THE OFFICE OF THE MAYOR-ELECT
BUILDING A NEW PITTSBURGH

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT
(Please use one report for each subcommittee recommendation)

Subcommittee Name	Boards, Authorities, and Commissions
Subcommittee Chairperson(s)	Beth Pearson and Audrey Glickman
Title of recommendation	Create job descriptions for each Board, Authority and Commission
Describe the recommendation	Currently it is not clear what skills appointees should possess to be viable members of a Board, Authority or Commission. This makes it far too easy to appoint political cronies or business "big wigs" who gain economically or politically from the decisions made in these groups. This insular group does not represent the citizens either; the subcommittee believes that BACs should generally be composed of citizens who will have to live with the rules or regulations these agencies propose. Qualifications for board membership should be clear, articulated, and relevant for the BAC in question. Standards should be set regarding the relative importance of each skill set or qualification; weight should also be given to those skills that make for productive group (*i.e.*, leadership, organization etc.). BAC appointments should be driven by qualification and suitability to the position rather than by political connections and/or business interests. When specific expertise is required by any BAC, the optimal candidate will be someone with experience but without current connections to an organization that might benefit from the group's decisions.
Is this an immediate or long term recommendation?	Immediate and long term
How will this address our challenges or reach our goals?	Appointees will be chosen in a more transparent manner, using objective criteria. Performance can also be evaluated using these criteria and members replaced who are not performing. This transparency will make it more likely that citizens will value the recommendations and rules put forth by these agencies and that agencies will be able to be held accountable.

What are the obstacles to implementation?	This may affect the "unwritten rules" that guide many of these groups. It may also annoy the City Council which has the authority to appoint to many of the Boards, Commissions and Authorities.
Who needs to be involved?	Members of current and past BACs, professional job description personnel
What city resources need to be invested?	We may be able to use Talent City and/or the personnel department of the city to come up with descriptions.
What will be different if the recommendation is adopted?	Each BAC will have members who are chosen for their skills and ability to improve the organization rather than being chosen because of whom they know. Also, with the qualifications being clear, the BAC members can be held to higher standards of behavior, attendance, and willingness to consider ideas not in accord with their own.
Describe any background materials that you consulted	The enacting legislation for each group, Talent City (which has no descriptions for these positions and doesn't have a charge to produce any)
Have other cities implemented this recommendation?	Yes, other cities have clearly articulated job descriptions
Are there any other considerations?	The transparency of the appointing process should encourage more involvement in the agencies and that should help the BACs to include more people who have to live with the decisions that come from these agencies, and fewer people who don't.

We request that each recommendation be submitted by the subcommittee Chairperson to Kevin Acklin and your Committee Chair by **5:00 pm on Friday, December 27**.

THE OFFICE OF THE MAYOR-ELECT
BUILDING A NEW PITTSBURGH

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT
(Please use one report for each subcommittee recommendation)

Subcommittee Name	Boards, Authorities, and Commissions
Subcommittee Chairperson(s)	Beth Pearson and Audrey Glickman
Title of recommendation	Reduce the number of current and past politicians, power brokers, and perennial appointees.
Describe the recommendation	Restrict the number of current or former politicians who can be on any one board; eliminate the appointing of the same person to more than one Board, Authority and Commission. Ensure that no one on a Board, Authority or Commission has any vested interest in the BAC's outcomes, either personally, financially, or politically. No BAC should have members who have a financial or political interest, directly or indirectly, in the outcome of any actions the agency may propose. All BAC members should be required to file annual disclosure statements that disclose any potential conflicts of interest or financial arrangements that could be seen as a conflict by an ordinary person. These statements should be reviewed by the Mayor's office. BACs should have the smallest number of members who can effectively do the agency's work, unless specified in the enabling legislation. We recommend no more than seven members on any one BAC, and any member may serve only on one BAC at any time.
Is this an immediate or long term recommendation?	Immediate and long term
How will this address our challenges or reach our goals?	This will increase fair representation of ordinary citizens on all Boards, Authorities and Commissions. By limiting the number of "traditional" appointees, more opportunities will be available for appointment of regular citizens who have a strong interest in the mission of the Boards, Authorities and Commissions without gaining any benefit by the outcomes of the decisions.
What are the obstacles to implementation?	This goes against common practice
Who needs to be involved?	Mayor/City Council/BACs

