time that consolidation of contiguous urban settlement obtained economies in basic services, enhanced infrastructure planning, and represented more accurately to the nation the real economic and demographic status of the city. Much of this consolidation through annexation was accomplished under the rubric of Greater Pittsburgh. Indeed, the logic of consolidation was so powerful that a referendum in 1929 to establish a broad metropolitan government, advanced vociferously by the Civic Club of Allegheny County, won a two-thirds majority of voters but failed on the basis of an unusually high and technical standard established by the enabling legislation.

Even though many boroughs and townships actually initiated the annexation process, not all suburban municipalities look favorably upon

- - - -

2.3

annexation, and they adamantly resisted the city's overtures. Nonetheless, the logic of functional cooperation remained a strong force. For example, in 1911, the state legislature, in creating the City Planning Commission, authorized this new city body to draw up plans, though without enforcement powers, for the city and an area extending three miles beyond the city limits. Despite the legislature's recognition of the real functioning space for planning, extra-territorial planning by the city was not carried out.

Over the years, however, the city and the county had to coordinate the development of bridges, highways, and public buildings, though often after considerable acrimony. During the course of doing business, as the county became more urbanized, the two governments consolidated in various forms many functions, including, but not limited to, sewage treatment, ALCOSAN, smoke control, crime lab work, voter registration, mass transit, the Port Authority, real estate assessment, health department, public auditoriums, welfare, and most recently, the 911 system. And we've heard several more today.

The Regional Asset District and revenue distribution represents another form of cooperation.

- - - -

2.3

The historical record shows that most of these cooperative steps involved extensive discussion, hand wringing, and sometimes acrimony among public officials, but most consolidated operations have long functioned as intended with the dire predictions and acrimony receding in our memories and left for us historians to pick over.

Home Rule might be considered as another step by which local governments sought to overcome outdated charters and codes in order to develop the means to govern at appropriate levels. The wisdom of Home Rule engendered ongoing discussions in the post-war era and culminated in public approval of Home Rule charters for the county and the city. These charters increased the flexibility the governments need to solve some local service functions, but I should add they don't go far enough.

The fact that a striking number of these consolidations of functions took place in the 1950s underscores another important point, the importance of unified leadership and vision. As we all know, the 1950s was the heyday of Pittsburgh's ambitious and renowned renaissance. It was a time when public and private leaders formed a powerful and effective partnership and spoke with one voice, or at least as

- - - -

2.3

nearly as one voice as the region has ever seen.

Renaissance accomplished great things in the city and the county, but some things were overlooked, and with changing social and political realities, the partnership fell apart at the end of the 1960s, symbolically, at least, over the effort to create an innovative rapid transit system known as Skybus.

The point is, when civic leaders shared similar visions for two decades after World War II, the region redeveloped the downtown, improved its environment, modernized a lot of infrastructure, and a point often overlooked in the conventional story of Renaissance, consolidated many governmental functions. Pittsburgh and, by association in the minds of people across the nation, Allegheny County reaped incredible public relation rewards for its accomplishments.

Historically, at least, the renaissance unity might be seen as more the exception than the rule. For example, leaders and planners in the 1920s and '30s struggled to resolve serious infrastructural challenges. They developed ambitious plans for retrofitting the city to the new automobile technology and for accommodating a rapidly suburbanizing county. The devil, however, was literally in the details. Jealousies between city and county planners, the

- - - -

2.3

diverse interests of different business stakeholders, and, most importantly, squabbles among political leaders impeded the finalization of plans and, accordingly, their implementation. The East Parkway, the Crosstown Boulevard, even the highways along the Monongahela and Allegheny riverfronts were all part of this planning but were all stalled by the fragmentation of political power needed to resolve the details. These projects awaited the unity of the renaissance to be moved forward.

Though not unique to Pittsburgh, the divided administrative structure remains the final obstacle to rationalizing the government of the metropolitan region's central core. Over the years, local leaders have pursued annexation, functional cooperation and consolidation, and Home Rule to address the needs and issues which arise with continued urbanization. This long process has enhanced the provision of services for the populations, but it has not been able to overcome the disadvantages of divided leadership and vision which have so often characterized this region. The current discussions for a more complete governmental consolidation involve what might be viewed as the next logical step in this process.

Thank you.

- - - -

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: I believe you are Mr. Santilli?

MR. SANTILLI: Yes.

2.3

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: I don't see here written comments, but we are behind schedule. I know we do have your testimony. If you could expedite it, I appreciate it.

MR. SANTILLI: I promise it will be fairly brief. Enzo Santilli, managing director of MarketSphere Consulting.

My involvement in this actually began when I was part of the Leadership Pittsburgh group that studied five different mergers -- and this was about three years ago -- each of which we studied along five different elements in terms of its impact on the labor and work force and minority representation and various angles. The group report was made available to Chancellor Nordenberg's committee, and I believe they incorporated some of that in the report that they found. And I believe when you also look at the RAND report, it had many of the same themes. So it was encouraging just to see as different groups study this, they all reached the same pros and cons and different factors.

