

BIOGRAPHICAL OUTLINE DOUGLAS E. HILL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Executive Director of the County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania, a nonprofit, nonpartisan association representing all of the Commonwealth's 67 counties, since 1984. The Association, with a staff of 62 and budget of \$6.0 million, provides legislative, research, insurance, education, technology, and similar services.

Prior to joining CCAP, worked for six years as research director and legislative director for the Pennsylvania State Association of Boroughs.

Masters in Public Administration from Penn State University and Bachelor of Arts in Political Science from Westminster College (PA).

Currently serving on a variety of professional, state and local boards and civic groups, including among others:

- National Conference of County Association Executives (Past President)
- National Association of Counties/Nationwide Deferred Compensation Advisory Committee
- National Association of Counties Member Programs and Services Committee
- National Association of Counties Sustainability Leadership Team (Including Smart Growth Subcommittee)
- Advisory Board, National Center for the Study of Counties, Carl Vinson Institute of Government, University of Georgia
- Pennsylvania Local Government Conference (Former Chair)
- Pennsylvania Travel and Tourism Partnership
- Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission Historical Records Advisory Board
- Shippensburg University Center for Land Use Advisory Board
- PA Pandemic Preparedness Planning Advisory Committee
- PA Bioterrorism Preparedness Planning Advisory Committee
- Pennsylvania State Association of Elected County Officials (former service on Executive Committee)
- Pennsylvania Society of Association Executives (Former service on Legislative, Technology, and Program Committees)
- Department of Environmental Protection Technical Advisory Committee (Water Quality)
- PA Snowmobile and ATV Advisory Committee (Alternate)
- PA Sewage Advisory Committee (Alternate)
- Speaker of the House, HOBY Mock Legislature
- West Shore Baptist Church Board of Trustees (Personnel Committee Chair)
- AARP Capitol Area Team Volunteer Committee

Prior service includes, among others:

Governor's Election Reform Task Force (2005)
Governor's Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness Advisory Council
American Heart Association Operation Heartbeat Committee
Statewide Uniform Register of Electors Advisory Committee
Governor's Voting Modernization Task Force (2001)
Pennsylvania Capitol Centennial Advisory Committee
Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency Corrections Policy Committee
PA Low Level Radioactive Waste Advisory Committee (Alternate)
National Association of Counties Board of Directors
National Association of Counties Homeland Security Task Force
National Association of Counties Annual Conference Planning Committee
National Conference of County Association Executives Deferred Compensation Study Group
(Chair)
National Association of Counties Orange County Response Task Force
Governor's Census 2000 Advisory Panel
Pennsylvania United Way Board of Directors
Hampden Township Planning Commission (Chairman)
Pennsylvania Intergovernmental Council Board of Directors (Chairman)
West Shore Baptist Church Board of Trustees (Chairman)
West Shore Baptist Church Board of Deacons
West Shore Baptist Church Moderator
Manager, HMMS Rhinos Boys' Travel Soccer Team
Manager, HMMS Invaders Boys' Travel Soccer Team
Youth soccer and basketball coach
Cub Scout Pack 296 (Treasurer)
Adult Leader, Boy Scout Troop 296
Adult Committee, Boy Scout Troop 88
Westover Civic Association Board of Directors (President)
Indian Creek Civic Association Board of Directors (President)

Honors and Awards

National Association of Counties / New York University County Leadership Institute (2004; inaugural class)
International Study Fellowship, Japan Center for Local and Area International Relations (2002)
Order of Democracy, National Association of Secretaries of State (2001)
C. K. Koontz Fellowship (Post-Graduate)
HHS Public Administration Fellowship (Post-Graduate)
National Merit Honorable Mention
Eagle Scout

Married, three children.

Phone 717-232-7554 x 3115
Cell Phone 717-979-2566
Fax 717-232-2162
E-Mail dhill@pacounties.org



CENTRAL OFFICE:
17 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101-1624
PH. 717-232-7554 FAX 717-232-2162

NORTH OFFICE:
P.O. Box 60769, Harrisburg, PA 17106-0769
PH. 717-526-1010 FAX 717-526-1020

**TESTIMONY ON BRIDGE ISSUES
BEFORE THE HOUSE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

**Presented by
Douglas E. Hill, Executive Director**

**July 29, 2008
Pittsburgh, PA**

Good morning. I am Douglas E. Hill, Executive Director of the County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania. The CCAP is a non-profit, non-partisan association providing legislative, educational, insurance, research, technology, and similar services on behalf of all of the Commonwealth's 67 counties.

We appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to present our comments on bridge issues. We have asked to testify in order to emphasize an aspect of the bridge infrastructure issue that has received relatively little consideration or comment during the recent study and debate – the matter of funding for county and municipal roads and bridges. We concur with our partners from the other local government associations that local roads and bridges and state highways, along with our mass transit systems, comprise a single transportation network for the Commonwealth's traveling public, and that it is absolutely essential that the funding of the *entire system* be taken into account when considering any changes to funding methods for our transportation network.

Act 44 put in place several new funding components for mass transit and infrastructure. The act was based in part on the report of the Transportation Funding and Reform Commission, on an alternative proposal by the Governor, and ultimately on another proposal by legislative leaders. We are not here to argue which of these funding sources is correct, but rather to note that the act's county and municipal infrastructure funding components were included only after consistent and strident efforts by local officials. Local infrastructure, other than mass transit, was not even considered part of the original charge to the Commission. Even then, compared to the significant new investment in state infrastructure and in mass transit, only \$30 million annually was included for municipal highways, and only \$5 million for county bridges.

Let me be clear in indicating that we are grateful for this new funding, and that we are equally grateful for the significant infusion in mass transit funding. I also note that we and our municipal partners have been consistently supportive of funding for Commonwealth infrastructure.

Rather, our concern is that we should not have to continually fight for inclusion in these funding discussions. What use is a state-of-the-art Commonwealth transportation network, if the local and collector network the counties and municipalities maintain remains substandard and potentially dangerous? The system must be considered as a whole, and counties and municipalities should be considered full partners. There should not have to be debate on that point.

Any transportation funding solution *must* include a component on funding for county and municipal elements of the transportation system. As local officials we have supported, and continue to support, tax or fee increases, but can do so only if local government receives its fair share. These are not easy votes for you, and support of revenue increases is not easy for our membership, but the conclusion is inescapable that our system is underfunded and we need to deal with the long term needs of our residents and our businesses for a safe and efficient transportation network.

Let me now address our specific needs regarding bridges and highways. In the Transportation Funding and Reform Commission's report, the Commission acknowledged that the funding needs for the 76,670 miles of municipally-owned roadways and more than 4,000 county bridges are in excess of \$1.5 billion. As noted earlier, Act 44 included \$30 million for municipalities and \$5 million for counties. For counties, this new \$5 million is added to the approximately \$32 million we receive from a half cent liquid fuels tax and about \$7 million we receive from the oil franchise tax. The municipalities' \$30 million was added to an existing \$294 million the municipalities receive from the liquid fuels and oil franchise taxes. Each funding stream clearly falls far short of need, and the difference is made up by county and municipal property tax payers.

From the municipal perspective, our partners at the Pennsylvania State Association of Township Supervisors have advocated restoring the historic allocation of 20% of liquid fuels funding to local government, a ratio maintained well into the 1990s. Doing so would require about \$158 million in new funding, since the local share has decreased to less than 13 percent.

The discussion of bridges is more of a county issue; counties have only nominal responsibility for highways, but we have responsibility for a significant volume of bridges, many of them larger spans. County and municipal bridges are a vital link in our infrastructure system. According to PennDOT, there are more than 6,300 municipal and more than 4,000 county bridges greater than 20 feet. In addition, PennDOT estimates that there are 22,500 county and local bridges that are between eight and 20 feet in length, and catalogues another 29,000 under eight feet.

The more than 4,000 county-owned bridges are funded with a gas tax allocation that has remained largely unchanged since 1930, and is, in fact, distributed based on relative gasoline sales in 1928, 1929, and 1930. While a portion of the state's Oil Franchise Tax is also allocated to help counties draw federal bridge monies, and even with the addition of Act 44's allocation, the available funds from all sources remain inadequate to maintain and replace this key element of the transportation infrastructure.

With a lack of infrastructure funding, many of these bridges are structurally deficient and many others are approaching the end of their useful life -- the average age of county bridges is 48 years. County bridge failures have not achieved the publicity of the December 2005 collapse of a state bridge spanning Interstate 70 or the tragic collapse in Minnesota just one year ago, but counties' ongoing inspections of their spans show that there are critical unmet infrastructure needs.

A resolution adopted by the CCAP membership supports a half-cent increase in the state's liquid fuels tax, or an equivalent amount from another transportation funding source, to be allocated to each county based on each county's relative bridge responsibility. The county would use the new funding for any part of its transportation infrastructure, or could re-grant it to municipalities as some counties do currently. Our municipal partners also support increased fuels taxes or revenue from other transportation sources, for the purpose of generating their requested 20% share. We have each made these requests in numerous public settings.

We have to note that increased allocations would represent significant progress in shifting costs to highway users and away from the property tax, but by no means solves the infrastructure funding problem. The current half cent the counties receive yields about \$32 million per year, the oil franchise distribution yields about \$7 million, and Act 44 adds another \$5 million. The increase we propose would yield another \$32 million, so the annual total would be about \$76 million. By contrast, county spending per year on bridges is currently about \$30 million for maintenance and \$72 million for capital, so even with the proposed increase there would still be a need to contribute nearly \$30 million from county property tax dollars – and that does not address the recent rapid increases in raw materials.

Moreover, these expenditure trends reflect a continuing pattern of deferred maintenance, largely due to competing pressures on scarce property tax dollars. The true annual need is much higher. If we assume a replacement cost of about \$2 million per bridge, the statewide capital cost for county bridges is \$8.4 billion, and even if spread over a replacement cycle as long as 75 years, that yields an annual need of \$112 million in capital costs alone.

Attached to these remarks is a chart showing county bridge information, showing the number of bridges by county, including those over 20' and those under 20', along with the number and percentage of bridges over 20' considered to be structurally deficient.

Also shown is a calculation of each county's number of bridges, per 1,000 population. This is included to give you a perspective on the disparate nature of bridge ownership among counties; you will see that there is no correlation between county size and the number of bridges for which it is responsible. For example, Philadelphia has 0.28 bridges per 1,000, Allegheny has 0.41, Mercer has 2.11, and Greene has 2.14. Erie has zero. There are historical, political, topographic, and other reasons for this disparity, but it highlights the notion that some of our most fiscally-challenged counties have proportionately greater need.

Last, let me make a pitch for changing the distribution methodology for county liquid fuels funding. As noted earlier, the existing half cent is distributed pro rata based on actual fuels usage by county from 1928, 1929, and 1930. We advocate changing this formula to one based on need, rather than early 20th century usage, and in fact Act 44 distributes its \$5 million based on relative square footage of county-owned bridge deck. Note we estimate that an additional \$4.6 million would be required to fund a hold harmless should the current formula be updated for the traditional allocation.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this important issue. I will be pleased to answer your questions.

COUNTY-OWNED BRIDGES
CCAP 07-29-08

County	Bridge Count >20'	Bridge Count <20'	Total Bridges	SD Count >20'	%SD Count >20'	Bridges Per Thousand
Adams	41	1	42	12	29.3%	0.46
Allegheny	165	355	520	46	27.9%	0.41
Armstrong	32	4	36	9	28.1%	0.50
Beaver	32	25	57	9	28.1%	0.31
Bedford	38	0	38	17	44.7%	0.76
Berks	61	0	61	30	49.2%	0.16
Blair	58	7	65	14	24.1%	0.50
Bradford	47	5	52	24	51.1%	0.83
Bucks	111	3	114	36	32.4%	0.19
Butler	121	11	132	35	28.9%	0.76
Cambria	23	3	26	5	21.7%	0.17
Cameron	6	0	6	1	16.7%	1.00
Carbon	17	1	18	5	29.4%	0.31
Centre	1	0	1	0	0.0%	0.01
Chester	91	5	96	16	17.6%	0.22
Clarion	1	2	3	0	0.0%	0.07
Clearfield	11	0	11	7	63.6%	0.13
Clinton	3	0	3	1	33.3%	0.08
Columbia	61	0	61	15	24.6%	0.95
Crawford	39	3	42	22	56.4%	0.46
Cumberland	23	6	29	6	26.1%	0.14
Dauphin	51	0	51	3	5.9%	0.20
Delaware	41	4	45	13	31.7%	0.08
Elk	2	0	2	0	0.0%	0.06
Erie	(None)			(None)		0.00
Fayette	52	9	61	19	36.5%	0.41
Forest	3	2	5	0	0.0%	1.01
Franklin	77	16	93	5	6.5%	0.72
Fulton	3	0	3	0	0.0%	0.21
Greene	86	1	87	40	46.5%	2.14
Huntingdon	20	0	20	5	25.0%	0.44
Indiana	34	0	34	5	14.7%	0.38
Jefferson	33	0	33	9	27.3%	0.72
Juniata	(None)			(None)		0.00
Lackawanna	36	115	151	24	66.7%	0.71
Lancaster	64	0	64	23	35.9%	0.14
Lawrence	28	0	28	13	46.4%	0.30
Lebanon	13	0	13	5	38.5%	0.11
Lehigh	43	0	43	16	37.2%	0.14
Luzerne	78	229	307	31	39.7%	0.96
Lycoming	15	0	15	4	26.7%	0.12
McKean	5	0	5	2	40.0%	0.11
Mercer	162	92	254	19	11.7%	2.11
Mifflin	8	2	10	0	0.0%	0.22
Monroe	25	2	27	4	16.0%	0.19
Montgomery	102	38	140	58	56.9%	0.19
Montour	19	4	23	10	52.6%	1.26
Northampton	102	17	119	6	5.9%	0.45
Northumberland	72	1	73	9	12.5%	0.77
Perry	13	0	13	4	30.8%	0.30
Philadelphia	1	423	424	1	100.0%	0.28
Pike	18	1	19	5	27.8%	0.41
Potter	(None)			(None)		0.00
Schuylkill	61	1	62	18	29.5%	0.41
Snyder	4	0	4	0	0.0%	0.11
Somerset	61	1	62	29	47.5%	0.77
Sullivan	6	0	6	1	16.7%	0.92
Susquehanna	31	1	32	5	16.1%	0.76
Tioga	13	0	13	3	23.1%	0.31
Union	27	0	27	10	37.0%	0.65
Venango	18	0	18	3	16.7%	0.31
Warren	(None)			(None)		0.00
Washington	114	18	132	50	43.9%	0.65
Wayne	25	16	41	10	40.0%	0.86
Westmoreland	20	22	42	2	10.0%	0.11
Wyoming	11	2	13	4	36.4%	0.46
York	91	5	96	11	12.1%	0.25
TOTALS	2,670	1,453	4,123	789		0.34
AVERAGES	42	23	65	13	28.6%	

NOTES

Data for bridges >20' from PennDOT NBIS Highway Bridges Reports
Data for bridges <20' from county surveys