What city resources need to be invested?	Unknown
What will be different if the recommendation is adopted?	Citizens will have more assurance that recommendations and resolutions resulting from Boards, Authorities and Commissions are neutral and thoughtfully considered. Removing those appointees with vested interests, the agency's decisions will be seen to have been enacted without taking into account benefits to standing members or their "constitutents."
Describe any background materials that you consulted	The Fair Representation In Appointments Act makes it clear that BACs are supposed to be acting in the public welfare, but are frequently, and rightfully, seen as serving limited interested parties.
Have other cities implemented this recommendation?	.
Are there any other considerations?	The agencies may have to modify the enabling legislation and current practices to reduce the number of members who represent special interests.

We request that each recommendation be submitted by the subcommittee Chairperson to Kevin Acklin and your Committee Chair by **5:00 pm on Friday, December 27**.

THE OFFICE OF THE MAYOR-ELECT
BUILDING A NEW PITTSBURGH

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT
(Please use one report for each subcommittee recommendation)

Subcommittee Name	Boards, Authorities, and Commissions
Subcommittee Chairperson(s)	Beth Pearson and Audrey Glickman
Title of recommendation	Open Meeting Recommendation
Describe the recommendation	All BAC meetings should be scheduled and held regularly including any committee of the agency. This information should be clearly articulated in the BAC's bylaws. All BACs should be required to prepare meeting materials enough in advance that all members have sufficient time to review them and consider the issues; agendas should be posted on the web site a week in advance so interested parties can attend. Meetings should be open to the public unless there is a compelling reason not to. Any closed meetings must describe why they are closed and have a way for citizens to find out what happened at the meeting. Members should be prepared for open meetings during which there may be spirited discussion and some animosity. Members of the BACs should be willing to hear views that do not align with their own and to use those ideas to create the most useful policies and outcomes. Minutes for meetings should be posted to the website within seven days of the meeting for general perusal; the BAC-specific website should be accessible via the City's general website.
Is this an immediate or long term recommendation?	Immediate and long term
How will this address our challenges or reach our goals?	Residents of the city and surrounding areas need to be able to follow actions and recommendations made by BAC members. "Back room" politics is not appropriate and the City should ensure that all citizens have equal access to information and the opportunity to make their voices heard.
What are the obstacles to implementation?	Tradition

Who needs to be involved?	Staff members who prepare agenda and meeting notes
What city resources need to be invested?	City staff who support the BACs, IT department for website updates.
What will be different if the recommendation is adopted?	Citizens will be able to evaluate the performance of the BACs and will understand what decisions are being made that will affect them. Affected citizens can present their opinions and factual information so members will have a larger base of information on which to make decisions
Describe any background materials that you consulted	
Have other cities implemented this recommendation?	Many cities have open meeting laws
Are there any other considerations?	Current members of BACs may not enjoy the public nature of the discussions and decisions.

We request that each recommendation be submitted by the subcommittee Chairperson to Kevin Acklin and your Committee Chair by **5:00 pm on Friday, December 27**.

THE OFFICE OF THE MAYOR-ELECT
BUILDING A NEW PITTSBURGH

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT
(Please use one report for each subcommittee recommendation)

Subcommittee Name	Boards, Authorities, and Commissions
Subcommittee Chairperson(s)	Beth Pearson and Audrey Glickman
Title of recommendation	Consolidate or eliminate overlapping BACs
Describe the recommendation	We recommend that the number of BACs be reduced where possible, either by putting the independent agency under the umbrella of another agency or simply eliminating the group. There is at least one organization that was formed to handle financing for a specific project. That project is over, but the group continues. Others, like the Sports and Exhibition Authority and the Stadium Authority have clearly interconnected mandates.
Is this an immediate or long term recommendation?	Long Term
How will this address our challenges or reach our goals?	It is more efficient to have a smaller number of highly effective BACs than to have a larger number whose activities may impinge on one another. As these agencies are scrutinized, it is also likely that there will be a need to more clearly articulate what each group's charge is and with which other BACs each is most closely connected. (For example, the Urban Redevelopment Authority and the City Planning Commission should obviously be working together even if not a single agency.)
What are the obstacles to implementation?	Any time there is a suggestion that an agency is no longer needed, there is going to be opposition, particularly where the agency is perceived to have significant power and where there will be competition as to the final appointees to any merged entity. The decisions to make these changes are not going to be easy and will probably take considerable inter-agency negotiation and reconciliation.
Who needs to be involved?	Mayor/City Council and the BACs membership
What city resources need to be invested?	Analysts will be required to look carefully at each BAC's enabling legislation and identify overlapping functions or interconnecting mandates.

