

STATE REPRESENTATIVE

BRAD ROAE6TH LEGISLATIVE DISTRICT

DISTRICT OFFICES

18937 PARK AVENUE PLAZA
MEADVILLE, PA 16335
PHONE: 814-336-1136P.O. BOX 141
145 WEST ERIE STREET
LINESVILLE, PA 16424
PHONE: 814-683-6031CRANESVILLE BOROUGH OFFICE
10195 JOHN WILLIAMS AVENUE
CRANESVILLE, PA 16410
TOLL-FREE: 800-770-2377

House of Representatives

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
HarrisburgCOMMITTEE
STATE GOVERNMENT, CHAIR
APP
STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER
BOARD OF GOVERNORSCAPITOL OFFICE
P.O. BOX 202006
HARRISBURG, PA 17120-2006
PHONE: 717-787-2353REPROAE.COM
BROAE@PAHOUSEGOP.COM
FACEBOOK.COM/REPROAE

November 27, 2024

Chairperson George D. Bedwick
 Vice Chairperson John F. Mizner, Esq.
 Commissioner John J. Soroko, Esq.
 Commissioner Murray Ufberg, Esq.
 Commissioner Dennis A. Watson, Esq.
 Pennsylvania Independent Regulatory Review Commission
 333 Market Street, 14th floor
 Harrisburg, PA 17101

Via Electronic Mail to: irrc@irrc.state.pa.us

RE: Department of General Services Regulation #8-28: Commonwealth Parking Facilities

Dear Members of the Independent Regulatory Review Commission:

I write to express concerns with this Department of General Services (Department) final-omitted regulation.

This final-omitted regulation removes out of date provisions from Chapter 71 and increases parking fines for the Commonwealth parking facilities. According to the Preamble, this is the first time this regulation has been updated since its enactment over 50 years ago.

While I support removing out of date provisions and implementing appropriate fines, I am concerned that as a final-omit, the Department is bypassing further input by the regulated community on a regulation that has never been updated in its over 50 years of existence. As a result, I am concerned questions and additional concerns could be overlooked or unanswered. For example:

- The regulation deletes Section 71.4(2) which according to the Department "suggests prioritizing parking assignments for handicapped employees." The Department goes on to say that "in current times there is an abundance of handicap designated parking areas, making this provision unnecessary." While there may be spots available, has the Department discussed the regulation further

with the advocates for individuals with disabilities to ensure that their needs are properly addressed when it comes to Commonwealth parking? I will note that as this regulation was originally adopted in 1973, but the Americans with Disabilities Act was not originally enacted until the 1990s a review to ensure proper alignment and consistency might be necessary.

- What about parking safety standards? What about additional signage with information about the parking and possible penalties for violations? Should the regulation include these kinds of provisions?
- