Testimony for House Transportation Committee

on State Police Funding Issues

Mr. Chairman and committee members, thank you for the opportunity to address the state police funding issue.

We are grateful for the agreement the Legislature and Governor Wolf reached last year on finding a way to move forward to better balance state police needs with ongoing highway and bridge needs.

The initiatives to enhance funding for the State Police including the fiscal code, municipality fees and fee increases will allow funding to remain available in the Motor License Fund for additional highway and bridge improvements across the state, which will stimulate local economies and help sustain jobs.

National estimates project that every \$1 billion in infrastructure investment sustains roughly 25,000 jobs.

We expect to have an additional \$2.1 billion for highways and bridges over the ten-year phase-in period for the state police funding cap. During the Business Plan reviews we conduct each year with staff in our eleven district offices, we heard repeatedly about the increasing challenges they face for basic maintenance, interstate reconstruction, and our secondary road network, especially on lower volume roads and especially in rural areas. The districts and counties do tremendous work to maintain our system, and it became clear to me that the impact of an unchanged maintenance allocation to our counties since 2006 was no longer tenable.

Without the enhanced revenue resulting from the cap on funding from the Motor License Fund for state police operations and its subsequent dedication to maintenance, maintenance budgets –already stagnate for many years – would decline moving forward, given other expected claims on PennDOT's resources. This decline would affect rural and four-digit roadways most severely.

As a result, I have directed that we start a new initiative, which we are calling PennDOT's RoadMaP, which stands for Maintenance and Preservation. With the additional \$2.1 billion, I plan to allocate \$1 billion over the ten-year period to the counties for improved basic maintenance; an additional \$500 million to our existing intestate preservation program, bringing that ten-year program to \$1 billion; and \$600 million will go toward highway and bridge capital projects, with priority given to rehabilitation and reconstruction needs identified through our district and regional planning efforts. PennDOT RoadMaP will bring a new emphasis on pavement improvements to the secondary, lower volume road network. One way we can accomplish this is by expanding the use of recycled asphalt taken from improvement projects. This will be accomplished by several means, ranging from full depth recycling of the existing pavement structure to overlays with cold recycled asphalt and warm mix asphalt containing a high percentage of recycled material. We will expand these best practices and environmentally friendly ways of reusing asphalt in counties in two more districts across the state starting in 2017, with expansion to

additional counties and districts in 2018. This will help us address the pavement improvement backlog on our secondary system and particularly the low-volume rural roads.

I would note that the areas to see benefits from RoadMaP are by and large the same areas that now benefit from State Police providing their police protection.

To make our maintenance and preservation investment go further under PennDOT's RoadMaP, we have undertaken a County Transformation program to extensively rethink and retool our county maintenance operations. Each county is undergoing peer examinations to learn and establish best practices across the state. As part of our PennDOT RoadMaP program, the County Transformation initiative will help address critical maintenance backlogs across the state.

I must stress that our attempts to preserve funding in the Motor License Fund for roads and bridges does not mean we do not support proper funding for state police. State police provide a critical role in maintaining the safety of our network, and we count on their services for ongoing enforcement to keep drivers and our workers safe.

Increasingly, the demands to provide municipal-level services have added to the state police's cost burden, and that is why Governor Wolf proposed a reasonable \$25 per capita fee to offset that. Revenue from the fee will help us maintain the plans I have outlined for dealing with the continued backlog of maintenance, especially on rural lower volume roads.

House PSP Funding Bill

HB 822 (Saylor) - Amends Section 710 (Pennsylvania State Police) of Act 175 of 1929 (The Administrative Code) by adding a subsection that would establish a fee schedule for services rendered to municipalities having a population in excess of 10,000 or a population density of 165 persons per square mile which rely on the PSP as the primary police agency. This applies only to primary police services and the fees shall be deposited in to the General Fund.

HB 860 (Grove) - Amends Act 175 of 1929 (The Administrative Code) by adding a new Section 714 (State Trooper Services Contractual Program). HB 860 states that if a municipality currently has or prior to Jan 1, 2013 had a local police force and disbands it they must enter into an agreement with the PSP for State Trooper services. Moneys paid would go to a restricted account and would be used to pay for the services which were contracted.

If a municipality already has an agreement with the PSP, prior to the effective date of this bill, they are required to enter into a new agreement within one year after the effective date, at which time the agreement shall expire. If the agreement expires, PSP shall maintain its level of State Trooper services, but, the municipality will be charged an elevated rate based on the contracts of other area with a similar population. If three months has passed from the expiration date and the municipality has not entered into any agreement, the Commissioner of the PSP may assess additional fees on the municipality to maintain those PSP services, until a new agreement has been reached.

PSP will promulgate rules and regulations necessary to implement the above, while local governments must adopt a resolution or ordinance authorizing the contractual arrangement and payment to PSP.

HB 959 (Sturla) - Amends Title 44 (Law and Justice) by adding Chapter 25 (Municipal Patrol Services). Under this new chapter, non-exempt municipalities receiving PSP full-time, or part-time, patrol service would pay a fee which is equal to that of the appropriation to the PSP from the Motor License Fund during FY16-17 (823.8M) less the appropriation to the PSP from the Motor License Fund for the year which the services are provided. This fee shall be assessed on a per capita basis, although municipalities that receive PSP part-time patrol shall pay one-third the rate that PSP full-time patrol municipalities pay. The fees for service shall be paid on a quarterly basis in equal installments to the General Fund. Municipalities classified under the Municipalities Financial Recovery Act (Act 47 of 1987) shall not be charged for services.

If a municipality institutes local full-time, or part-time, patrol services sufficient enough to cause a reduction in the services needed from PSP, the Commissioner shall adjust the fee.

A municipality that eliminates their local full-time, or part-time- patrol services after the effective date shall enter into a yearly agreement with PSP, at a reasonable fee and payment schedule set by the Commissioner of the PSP.

PSP shall prepare and disseminate an annual report to each municipality paying a fee.

A municipality that is requested by PSP to respond to an incident in another municipality patrolled by PSP may levy a per-incident fee or hourly fee on the other municipality.

A municipality failing to enter into an agreement or make a payment shall be ineligible for funding under Title 75 §9010 until the outstanding balance is paid in full, but, may request an extension.