What will be different if the recommendation is adopted?	With fewer, more productive BACs the city will have to spend fewer resources supporting the BACs. We also believe that the ability of each BAC to be productive will increase if they are meeting with other agencies whose work is connected.
Describe any background materials that you consulted	
Have other cities implemented this recommendation?	
Are there any other considerations?	There is likely to be significant push back from incumbents who do not wish to see their fiefdoms eroded.

We request that each recommendation be submitted by the subcommittee Chairperson to Kevin Acklin and your Committee Chair by **5:00 pm on Friday, December 27**.

THE OFFICE OF THE MAYOR-ELECT
BUILDING A NEW PITTSBURGH

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

(Please use one report for each subcommittee recommendation)

Subcommittee Name	Boards, Authorities, and Commissions
Subcommittee Chairperson(s)	Beth Pearson and Audrey Glickman
Title of recommendation	Recommendations for Specific Boards, Authorities, and Commissions
Describe the recommendation	The BAC Subcommittee has specific recommendations for specific Authorities.
Is this an immediate or long term recommendation?	Immediate and long-term.
How will this address our challenges or reach our goals?	These recommendations will save time and money, and push our BACs toward more transparency and toward better assisting the function of City Government, as they are intended to do. **AUTHORITIES** **Equipment Leasing Authority Recommendations** **1. Implement a Policy, and Place Responsibility for Vehicles under the Separate City Departments.** The City should have an overriding policy for vehicles, and responsibility for vehicular management should fall to the specific departments. That would remove the lumping together of all vehicles in the City budget, and allow the expenses to inure to the various departments which use the vehicles. Having the ELA decide which vehicles are important to purchase in any year based upon its budget is imprudent. Right now, vehicles, gasoline, and personnel are budgeted and accounted for separately from the departments to which the expenses inure. We note that the City has equipment – especially vehicular – which has been sitting in storage for one reason or another. There are also unused (some major) parts for vehicles which could be sold. Thus, reorganization in terms of vehicles and the City departments seems to be in order. **2. Separate the City Department for Vehicles.** Responsibility for City contracts and for vehicles falls under the same office, sort of as an intermediary, attached to but separate from the Finance Department. The efficiency of this method should be examined. Contracts are managed twice – once in the City's finance/vehicle office, where RFPs are issued and received, and then they come to rest in the Controller's office, as well as – presumably – in the department for which the contract was written. This seems redundant.

3. Greening Up. The City should be looking toward use of electric vehicles. Generally, smaller vehicles travel only within the City limits, and park at City facilities where they could be plugged in and charged overnight.

The City should also be investing in an asphalt recycling system, which would pay for itself within the first year and would allow repaving of up to an additional 40 miles of road per year. A deal is currently on the table from the manufacturer.

4. Decommission Authorities Whose Existence is Not Benefiting the City. Why is the Equipment Leasing Authority still in existence? It was formed to buy equipment and lease it to the City. Rental payments went to pay off the Authority's bonds. All bonds have been retired as of September 1, 1997. Therefore, is the Authority still necessary? Couldn't the City purchase vehicles outright? The fact that the Equipment Leasing Authority is budgeted $5,000,000 specifically for vehicular purchases for this year seems to perpetuate the City keeping vehicles budgeted separately from the specific departments using them.

Housing Authority of Pittsburgh Recommendations

1. Stick to Original Mission. The Housing Authority exists as a vehicle for receiving and disbursing monies from the federal government (HUD), and for implementing related federal programs. Any educational programs and learn-to-work programs should immediately be transferred to Education & Neighborhood Development.

2. Better Manage Transparency of Funds within the Authority. The Housing Authority this year is planning to draw down 2/3 of its $60 million reserves. After stating recently in City Council that the reserves of undisclosed amount could not be drawn upon except in very specific circumstances, this draw-down is interesting. Recently the Housing Authority could not get a loan from PNC, and therefore made a deal with Allies & Ross to lend the money to a private partnership (Keith B. Key is involved), at 5.8% interest, which interest (up to $11 million over 40 years) is somehow in the future going to be returned to benefit public housing. (This sort of deal is not very transparent, and the money is difficult to follow.) Allies & Ross has another deal for building houses in Larimer, and the URA is also building houses in Larimer. Additionally, the Housing Authority has applied for a slice of the federal Choice Neighborhoods grant to build even more houses in Larimer. (There are numerous applicants across the country, and limited funds.) The Chair of the Housing Authority is Councilman Ricky Burgess, who represents Larimer.