It was my strong sense and the group that I

- - - -

2.3

worked with sense that an effort like this should move forward based on several things. One was the economic development factor, which, again, the RAND report further detailed. The ability to conduct regional planning was a theme that we heard from all of the other cities and counties that we talked about that were now merged. More importantly, the ability to have that single voice, which may not sound as important within the county but is very important when you talk to groups outside of the county, the groups that you're either lobbying for funds with or trying to coordinate government efforts.

We found that it was less about saving huge dollars today. I think the points that have been brought up in some of the reports about things moving maybe to the higher service levels and the higher wage scales are probably a fair point and a fair criticism of this, but it was more about the smarter role of government moving forward and how do you invest the next wave of dollars and the next set of investments.

The thing that was most striking to us was none of the groups that we talked to in five other mergers ever looked back, ever dissolved it. It never really came up for a vote, so we understand that one in four of these have ever passed when taken to a

- - - -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

referendum, but it was very interesting to see none of the groups would ever look back, much the way I don't think anybody is out there today advocating that the North Side or the South Side should become their respective own cities again. Maybe there is a few out there, but not too many.

Then I wanted to address this just as a person who works -- the firm that I co-lead is a management consulting and accounting and technology advisory firm, and so we work with a number of clients from all of the cities. We have offices in ten cities nationwide. We serviced last year 27 major companies here in the Pittsburgh area, and most of my clientele are people that are CEOs, CFOs, or a chief level person. Most of them, repeatedly when this issue comes up in conversation, talk about the idea that they just want to invest in regions that have That's probably the most important thing to momentum. It's not about whether you can cite some them. specific empirical study which says this is going to make \$53 million better or some kind of number. just don't want to see a place where it's fragmented. I had one leader tell me about how just to get the parking lot paved, he had to coordinate with three different entities because it was a county road and

- - - -

the two bordering municipalities.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Clearly, what's before us does not address all of it, and the comments about there are still independent municipalities in this, but it's considered, I think, by many to be a momentum play. It's a huge step forward. I remember when Mr. Onorato took office, one of the speeches he gave early on about reducing row offices was just his goal of changing the psyche of the region, and I think it did have a positive effect in terms of just saying we can make some change, and that is often what you see. Ι can't pretend to represent the entire business community, by any means, but that is clearly the common theme that you see when you talk about this with people. It's just they want to see a momentum They want to invest in places where there is particularly a strong bias toward moving forward, rather than just doing more of the same.

And so I guess with due respect to the time here, I think the other model that we studied was realizing that while it would not incorporate every municipality, certainly we thought the school district concept was way too massive. It was the study in our group that perhaps the model could go forward after the city and county consolidated, they could offer up

- - - -

2.3

services to the municipalities that could then decide to opt in based on the efficiency and dynamics of it. And then over time, you would probably see a more consolidated play, but to try to do it all at one time would probably be too massive. So it was just seen as a step forward.

And then my final comment, rightly or wrongly, I live in a school district that includes six municipalities, and my ten-year-old son, who knows nothing about my involvement in this or what I'm doing, just said to me, dad, I don't understand why we have all these places and why we keep seeing all these different police cars and all these different street signs. This sounds kind of stupid to me. Why aren't we all just one? And I didn't really have a good answer for him, other than to tell him that I agree.

MR. JENSEN: Thank you for this opportunity to speak this morning/afternoon regarding the consolidation of the City of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County. My name is Brian Jensen. I am a senior vice president with the Pennsylvania Economy League of Southwestern Pennsylvania, where I manage the local government function and structure program. The goal of that program is to make Pennsylvania local government, particularly that of Southwestern

- - - -

Pennsylvania, Allegheny County, and the City of Pittsburgh, less costly, more efficient, more effective, better focused, more coherently led, and more competitive economically.

2.3

The Economy League has publicly promoted the value of better government for many years. From the early 1950s when our organization staffed the Metropolitan Study Commission of Allegheny County that recommended a full rationalization of functions and service delivery among the various levels and units of local government in Allegheny County to address post-war suburban sprawl to the City/County Cooperative Services Program of the early 1990s that was intended to promote extensive functional consolidation between Allegheny County and the City of Pittsburgh, the Economy League has been actively involved in trying to foster intergovernmental cooperation to enhance effectiveness and cost efficiencies.

It is in the light of PEL's tradition of researching and promoting good government management and structures that we undertook a two-year-long analysis of city-county consolidations across the country. This afternoon, I would like to convey to the committee some of the highlights of our research

- - - -

2.3

and offer some conclusions on what we think it means for the current discussion. I believe you have my testimony and you'll have copies of my slides in my testimony. For the rest of you, I have slides up on the screen.

PEL researched consolidation in Athens,
Augusta, and Columbus, Georgia; Baton Rouge and
Lafayette, Louisiana; Indianapolis; Jacksonville;
Kansas City, Kansas; Lexington and Louisville,
Kentucky; and Nashville. These are the major
city-county consolidations that have occurred since
World War II. While state laws differ and each
consolidation took on characteristics specific to its
unique situation, a study of these city-county
consolidations reveals a number of commonalties.

