



**Joint Legislative Public Hearing Testimony**

**2017-2018 Executive Budget Proposals**

**Transportation**

**February 15, 2017**

**Paul Gendron**

**Statewide PEF/DOT Labor Management Committee Labor Chair**

**Karen Patterson**

**Statewide PEF/DOT Labor Management Committee Labor Vice-Chair**

## INTRODUCTION

Good morning Chairs, committee members and distinguished guests. My name is Paul Gendron of the New York State Public Employees Federation (PEF). I am an Executive Board member from Binghamton and the Chairman of our statewide Department of Transportation (DOT) Labor Management committee. I have over 23 years of engineering experience at DOT including 17 years as a Professional Engineer. With me today, is Karen Patterson from Hornell. Karen is the Vice Chairman of our statewide DOT Labor Management committee and has 27 years of experience in the Construction, Design and Operations Groups.

I want to thank you for the opportunity to address DOT issues in the 2017 - 2018 proposed budget. PEF represents over 3,800 employees in the DOT as engineers, technicians, planners, architects, right of way agents and other professional, scientific and technical titles. Their primary responsibility is to keep the infrastructure safe for the traveling public.

## FUNDING

DOT funding is increased in the proposed budget. All funds have increased by \$750 million, about 6.6% of all funds. Since PEF members are on the frontline in determining transportation needs and spending those funds wisely, we applaud this commitment to an increased capital program.

At the federal level, an additional future 10-year investment of \$1 trillion nationwide is being considered on top of an approved federal authorization through federal fiscal year 2020. An influx of federal money will also require additional administration by experienced state employees.

While increases in funding is a welcome relief, utilization of those funds needs to be carefully monitored. Multiple studies have shown in-house, experienced DOT employees produce better projects for lower cost.

## DESIGN-BUILD

Two alternative methods for funding capital projects for the public sector have been touted in recent years.

But both design-build and public private partnerships (P3s) have a checkered history in our country.

In Part P of the Transportation Article VII Legislation, design-build is proposed to be made permanent and expanded to all agencies and authorities. This would expand the current two-year pilot program that was created under Chapter 60 of the Laws of 2015. The current legislation allows design-build procurement for five agencies.

PEF has multiple concerns.

Design-build allows one contractor to design, construct and inspect the entire project instead of the traditional design-bid-build procurement method which allows for a separation between designer and builder. This results, among other things, in the loss of checks and balances and the continued erosion of professional public employees' skills and knowledge. It puts the public at risk, bypassing competitive bidding laws, labor protection and other safeguards that ensure transparency, fairness and impartial oversight.

When a design-build contract is let, only 30 percent of the design phase has been completed. With greater risk to the design-build contractor comes greater cost. Also increasing costs are procurement procedures and additional administrative oversight. In design-bid-build procurement, this cost would not be expended with in-house design.

DOT is the infrastructure owner and has a greater stake in a quality product. It is important DOT employees inspect these projects to ensure proper quality of construction and safety of the construction workforce and the public. DOT employees live in the areas where they work, they have not only an ownership stake due to their employment with DOT but they are also taxpaying citizens in the area in which these projects are built. They probably have family members who travel on those same roads and bridges.

Consultant inspection firms for design-build projects typically employ people who live far away from the finished product and have no local accountability. Non-compliance reports prepared by DOT quality assurance staff on projects are not treated seriously. There have been reports of inspectors hired by these consultant firms telling state forces they work for the contractor, not the state when the single state engineer assigned to quality assurance would question compliance with standards and specifications.

One pro design-build claim is that the contractor can use innovation to save money. But the DOT has used this procurement method for routine, non-emergency projects, rather than for innovative or immediate need projects. When multiple small work sites are bundled (for example bridge deck replacements or bridge superstructure replacements, where the only feasible option is to replace in-kind,) there is no opportunity for innovation, thus creating added cost with no added benefit. Examples of this include two bridges, one that measured 35 foot long that had a superstructure replaced and another 20 foot long that was replaced in its entirety under a design-build process.

Larger, bundled design-build projects also hurt local economies. Both of the bridges would traditionally have been simple design-bid-build contracts. These contracts would have employed local contractors and used existing DOT engineering staff to design and inspect the construction. But the design-build process makes it impossible for smaller, local companies to bid. Typically these contracts are awarded to larger, out-of-state firms.

Lastly the proposed minimum threshold to allow design-build of \$1.2 million is unrealistic. This low threshold is what has allowed design-build projects to be built with minimal opportunity for innovative cost savings.

A design-build report was produced in the fall of 2015 by the Empire State Development Corporation summarizing the 5 projects progressed under Chapter 60 of the Laws of 2015. None of the projects have been completed. In fact, three of the 5 projects have a "to be determined" best value cost. No permanent law should be in place until a complete review of design-build projects under Chapter 50 of the Laws of 2015

can be completed. Such a review should be conducted by the state Comptroller, as has been done in the past by previous Comptrollers.

Also, it was recently announced the replacement of the Tappan Zee Bridge will be completed in 2018. Waiting until a full accounting of this first NY mega project before making final decisions is a prudent course.

## PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

Public Private Partnerships (P3s) have been discussed as funding mechanisms at the Federal level. These projects also have a checkered history in our country. The disastrous Chicago Parking Meters, Chicago Skyway, Indiana I-90 and Pocahontas Parkway in Virginia are just some examples of P3s that have negative and long lasting effects on public transportation. They provide taxpayer subsidies in the form of guaranteed profits for corporations that have failed to deliver positive results of reduced costs to the public.

The research group, In The Public Interest states some of the many concerns very well:

**“Though privatization may offer short-term relief to transportation budget woes, it often has grave implications for the public.**

- **The public will not receive full value for its future toll revenues.** The upfront payments that states receive are often worth far less than the value of future toll revenue from the road. Analysis of the Indiana and Chicago deals found that private investors would recoup their investments in less than 20 years. Given that these deals are for 75 and 99 years, respectively, the public clearly received far less for their assets than they are truly worth.
- **The public loses control over transportation policy.** Private road concessions in particular result in a more fragmented road network, less ability to prevent toll traffic from being diverted into local communities, and often the requirement to compensate private operators for actions that reduce traffic on the road, such as constructing or upgrading a nearby competing transportation facility.
- **Public officials cannot ensure that privatization contracts will be fair and effective** when leases last for multiple generations. No army

of lawyers and accountants can fully anticipate future public needs. Transurban, for example, has control over the Pocahontas Parkway in Virginia for 99 years."

When for-profit investors take over public service facilities, it must be remembered that every dollar that is put into a private corporation's balance sheet is a dollar that can't be spent on additional public safety or service.

If P3s are to be considered, they must at a minimum follow these basic principles:

- The public should retain control over decisions about transportation planning and management.
- The public must receive fair value so future toll revenues are not to be sold off at a discount.
- No deal should last longer than 30 years because of uncertainty over future conditions and because the risks of a bad deal grow exponentially over time.
- Contracts should require state-of-the-art maintenance and safety standards instead of statewide minimums.
- There must be complete transparency to ensure proper public vetting of privatization proposals.
- There must be full accountability in which the legislature must approve the terms of a final deal, not just approve that a deal be negotiated.

## FULL STAFFING

The most cost effective highway and bridge design, bridge inspection and construction inspection services are provided by the in-house DOT professionals. Additional valuable services are bus and truck inspections and other safety sensitive work.

This year's budget calls for increase in the Design and Construction program of 86 full time equivalents (FTE's) for a proposed total of 2,594 while maintaining all other program levels at their current amount. This is a positive but partial first step in replacing the many hundreds of engineering staff lost over the last 10 years. In the proposed 2007 -

2008 budget, the proposed number of Design and Construction Program FTE's was approximately 3,800, a nearly 1200 positions difference. In construction inspection alone, more than one-third of in-house jobs have been lost.

At the time the capital program was approximately \$2 billion dollars and the total funding for the capital projects category was \$4.3 billion. In this year's proposed budget, the capital program is approximately \$2.7 billion dollars and the total funding for the capital projects category is \$6.4 Billion. Increases in staffing in all program areas and further increases in the Design and Construction program will lead to better efficiency, better quality and less overtime costs.

Consultant engineers still make up too great of a portion of DOT's engineering staff. Under the proposed budget, DOT will see an increase in consultant staff of 46 FTEs. This will bring the estimated disbursement for consultant service contracts to \$168,319,000 for FY 2018.

Our studies have shown that consultant Civil Engineers cost New York State taxpayers an average of 87% more than Civil Engineers permanently hired by DOT.

In one case for a consulting bridge inspection contract, the billable rate for a consultant engineer bridge inspector was 32% more than the NYSDOT Commissioner's hourly rate!

Also troubling is the fact that many of these consultant engineering service contracts originated decades ago and are simply renewed as needed. So for all intents and purposes, DOT is paying exorbitant consultant costs for de facto permanent employees.

As long term stewards of public money, these facts should trouble all of us greatly.

One additional staffing concern relates to Part LL of the Transportation Article VII Legislation. PEF is concerned that shared service agreements between DOT, the Power Authority and the Canal Corporation could lead to a blurring of the lines of functions and responsibilities between

State Agencies and Public Authorities. It could further reduce transparency, accountability and oversight if not clearly defined.

### **COST/BENEFIT ANALYSIS**

A continuing priority for PEF is the inclusion of Cost/Benefit legislation that would require an analysis before entering into consultant contractual services. This would be valuable in many fields, including engineering. Requiring this analysis allows for documentation to reinforce decision making.

### **CONCLUSION**

As stated by everyone, investment in our infrastructure is vital for economic development. We believe through strong financial decision making, cost/benefit analysis and having a steady, educated workforce, transportation funds can be used most efficiently.

The DOT already makes efforts to create five-year capital programs and other long term planning tools. If proper staffing and steady funding were available, there would be less need for emergency projects as well as less efficient and costly procurement methods such as design-build.

Thank you for your time and the opportunity to speak with you today.