The City (per the City Planning Department Capital Budget) puts up the matching monies. The Capital Budget says: "Annual matching funds for the $30 million of federal financial support for the transformation of federally assisted housing developments and the surrounding neighborhoods of Larimer and parts of East Liberty. The City as a co-applicant for this grant with the Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh and other partners." That will be $473,000 this year, $2,399,760 next year, and declining numbers to a total after 2019 of $9,890,240 of matching funds.

3. How Many Authorities Are in the Development Business? Note that the URA is also in the business of developing housing. *See also* "Urban Redevelopment Authority" herein. Again, we should move planning and development back into the City Planning Department for more uniform and controlled results. The recent rapid construction of plain cheap-looking homes in substantial old neighborhoods is an example of what can go wrong. This is not a matter of neighborhoods not wanting the poor or lesser-capable living among them; it is a matter of parking chintzy new buildings among glorious older ones. We have an excess of housing stock. It should be employed to good purpose rather than being demolished.

4. Transparency in Budget. The overall budget for the Housing Authority for this coming year is approximately $174,000,000, up about $25 million from last year's balance sheet, the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* reported. That is a lot of money to go without transparency.

The Housing Authority's website says: "The Finance Department oversees the Authority's budget. Throughout the year, the department reviews, evaluates, and analyzes the activities of the agency to ensure that expenditures adhere to budgets. The department records all HACP business transactions and monitors HACP's financial activities, while producing approximately 50,000 checks per year for payroll, accounts payable and Housing Choice Voucher Program subsidy payments."

This should be happening more transparently, as well.

Public Parking Authority of Pittsburgh

1. CUSTOMER FRIENDLINESS is very important.

After the imprudent deal that almost happened with leasing our parking facilities to Wall Street, the Parking Authority was tasked by City Council to refashion itself to be more like the parking management that would have come with the Wall Street deal (LAZ Parking).

Most important was customer service. The Parking Authority did effectively nothing toward this until they began implementing in 2013 the kiosk parking program. This program is not as **customer-friendly** as it could be. Seniors have been seen going back and forth to their cars to recall their license numbers. The machines do not take dollar bills – unlike the former machines at, *e.g.*, Carnegie Library in Oakland. Sometimes the time "ports" to other locations successfully, sometimes not. It is not always apparent that there is a parking machine nearby. Sometimes there is a sign that says there is a machine, but none has yet been installed. **In addition, during Small Business Day (which happened to be the day we initially met) the meters did not prevent drivers from paying when parking was supposed to be free.**

The parking machines, which did away with the parking meters, have eliminated bike parking spaces (on the meters).

2. Increase Garage Rates – The Market Can Bear It. One purpose of having authorities is that the political decisions are removed from elected officials – especially the raising of taxes, fees, and other rates.

The Parking Authority should increase the rates in the garages – we have 27% of the garage spaces, and lower rates than other garages. Meanwhile, we don't get any more than 7% of our meter money, because the Authority takes the other 93% for indebtedness repayment, etc. We are subsidizing the garage spaces at 35% under market rate. Therefore, we could conceivably raise the rates a bit.

3. Old Parking Meters. The Parking Authority warehoused and has been selling the old parking meters to other municipalities – they have gotten $75 each for some; they sold 200 to Lancaster for $50 each. Scrap value was not worth it, according to executive director Dave Onorato. We are not convinced that removing the old meters – rather than adding payment options onto them as Mount Lebanon has done – was as customer-friendly as it might have been. Among other things, it has made parking more difficult for seniors and the disabled, and it has made parking bicycles more difficult. However, the main point is that we believe the parking meters belong to the City of Pittsburgh, not to the Parking Authority, and thus any money from the sale of the meters should be returned fully to the City of Pittsburgh.

4. Transparency in Management and Finance. We have no solid information as to what 50 middle management employees at the Parking Authority do for a living. We have no transparency as to how much money is actually being collected for parking. The Parking Authority seems to exist for itself and its own enrichment rather than for the benefit of the City of Pittsburgh.