As the slide before you shows, the main goal of these consolidations was to unify local leadership and vision in pursuit of a single community and economic agenda. Pittsburgh and Allegheny County have a history of competing agendas, as the previous speaker mentioned, Dr. Muller, from the differences over Skybus to who should develop the convention center hotel. We have had squabble in between the city and county. Consolidation elevates the city's visibility, and this increases its competitiveness by

- - - -

2.3

moving it higher from the top 10 or top 20 lists of every conceivable comparison. Such visibility equates to free advertising, economic development is bolstered, consumer and investor confidence is increased, and the public is generally satisfied with the results.

While cost savings has not been the primary goal elsewhere, we know that city-county consolidation eliminates service redundancy. The City of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County governments perform a diverse range of functions. A number of those functions overlap. As you can see in this slide of the combined \$1.1 billion of city and county budget, \$38 million is essentially wasted in duplicated functions. PEL estimates that this amount can be captured by consolidating the two governments. And I might add, we think that's a very conservative estimate.

This review of other city-county consolidations suggests a number of best practices for our consideration if we are to proceed with consolidating the City of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County. We cannot amend our present government structures or their practices in hopes of securing the benefits that other consolidated city-counties cite. Instead, we should abolish the existing city and

- - - -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

county and create a new classification of local government, a consolidated city-county. Only by doing this can we discard what is obsolete and establish the vital characteristics of a workable jointure, such as the establishment of an urban service district that ensures the urban services continue without tapping the tax base in the suburbs. Likewise, an urban service district is a mechanism whereby city legacy costs do not become the responsibility of all. At the same time, residents of the urban service district do not need to fear a loss of representation if we follow the model that is used in Nashville, whereby a majority of council members who represent the urban service district must ratify council actions that affect the urban service district exclusively. charter should be drafted locally to determine how many district and at-large seats the new government should have and to decide other details of the consolidation.

No consolidation approved by referendum since World War II has been a full consolidation of all the municipalities in the county. The successful practice elsewhere has been to consolidate only the central city government and county government and to leave suburban municipalities, school districts, and

- - - -

volunteer fire departments out of the mix. In most cases, however, these successful consolidations have provided mechanisms for other municipalities to join the consolidated government voluntarily.

2.3

The next three slides attempt to illustrate how this consolidation would work. The City of Pittsburgh, shown in the light gold, is one of 130 municipal governments in Allegheny County.

Additionally, Allegheny County, shown in darker gold, performs various governmental functions. Under consolidation, Greater Pittsburgh, as we have been calling it for convenience sake, would function as the government of both Allegheny County and the City of Pittsburgh. All the other municipalities remain unaffected by the consolidation.

The final point I would like to make today, Mr. Chairman, is how city-county consolidation would affect the stature of Pittsburgh and the local perception. As the map shows currently, 56 U.S. cities are larger than the City of Pittsburgh. Under consolidation, only nine U.S. cities would be larger than Greater Pittsburgh. Greater Pittsburgh would fall just behind Dallas, if we could go to the final table. We would no longer be smaller than Wichita, Anaheim, or Cincinnati.

- - - -

2.3

Thank you, again, Mr. Chairman for the opportunity to share our research on this issue, and I would be happy to address any questions you may have.

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Representative Maher?

REPRESENTATIVE MAHER: I realize we're behind the clock, so I'm going to ask brisk questions and request brisk responses.

Dr. Murray, you've done so very much for this region, and I'm glad you reminded us of the 564 vote landslide. Do you expect that had there been less due diligence, less imagination about the objections that are perceivable that we would have Home Rule today?

MR. MURRAY: No. I think we would not have Home Rule today. I think the education process was critical. I think it was absolutely essential, and I think one of the reasons for that is because we were changing 200 years of history. Whenever you do that, regardless of how rational the change sounds, people are very, very concerned about it.

And I won't prolong this answer, but I want to go back to something now judge and former controller Frank Lucchino used to talk about, because Frank and I got together and we said, why can't we just change Pittsburgh's current government charter to a Home Rule

- - - -

2.3

charter? Now, that wouldn't change anything at that time, but it would enable us to do other things. And we went around and talked to people about it. We talked to people in the community, community leaders. Everybody came from Missouri all of a sudden. What's it going to look like? Well, we don't know what it's going to look like. It just enables us to get it done.

So I think the point is there have to be answers to these questions, and if the answers are not clear, if the average person cannot understand them, there is no possibility of this succeeding.

REPRESENTATIVE MAHER: You heard

Representative Frankel's and my comments earlier -
and I appreciate your attendance -- about the concerns

of a premature journey to the ballot box.

MR. MURRAY: Uh-huh.

REPRESENTATIVE MAHER: Do you have any reaction?

MR. MURRAY: I think a massive education effort has to precede that journey to the ballot box. I think people have to understand how critical it is that we make this kind of change and exactly what kind of effect it's going to have on that.

REPRESENTATIVE MAHER: Thank you. With

- - - -

2.3

the measurement, Mr. Jensen, of nine versus 57 in terms of the size, what standard were you using, MSAs? We wouldn't change MSAs. This is just a nomenclature exercise.

MR. JENSEN: No. That's city size. So the City of Pittsburgh would go from being No. 57 to No. 9.

REPRESENTATIVE MAHER: Couldn't we accomplish that same goal just by renaming Allegheny County the City of Pittsburgh? I am curious. If it's just a matter of how the label looks, well, that's pretty easy.