5. Manage Who Is Managing Parking. The Parking Authority is not the only authority which does parking – the URA, SEA and the Stadium Authority also dabble in it.

For instance, a bill recently passed in Council (2013-2050) concerning the buildings which surround the Park Building on Fifth Avenue, the former Saks building on Smithfield and the former Wendy's and the shop next door on Fifth Avenue. The resolution authorizes "a Cooperation Agreement between the City of Pittsburgh and the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh to divert 75% of the incremental parking taxes, up to $7,000,000, in order to fund a portion of the redevelopment of the former Saks Building into the 350 Oliver Project." That project is a large parking garage, with shops below. It will be constructed of concrete block and corrugated sheet metal, as passed through the Planning Commission.

Why should we be giving away our parking monies, and why should the URA be doing parking (new building planned in the middle of Downtown) when we have a Parking Authority? And the SEA has given parking to the Penguins, as well.

6. Video Records and Enforcement. We must make certain that any video records of parked cars and license plates are destroyed regularly (every day or at the end of every shift) and are not copied first. Gathering information on the comings and goings of citizens is not only unwarranted, but it may be dangerous to reveal individuals' patterns of travel and when and how long they are away from their homes.

We understand that the Parking Authority snaps some 200,000 photos of license plates parked and traveling with their cameras mounted on poles and those mounted in equipped vehicles. (*Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, September 23, 2013 http://www.post-gazette.com/neighborhoods-city/2013/09/22/Pittsburgh-s-parking-authority-snaps-200K-motorists-a-month/stories/201309220010). And they may recently have purchased a new computer server to house the amount of information generated – even though they should be deleting it. This is hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars being spent on parking enforcement. And the return does not seem to be worth it, according to the newspaper reports.

7. Provide Service. The City of Pittsburgh has yet to do parking right, and we may be losing a lot of visitors and positive public image because of it. Notwithstanding the extra PILOT payments made in recent years to the City by the Parking Authority, parking should really be a cash cow – the City should benefit greatly. If the Wall Street Lease deal showed that proper management can bring in money, let's copy that management plan and do it ourselves.

Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority

1. Work with City Departments to Maintain Customer-Friendly Service. The Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority has a large task ahead of it as ALCOSAN works on its mandate for separating the City's storm water from its waste water as it runs under the streets. Additionally, there are neighborhoods in the City (Shadyside is possibly one of the worst, and it does not even touch a river) that have continual basement flooding issues.

Also the City suffers many sinkholes in street surfaces, many times caused by water and sewer lines that are in poor repair underneath the streets. Some neighborhoods still have brick sewer mains and wooden laterals, and when large trucks traverse the street surfaces, it can wreak havoc with the old systems under ground.

2. Work with City Departments to Facilitate City and Utility Work Underground. Along the same lines, we note that the PWSA has reportedly sometimes been reluctant to join with the City's Public Works Department and all the other utilities and other municipalities in coordinating digging schedules. When one entity has a reason to dig, all the entities should be notified – so that they will not make any major surface changes or repairs before the digging, and so that they may join in the dig to make their own repairs at the same time.

We have heard many times that the PWSA is the most reluctant to participate, and so we encourage not only active participation, but leadership in it.

And being "green" in the coming modifications is of major importance, in addition to cost-effectiveness.

3. Maintain a Healthy Water System. Additionally, we encourage the PWSA, known for its good, clean, great-tasting water, to be at the forefront in managing water as fracking surrounds our City and the rivers may carry effluents heretofore unseen.

	As Clean Water Action notes, "The Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority (PWSA) draws the drinking water for its 400,000 customers from the Allegheny River. A 2012 Carnegie Mellon University study found continued high bromide levels in the Allegheny River. Bromide, a nontoxic salt compound, reacts with chlorine in the treatment process to produce trihalomethane, a carcinogen, in the finished drinking water supplied to customers. The increased bromide levels can be mainly attributed to discharges of Marcellus Shale gas drilling wastewater by upstream treatment plants. To date, PWSA has not addressed this issue and DEP has only asked drillers to take voluntary action to stop these discharges." **4. Maintain Greenness.** As a matter of fact, all Authorities should be working toward minimizing energy use and moving to greener technologies. **Sports and Exhibition Authority** **1. More Non-Political Board Members.** The SEA is perhaps the most political of all the authorities – its board members include state legislators as well as county and city officials. **2. Less Development.** There is no reason why the SEA should be in the development – really city planning – business. As with the Housing Authority and the Urban Redevelopment Authority, the SEA should turn over planning and development responsibilities within the City to the City of Pittsburgh government – particularly to the City Planning Department. The SEA should not be the sole arbiter of development of the various properties under its jurisdiction, nor should it be using its political weight to get developments approved by City departments, boards and Council. **Stadium Authority** Merge the Stadium Authority into the SEA, and turn the development work over to the City of Pittsburgh. **Urban Redevelopment Authority** **1. Place City Planning and Development Back into the City Planning Department.** The Urban Redevelopment Authority has gotten involved in City Planning without actually doing city planning. All of the city planning functions should revert immediately to the City Planning Department. The URA should no longer decide where development is needed, should not be amassing properties to lay at the feet of developers along with tax breaks to construct developments which – although on paper they may meet most of the general guidelines (resolve an imminent threat to public or employee safety or health, achieve compliance with Federal or State statutory mandates, comply with the City's Comprehensive Plan, allow for cooperative purchasing with other governments, minimal impact of the project on the operating budget, improved efficiency or

effectiveness of service delivery, ability to improve quality of life in all City neighborhoods, support of the public) – seem only to be building for the sake of building, without sufficient input from and coordination with the neighborhood residents, the CDCs and the stakeholders in the surrounding neighborhoods.

City planners are the ones who should be interacting with the public, with the neighborhood organizations and in meetings with the residents, on a regular basis. They should have the feel of the neighborhood, as it changes over time and as it wishes to change, uppermost in their minds as they develop plans for the City. The URA is not in the city planning business, and should not be in that business.

2. Move Other Responsibilities to City Departments, As Well. There are other areas in which the URA is involved which should be moved to City Departments.

An example: The Party Wall program is one which should be managed within the City government. Currently, if the City demolishes a condemned house that is not free-standing (such as a duplex or row house), the owner of the abutting home is left with the responsibility of contacting the appropriate person at the URA to apply and arrange for Party Wall remediation. This should be an automatic City service – if BBI is demolishing a home (and we are not certain why demolishing homes is under BBI, although condemning them is appropriately under Public Safety) with a party wall, before demolition begins the adjoining owner should be contacted about the Party Wall program.

There have been instances in which the demolition occurs in the middle of winter, and the adjoining home suffers freezing pipes and undue heating bills, it may take time for the homeowner to learn whom to call, to make the arrangements, and then for work to begin (due to needs for shoring the remaining basement, for working under freezing conditions, for waiting for snow and ice to melt, etc.). Because the Party Wall office does not know what is being demolished at any given time – and because demolitions may come in spurts, and because the Party Wall folks hire from their own set of contractors who may or may not be immediately available – this is a major inconvenience and expense to our citizens whose homes were not condemned and demolished.

So certainly Party Walls should be moved to a City Department, rather than in the URA. Garnering the money can remain a function of the URA, but the City should be managing more of the URA functions.

3. Consider Moving the URA's Housing to the Housing Authority. It is not clear why the URA is involved with housing, and its relationship with the Housing Authority in that regard is equally unclear. Why is the URA budgeted for "HOME Funding" money, which "provides funding for the affordable housing and rental assistance to low and moderate income people"?

4. City Planning Should Manage Where the URA is Amassing Properties. The URA should not be amassing properties on which homes could be rehabilitated or built. In fact, we sometimes have various City entities holding properties – for instance, the School District owns a slice of property behind the Summerset development –

and the properties stand for years and years. Sometimes the URA comes along and consolidates the properties from those entities, and slides them to a developer who really may not have connected with the neighborhoods appropriately, who may not have a development plan appropriate for the neighborhood, or who may be relying upon the URA to usher the project through Planning and Zoning. This is not the sort of neighborhood engagement that the City Planning Department can and should be garnering.

If possible, it would seem advisable to divest the URA of its amassing of properties.

5. No Billboards. The URA should not be in the business of renting space to billboards (yet it is). Billboards are a blight upon our city – they use our public thoroughfares for their own purposes and repay us nothing for it. They block our views, cause distracted-driver accidents, and degrade our viewsheds. Even when the billboard user tax comes through the courts and the City is victorious, there still should be absolutely no more billboards, no more LED billboards, and as far as possible a general reduction in the out-of-compliance and generally illegal billboards in the City. That the URA or any City authority or entity would rent space to a billboard is absolutely untenable.