MR. JENSEN: I guess the way I would respond to that is if you take a look at the 50 largest cities in the United States, you'll see that just about 15, maybe 16 of them are consolidated city-counties, and they are within the top 50 cities because they have consolidated.

REPRESENTATIVE MAHER: New York still has five boroughs, but nobody gets confused about New York City. So maybe we could be the City of Pittsburgh with 130 municipalities. I'm not encouraging it. I'm just asking if this number ranking means so much, maybe we need to explore that.

And one just final thought -- and, Dr. Murray,

- - - -

so glad you mentioned it -- about Home Rule charter.

Has anybody examined whether or not, under Allegheny

County's Home Rule charter, the City of Pittsburgh's

Home Rule charter, whether or not the two entities as

they exist today under their charters could proceed

towards a referendum on this very question?

MR. MURRAY: I'm not aware of anybody doing that, but I assume it has been considered, but maybe you've hit upon something that should be looked at.

REPRESENTATIVE MAHER: Somebody should perhaps research that question.

Thank you.

2.3

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Representative Frankel?

REPRESENTATIVE FRANKEL: Thank you.

Brian, we've talked about this for a long time, and I understand and embrace the ideas of stature and efficiencies and so forth, but when I take a look at the proposal for the urban services district, it doesn't address, I think, concerns of the city's long-term financial viability, ultimately.

When I sit down -- and I appreciated Mayor
Ravenstahl's assessment of how things have improved
and the certain surplus situation, but any five-year

- - - -

2.3

budget projection that I've looked at and in my conversations with the Act 47 administrator and the oversight board is that the city's finances, that environment is not sustainable given the current structure, other than cutting out services to an extent that just are unthinkable.

So when I look at this, I don't know what ultimately the city itself, in terms of trying to get itself financially right sided, right sized and viable, benefits from this other than the stature and some efficiencies, ultimately. These other issues that are latent, the city's debt, the city's unfunded pension liability, are a hard part of this discussion. At the end of the day, you know, in order to get this sold, you're going to have to basically give a protection to all the county people saying, hey, don't worry about it. You're not going to be on the hook for anything. You continue to pay your \$52 emergency services fee to the city, we don't even adjust for inflation, and it took us 45 years to change that from \$10.

So from my perspective, as all these things are terrific and I'd like to see them done, but we are ignoring one of the core issues that confronts our city and our region, and that is how do we fix, in the

- - - -

2.3

long run, the city. I understand there are going to be benefits here, our stature, efficiency, one economic development agency will promote growth, but there is a lag period of time to see all those things happen, and I think what happens to the bond rating, for instance, for the combined entity, or is there a separate bond rating?

I mean, there are a lot of, I think, complicated questions here that, as much as I want to embrace the concept, I think some of these things ought to still be worked out. Maybe you can address some of those concerns.

MR. JENSEN: Thanks, Representative Frankel.

Just the bond rating, you may have marked in Tom VanKirk's testimony as he was reading the letter from Greater Louisville, Inc., that letter cites their bond rating has increased substantially over the bond rating of the previously existing City of Louisville and Jefferson County. So they did see that.

REPRESENTATIVE FRANKEL: Could you not see the reverse potentially happening, though, in this situation since Louisville was financially stable, healthy? My assumption is Louisville may not have had an A plus bond rating. They probably had a much

- - - -

better bond rating than the City of Pittsburgh does today. You could have the reverse dynamic of impacting the county's bond rating.

2.3

MR. JENSEN: Honestly, neither Louisville nor Jefferson County were particularly healthy financially. I wouldn't categorize them as the same category as the City of Pittsburgh, but neither one was a particularly healthy community at the time, so a consolidation certainly helped their bond ratings.

Just addressing what happens with pension costs and debt service, the money is owed and it has to be paid by somebody, and the question is who should pay? We do not believe that there is enough political advertising or jawboning that would get Allegheny County suburban residents to pick up that tab. I just don't believe that that will happen. I'm just trying to be very honest about it.

So what do you do? We believe that city-county consolidation is going to save a fair amount of money. As I said, conservatively, we estimate \$38 million. We think that there is potentially much more money available. Some amount of that could be put towards these legacy costs. So that's the beginning of addressing the issue.

And I think the other part is that we

- - - -

2.3

shouldn't downplay what we have learned from other city-county consolidations, and that is that they are a boost to economic development and they do generate growth and generating growth is going to generate more tax revenues, and it also provides that single elected leadership voice to go and do what elected leaders do, and that is to lobby for more goods to come back home.

So perhaps through those mechanisms, we'll be in a better position to resolve those issues. The status quo, however, if we don't do those things, does not look very encouraging to me from where I sit.

REPRESENTATIVE FRANKEL: I would agree with you, and as I expressed to many of my colleagues, we may have some issues with this, but I think the public -- and there may be parochial interests ultimately that still complicate this. I think the public understands that the status quo isn't acceptable, so I do agree with you on that issue.

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Representative Kortz?

REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, gentlemen, for your testimony.

Any of you that wants to answer this can.

I'll just throw this out. Hypothetical situation: If

- - - -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

we do nothing, there are certain assumptions that we can be assured of. The population is in decline in this area and the city is in Act 47. Although we're pulling out of it, it's incremental, but if we do nothing, where are we 25 years from now, if nothing happens, if we continue to fight.

Dr. Muller, you may want to chime in on this, because you're the historian. Where are we if we do nothing 25 years from now?

MR. MURRAY: The City of Pittsburgh is not going to be able to take care of its problems, period. It's not going to happen. Therefore, if we do nothing, we will have a continuous decline. And we may have the answer taken from us, because the city will simply not be available. One of the issues that I'd like to think about is why do we need the city and spending \$38 million a year more, at least, anyway? Why is there a condition that we have to fix the city's finances? If that's the condition, forget it. It's not going to happen. The Mayor said today -- I heard him testify before this group that \$100 million was now available and some of that money was going to be used to pay off the debt. So how many years is it going to take to take care of that \$800 million debt? Is it 40 years, is it 50 years, assuming that

- - - -

everything goes particularly well.

2.3

So as I suggested in my opening statement, it's simply not a viable option. We've got to think about something else. At least we would start paying off the city debt, not thrusting it on the county, not thrusting it on the municipalities, by the savings that we would have if the city simply did not exist as it now exists.

MR. MULLER: I'd like to take off the history hat for a minute and relate something that comes from being at the University of Pittsburgh. I look around the room here and we all are within a certain generational groove or higher in terms of age, and a lot of the students I teach or have taught over the years have moved on into the business world, government, nonprofit world, and one of the themes I hear over and over and over again, either as they are frustrated or they are actually leaving, is, of course, the jobs issue. But it's also a perception that this region is stuck in the past and that other regions are moving forward, the momentum play, as you put it.

And I'm talking about 30-year-olds and 35-year-olds who are -- look at our mayor, who is in a position of responsibility. These people are in

- - - -

2.3

positions of responsibility, often in nonprofits.

That's something from urban studies. We send a lot in that direction. And I get the same thing back over and over again, and I do believe, as we've heard earlier today, that this does send a signal that could be very valuable in that respect as well.

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Gentlemen, thank you all very much. We appreciate your time and being with us here today.

The next group is Allegheny League of
Municipalities, Richard Dunlap as executive director.

Do we also have Herbert Hartle, chairman of the board of directors, and Robert Powers, first vice chair.

Gentlemen, as you know, we are way behind. We only have the room for a couple more minutes and we have your testimony. We'd appreciate it if you could hit the high points.

MR. DUNLAP: Let me go through as quickly as I can, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I'm Richard Dunlap. I am the executive director of the Allegheny League of Municipalities. I first want to thank you for inviting us to speak on this very important issue today. With me today on my right is Herb Hartle, chairman of the board of directors of the Allegheny League of Municipalities. He is also

- - - -

2.3

president of the council of Ohio Township. And to my left is our first vice chairman of the Allegheny League of Municipalities, Robert Powers, and he is also the president of the council of the Town of McCandless, so we have the suburbanites represented here.

Our association has been watching and listening to the discussion of the subject of merging the governments of the City of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County with great interest. We have not yet taken a position on the issue and we are unlikely to do so until more details are known. As has been said, the devil is in the details.

I think it's fair to say, however, that the suburban municipalities have two major concerns with a merger. I think you've heard about these concerns today, and I will go over them quickly.

First of all, the suburban municipalities would be opposed to any sort of merger that would in any way force them to merge or consolidate. They believe that any change in government structure of the suburban community should be initiated by themselves, not imposed on them. Mostly, they are doing an excellent job of delivering services to their residents in a very efficient manner and do not want

- - - -

to see any changes to their local governments.

2.3

We understand that the current discussion is limited to the City of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County and that it would not touch the suburban municipalities or the school districts. We would strongly urge you not to expand it beyond the city and the county.

Our second concern is that even if the suburban communities are not directly affected by a merger of the city and county, there might be some indirect affect on them. Specifically, the concern is that taxes paid to the county by the suburban residents might somehow be used to pay off the city's debts or to subsidize the city in providing services to the core of the merged city and county. The suburban communities would be opposed to any such indirect negative impact on their taxpayers.

We understand that the proposal is to create an urban services district, which would have a separate tax structure so that the existing city residents would be responsible for paying off the city's pre-existing debts, including the underfunding of the city's pension plans. Under this plan, county taxes should not increase to the suburbs due to any merger.

- - - -

2.3

We believe that this is the right approach, and I believe our association would be supportive of legislation that carefully protects the financial interests of the suburban communities. I think your challenge is to draft legislation that very clearly accomplishes these two goals. You will find many people who will view any merger proposal very suspiciously. They will be looking for loopholes that might somehow encourage or allow forced mergers of the suburban communities, or that would somehow, either directly or indirectly, result in the suburban residents being taxed to pay off the city's debts.

Again, I understand that the objective is to merge only the city and the county and not to change the school districts or the suburban municipalities in any way and to fashion a model that would protect the suburbs from paying the city's debts. Your difficult job would be to somehow write this into the legislation in a clear and convincing manner so that there are no loopholes to this protection.