6. The URA Should Not Be Managing Parking. As noted above under "Parking Authority," the Parking Authority is not the only authority which does parking – the URA, SEA and the Stadium Authority also dabble in it. The URA should not be considered an expert in parking, and should not have the authority to branch out into that area, especially where the end result does not really benefit the City of Pittsburgh (the goal of all authorities).

For instance, a bill recently passed in Council (2013-2050) concerning the buildings which surround the Park Building on Fifth Avenue, the former Saks building on Smithfield and the former Wendy's and the shop next door on Fifth Avenue. The resolution authorizes "a Cooperation Agreement between the City of Pittsburgh and the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh to divert 75% of the incremental parking taxes, up to $7,000,000, in order to fund a portion of the redevelopment of the former Saks Building into the 350 Oliver Project." That project is a large parking garage, with shops below. It will be constructed of concrete block and corrugated sheet metal, as passed through the Planning Commission.

We should not be giving away our parking monies, and the URA should not be dealing in parking when we have a Parking Authority.

7. Limit URA Responsibility. The URA should be limited to its original role in receiving and disbursing monies received from various funders, loan repayments, and governmental agencies.

<u>General Recommendations for Authorities</u>

Further suggestions regarding all authorities. Note that the Allegheny County Sanitary Authority (ALCOSAN) and the Sports and Exhibition Authority (SEA) are joint ventures of the City and the County.

	1. Autonomy. The autonomy of authorities is sometimes troublesome. It is troubling in that projects under their purview may work contrary to general City Planning interests, and it is troubling in that they may compete with the City. Their budgets are both separated from the City's budget and entwined with it. Authorities set their own rates for salaries and contracts, and some remit PILOT payments to the City. That autonomy may serve as a check on governmental action, but in the City of Pittsburgh it has been shown to be a way for certain interests to get ahead, sometimes without due process. By selectively appointing heads and boards of authorities, one individual or one group may retain complete control of what should be general City functions, without regard to official procedure, without public input, without due process that can be afforded by official City actions. **2. Employees.** Salaries in an authority may be set by the board of the authority, thus enabling the authority to hire away City employees into more secure jobs. While in those jobs, they may continue any special interests which possibly were contentious when in the City government. Where the board members also hold City positions or interests (but see below), this too may promulgate actions counter to City policy. In many instances, authorities have served as a repository for City employees being shuffled to the side – they gain employment in middle management in an authority, as a means of avoiding an issue or other conflict, or they are paid larger salaries for doing essentially the same work they were doing as City employees. The Parking Authority, for instance, has some 50 middle managers; there is no public transparency as to what those employees do for a living, and some may have been moved to those positions to get them out of other City positions. **3. Decommissioning.** In general, where the functions of authorities can be merged (back) into City government, we feel that the merger should be made early and cleanly. The Equipment Leasing Authority, for instance, has no outstanding bond responsibilities, and its functions could be done efficiently and effectively within the City. **4. Property Ownership and Valuation.** All authorities, especially those involved in property ownership, development, and management, must be overseen in terms of undervaluing property in the City of Pittsburgh, and making (sometimes undervalued) deals for large conglomerations of property where the neighborhood or the City Planning Department may wish to maintain tighter control. Cheaply built new developments do not always happily replace solid old housing stock that was allowed to rot while under ownership of City authorities or other governmental control. (As a side note, regarding the proposed sale of the building at 200 Ross Street. The building is owned by the City, the URA, and the Housing Authority, and we believe it would be wasteful to sell that building and then be responsible for renting space for City functions. The City should be better maintaining the building, and investing in it, rather than looking to pay rent somewhere else. Moreover, that building holds many historic records of the City, which would be displaced and possibly

discarded, and we believe that would be wrong. The building itself could serve as a single-stop shop for various services of the City such as permits. It could also serve as a public amenity instead of just a decaying office building. For instance, the board room on the top floor could be rented for meetings.)

5. Council Members and Mayoral Insiders on Authority Boards. It is a conflict of interest for a Council member to serve on the board of an authority. Currently, each Council member is assigned to serve on at least one authority board, the idea being that the Council person will bring back news of the Authority's goings-on to the other Council members. This could be accomplished better by mandatory reporting of Authority boards to the Mayor and to Council (and to the public) prior to and immediately following any meeting.