I want to add one other thing. Some people may be of the opinion that the suburban municipalities are always negative to new ideas and act as obstacles to progress. I do not agree with that view. Most of the suburban municipalities are run by reasonable and

- - - -

2.3

conscientious people who want the best for the city and the county, as well as their own municipality. However, they are elected to run their municipality, not the run the city and county. Their residents expect them to act in their best interests, and they do their best to do so.

Most of them also recognize that a vital and growing city and county is good for their municipalities, and because of that, I think most of them will be supportive of any proposal that realistically shows promise of genuinely helping the region. But you have to appreciate the fact that the first duty is to the voters who elected them to be watchdogs on their behalf. As long as you recognize this and the legislation does not unfairly penalize them, I think you will find a receptive audience in the suburbs to any proposal that will help the region, including the city-county merger.

I want to thank the subcommittee for proactively seeking input from various groups before the legislation is drafted. You have a difficult task before you, and I wish you good luck.

And I know time is short. I don't know if they want these gentlemen to make a statement or you just want to question us.

- - - -

MR. POWERS: Rob Powers from McCandless.

I think Dick stated our position very clearly, so it
will save some time, okay?

2.3

MR. HARTLE: Thank you. Herb Hartle of Ohio Township. One thing is we do put our money where our mouth is. In Ohio Township, we serve eight other communities for police service. The gentleman that was here before, if you are driving through (inaudible), the only police car you should see is the Ohio Township police officers. So we do.

And I just had one of our secretaries put together some numbers. The communities we do service -- this is one year without Ben Avon -- 1.3 million those communities saved. On the other side of that, a much larger and complex police department than you had prior to coming to service with us. So we were at the forefront of some of this and it does work.

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: I do have a comment. ALOM has always been very good. First of all, I want to thank you for being here. It's usually reversed. I'm usually on your panel speaking to your group, but I think you guys do a great job and I think you can help us in the process.

Dr. Murray had mentioned earlier about

- - - -

2.3

education. It's a long education process, and your group has been fantastic about getting information to the municipalities and teaching them that it's not about this and it's not about that, basically to cut to the chase and get to what this is all about. And think we're going to have to actually count on your organization to help us, because you have the ability with your conferences and resources.

As far as Ohio Township, you're right. I was a commissioner in Wilkinsburg, and I remember you guys were one of the first communities to police other communities, and now more and more, those communities are following that lead and, basically, you guys. Thank you for that.

Anyone else with any questions, comments?

(No response.)

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Gentlemen, thank you, and I appreciate your speed on that. That helped us out.

Our final group is Suzanne Broughton, who is president of the League of Women Voters of Greater Pittsburgh; Court Gould, executive director of Sustainable Pittsburgh; Erin Molchany, executive director of Pittsburgh Urban Magnet Project; and Nancy Washington, a civic activist.

- - - -

2.3

As you all know, we are on limited time, so if you could just touch on the highlights of your presentations, we would appreciate it. Please do not forget to identify yourself for the court reporter.

MS. BROUGHTON: Good afternoon. I'm
Suzanne Broughton, president of the League of Women
Voters of Greater Pittsburgh. I'm going to
dramatically cut my remarks, both in the interest of
time, although I'm a little miffed at that, because I
think the committee really didn't schedule for some of
the very interesting questions that its members had to
ask and might in the future leave more time and also
because --

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: This is actually the first one. We plan to do several.

MS. BROUGHTON: And also because I think I want to add something in the end of this that isn't in my remarks.

So I'm here to strongly urge the House Urban
Affairs Committee to develop legislation that will
enable the citizens of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County
to effect a structural merger and to see that
legislation through the full House of Representatives.

The League has supported the passage of all three Home Rule attempts until we got it passed and

- - - -

the row office reduction, and our Representative Maher, we very much know the importance of public education.

2.3

We are very encouraged by the emergence of political and civic leadership that makes the outlook brighter in terms of change and the support of the Chief Executive and the Mayor. I'm going to skip the paragraph about the scope of the study. I think we've beaten that to death.

I will say that the main thrust of the Nordenberg report is improvement of the competitive position of the Pittsburgh region, and with respect to this region, the report states that in a fast moving 20^{th} century economy characterized by global contests among highly competitive regions, its future is far from certain. And I spent about 21 years as a tech writer at a high tech company. I think I understand that.

I am going to skip, again, most of the rest of the next paragraph, except to say that the Nordenberg committee did a very thorough job of researching this.

So to go down to the bottom of my second page, the task of the legislature is to revise those aspects of the state law that stand in the way of consolidation. I understand these to be twofold.

- - - -

2.3

First, the law authorizing consolidations of municipalities does not define second class cities as municipalities and, therefore, does not authorize Pittsburgh to consolidate or change that.

And, second, the same law requires a uniform tax rate across merged or consolidated units of local government. A proposed solution to that is the new section in Title 53 on municipal corporations that would give us an urban services district and general services district, and I think we've adequately discussed that. But we would support that.

We know that many legislators will share the concerns, some of the concerns raised in the Nordenberg report and some of those that were listed by Mayor Ravenstahl, the legislative districts and minority representation, employee rights and benefits, responsible plan to address legacy costs.