In October 1989, Councilwoman Michelle Madoff (of blessed memory) expressed concern that Councilpersons serve on the boards of authorities. Quoting her from the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, she said it opened up "the potential for cronyism, patronage and personal gain" for council members. She refused to serve on the Water and Sewer Authority when selected. She added that "the potential for abuse outweighs the benefits." At the time, the City Solicitor opined that the practice violated state law.

The same could be said for members of the Mayor's Office serving on the boards of several authorities. When Mayor Ravenstahl proposed selling our parking to Wall Street, the agreement among the Wall Street companies and the Parking Authority, the Pension Fund, and the City of Pittsburgh could have been signed on behalf of the three Pittsburgh entities solely by Scott Kunka, who was serving as Chair of the Authority, Chair of the Fund, and Director of Finance.

At the time, then City Controller Tom Flaherty called authorities "'shadowy fiefdoms to perpetuate power' for the people who run them," according to the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.* And Jim Roddey, then the chair of the Water and Sewer Authority board, opined that the mayor should select board members for their expertise and background in a specific area, such as engineering or finance, rather than simply because they are friends of politicians.

6. Qualifications of Other Members. (Please see our separate list of qualifications for members.) No one from industries directly affected by activities in which the Authority engages should serve on the board.

7. The Purpose of Authorities. The point of authorities – then and now – is to incur debt and handle monies without directly negatively affecting the City's bottom line. They exist to bolster the City's outlook. They exist to better accomplish certain tasks to benefit the City. When their job is done – as with the Stadium Authority – they should be disbanded. When they begin to exist solely to benefit themselves, they should be reined in. And at all times their boards and operations should remain removed from political influence, by whatever means possible.

8. Positions Must Remain Filled and Active. It is important that all positions remain filled, current, and active. There should be no delay in

	replacing vacant seats, expired terms should be re-upped immediately, and other matters should be handled expeditiously. To repeat: the point of authorities is to incur debt and handle monies without directly negatively affecting the City's bottom line. They exist to bolster the City's outlook. They exist to better accomplish certain tasks to benefit the City. When their job is done, they should be disbanded. When they begin to exist solely to benefit themselves, they should be reined in. And at all times their boards and operations should remain removed from political influence, by whatever means possible. **COMMISSIONS** **Advisory Commission on Community Based Organizations (ACCBO)** ACCBO essentially exists to distribute City Council's CDBG monies to CDCs in a nonpolitical manner. This intent at being nonpolitical has been a bit tarnished. When ACCBO holds its review of the presentations from the various CDCs, it splits into three or four groups of three or four persons on three or four separate days in order to have all CDC presentations heard. The members reviewing the presentations submit the information to the rest of the Commission members at deliberation meetings, which also often include input from Commission members who have an "inside track" (often more a jaded long-standing history of interaction). We suggest that the presentations by the CDCs be made public, and that all CDCs be welcomed to view each others' presentations. Not only would this encourage collaboration and spread good ideas from one organization to others, it would provide more transparency in the grading system by which the monies are subsequently distributed. **Clean Pittsburgh Commission** Assess efficacy of this commission – few members, to what goals? **BOARDS** **Disruptive Property Appeals Board** Replace departing members more efficaciously, as this board is important to the individual citizens of the City. **Green Jobs Advisory Board** Consider reinventing and reintroducing a Green Jobs Advisory Board or Commission. For this board, expertise and experience is more important than City residency. Both should be included.

What are the obstacles to implementation?	Vested interests and "business as usual."
Who needs to be involved?	Mayor's Administration and boards of BACs.
What city resources need to be invested?	Time, and strength against influence.
What will be different if the recommendation is adopted?	The more authorities there are, especially where they work against each other or against the Mayor's Administration, the more diffuse the direction of the City and the more time and money spent. This will clear away the legacies and serve to help move the City in a unified direction.
Describe any background materials that you consulted	Websites, news reports, personal experience of Subcommittee members.
Have other cities implemented this recommendation?	Yes.
Are there any other considerations?	

We request that each recommendation be submitted by the subcommittee Chairperson to Kevin Acklin and your Committee Chair by **5:00 pm on Friday, December 27**.