What I want to emphasize is that those matters are properly addressed by the city and the county as they write their consolidation charter. I would like to encourage those legislators strongly to resist the temptation to include constraints on those matters in the legislation that enables consolidation. Those positions that are absolutely necessary for consolidation should be included, and the county and

- - - -

2.3

the city should be able to appoint a group that solves the rest of those problems, though they are important.

And now what isn't in my remarks, so I'm going to ad lib here for a minute. And Representative Blackwell isn't here, but I'd like to comment on his remarks earlier in the day, what, two and a half hours ago, something like that, when he said that he is concerned about the noninclusion of the school district. And I think he raised a very important point about the inequity in school district funding.

I am a resident of the suburbs, one who does support this, and I raised my children in a district that benefits from the inequities which he was speaking about, but I'd like to remind him and the legislature that for many, many years, the legislature has had the power to undo some of that problem themselves.

When I moved here in -- well, almost 40 years ago, the legislature supported 50 percent of school district funding, and it's now about 32, 33, 35, maybe, whatever it is. And so it seems to me I have now presented, really, a position of the League of Women Voters of Pennsylvania, our state organization, but the legislature has the power to click together three times the heels of its little red shoes and say,

- - - -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

I want to go home or I want to go back. I want to do the 50 percent that should have been done, and in the process probably could rearrange the funding formula to undo some of what Mr. Blackwell rightfully acknowledges.

But somebody would probably say to me that, no, we can't do that, because the suburban legislators would never let this happen, and maybe that's been the case over time. That's probably true. So I would say to Representative Blackwell, yes, that's true, and the same thing is true of the charter. If we try to bite off too much in doing the consolidation, we will have the same problems that we had with the first two versions of the Home Rule charter where we tried to bite off the row office consolidations and it didn't We had to put that off and eventually it happened. We would be wise to only bite off a piece of the problem that we really think we might have a chance of solving, which is the city and county consolidation and not to include the school districts or the municipalities, though some day we might want to do that.

There is an interesting sentence at the end of the report which talks about achieving higher levels of efficiencies and effectiveness while promoting

- - - -

2.3

regional unity in an increasingly competitive world without eliminating the distinctive features of small town governments that may be attractive to citizens in some municipalities.

So as the name suggests, the League of Women Voters believe strongly in the power of voting and voters, so we ask you today to craft and pass enabling legislation that will both move this consolidation process forward and, most importantly, put the question of consolidation before the voters on a future ballot. And we thank you very much for this opportunity to discussion our views.

Not too bad. Who is next?

MS. MOLCHANY: Questions for Sue Broughton?

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Go on.

MS. MOLCHANY: My name is Erin Molchany, and I'm the executive director of PUMP, which is the Pittsburgh Urban Magnet Protect.

I'd first like to thank the committee for considering PUMP's testimony here at the public hearing. I promise it's brief.

PUMP is a membership organization with over 1200 members. Our mission is to make Pittsburgh a more dynamic and diverse place to live by inspiring

- - - -

2.3

young and young thinking people to effect change through civic engagement, social networking, and community development. We focused educational and advocacy efforts on municipal consolidations since 2004, hosting two educational forums and surveying our members on the issue. I'm here to present the opinions of PUMP members to the Urban Affairs Committee, tell you about how we can be helpful to this process, and reinforce our commitment to seeing this issue through to the most effective and efficient result for the good of our city and our region.

In 2004, 80 percent of PUMP members identified municipal consolidation as one of the most important issues facing the region. At PUMP, we work hard to educate our members about all sides of an issue. We survey them to learn of their opinions and we communicate those opinions to decision makers on their behalf.

When municipal consolidation first became an issue of importance to our members, we hosted a forum featuring members of city council, the mayor, county executive, state legislators, attorneys, and the deputy mayor of Louisville, Kentucky, which had recently gone through the city-county consolidation.

Following the forum, we surveyed members and

- - - -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

learned of the following: 83 percent of PUMP members supported Pennsylvania State House Resolution 568, which recommended that the state appoint a consolidation task force to study municipal consolidation in Pittsburgh/Allegheny County and make recommendations to the state legislature. 72 percent support a plan to merge the City of Pittsburgh and County of Allegheny government structures and associated services under one government. 52 percent felt that Pittsburgh and Allegheny County should replicate the Louisville model of municipal consolidation, merging the city and county while leaving the rest of Allegheny County's municipalities 35 percent were unsure if the Louisville model alone. was the right model for Pittsburgh. 65 percent of our members felt it was very important to develop a tax revenue sharing agreement with surrounding municipalities, allowing for improved land use planning. 27 percent felt that the establishment of a tax revenue sharing agreement was only somewhat important.

Based on the results of the survey, we deduced that PUMP members who are young and young thinking individuals of diverse professional backgrounds are open to a consolidation plan that they believe will

- - - -

2.1

2.3

create more efficient, effective forms of governance that will allow our region to more successfully compete in the global economy. We look forward to learning more about the specific role of Pittsburgh neighborhoods and communities in the system of representation of a consolidated city and county.

Being that a majority of our members are young professionals who fall between the ages of 25 and 35, I ask that you weigh our members' opinions heavily, because they are the future leaders, residents, and work force of our region. They will inherit the benefits and the faults of our existing system and continue to look to new technology and processes that will make our lives easier and the city more competitive.

From their feedback, we also learned that 90 percent would like to see PUMP hold additional forums to learn more about the specific municipal consolidation proposals for our city and county, which brings me to PUMP's commitment to advancing this issue.

We will continue to educate and share information about municipal consolidation with our 1200-plus members as the issue develops. We will continue to encourage young people to contact their

- - - -

2.3

state and local legislators to voice their opinions and provide them tips and training to advocate effectively. 97 percent of the PUMP members are registered to vote and they are very interested in initiatives that improve the quality of life in our city.

Please consider PUMP a resource. We endeavor to be a go-to organization with the opinions of young professionals. We appreciate your leadership and look forward to supporting your efforts to bring a referendum on this issue to the electorate.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

MR. GOULD: Hi. My name is Court Gould.

I'm the executive director of Sustainable Pittsburgh.

We're a nonprofit organization in the purview of the ten county region of Southwestern Pennsylvania.

I have provided my remarks, so I think I'll just paraphrase the high points that Sustainable Pittsburgh enthusiastically embraces the path that we're on that you're leading to provide enabling legislation to bring this issue to the public. With that, we would urge that there be a meaningful public process to debate the issue and hammer out the finer details.

And on the topic of throughout the morning

- - - -

2.3

we've been using the word education, just to make a contrast that this sort of appropriate public dialog be an education about the various pros and cons and how to ensure the most optimal consolidation, as opposed to an education approach that is a sales pitch or a campaign fait accompli style.

Along those lines, toward engaging the public, I recommend that it might be very advantageous to adopt a set of principles, a compass that's focused on outcomes for the consolidation that people can use in the future to measure whether progress is truly being made, and we'd recommend maybe starting with the governor of the Commonwealth's Keystone Principles for Growth and Development that were passed a couple years ago and have been used by the administration with great effect. Within those Keystone Principles are embedded the values of social equity and fairness. And, similarly, the Nordenberg committee showed great leadership in their pronouncements for the need to ensure representation to minorities.

With those sentiments, Sustainable Pittsburgh would further urge that consideration of social equity per a set of principles be committed to early on as part of that civic discourse, and I've provided you a copy of a study that we put together in 2004 when this

- - - -

discussion was really ramping up once again, and this focused on the issue and it provides a number of recommendations from around the nation of lessons learned on how to ensure that in a consolidated government, it doesn't disproportionately become a suburban agenda and that the interests of urban residents are accommodated as well.

So in conclusion, we would urge the formation of a task force or a commission to ensure that we have responsible public debate to be able to figure out the issues and the details and move on this important opportunity, particularly as competitiveness in the global environment has taken on the geography of the regions. This is an opportunity for Southwestern Pennsylvania to rearrange the governing center of gravity.

Thanks very much.

2.3

MS. WASHINGTON: Thank you. I am Nancy Washington, the presumptive -- that word is in the air a lot, the presumptive chair of the board of directors of Point Park University. I'm very pleased to be addressing you this afternoon and especially pleased because your subcommittee chair, Representative Costa, is a graduate of Point Park and also a member of our faculty.

- - - -

So very briefly at the end, because cocktail hour is fast approaching, I want to tell you who we are and I want to tell you why we believe consolidation is necessary.

2.3

Point Park University has over 3,500 students. 83 percent of our undergraduates and 91 percent of our graduate students are Pennsylvania residents. Our enrollment has increased by 56 percent in the past decade. We project a growth in the next four years to 4,300 students. We have just announced a \$210 million capital campaign to revitalize downtown Pittsburgh. We have made \$60 million in capital improvements. We have one of the largest footprints in downtown Pittsburgh.

We want to continue to grow. We are proud of who we are. We are proud of where we are. We have had the support of the county; we have had the support of the city. We cannot grow without a unified support system and a unified vision. We support consolidation and thank you very much for holding this hearing.

REPRESENTATIVE COSTA: Any questions or comments?

(No response.)

much. We appreciate it. On behalf of Representative

- - - -

2.3

Karen Beyer and myself, we want to thank all of the testifiers. We appreciate your input. As we said earlier, this is just the first step of the process. I believe it's going to take a long time, and I can't thank Chairman Petrone enough for allowing us to have this committee meeting and to have future ones to keep gathering more and more information, not only to educate the public, but to educate ourselves, if, in fact, we decide to give the ability to have a referendum, that we make the right decision.

I want to thank the members for coming in, especially those ones that were from out of town and made the choice to come in here. I want thank Point Park University. As I told Karen, I don't think I've ever been to a committee meeting where there has been flowers. This is really nice.

I want to thank President Hennigan and also Vice President of University Management Mariann Geyer for putting this together for us. And I want to thank the court reporter and the sound technician and, again, all of you in the audience that stuck with us to listen to this testimony. And again to the testifiers, thank you so much. We can't tell you how much we appreciate your information that you've given us today. So, thank you.

- - - -

This meeting is adjourned.

(Public hearing adjourned at 1:16

o'clock p.m.)

- -
5

- - - -

I hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true record of the proceedings of the Public Hearing held on Wednesday, May 28, 2008.

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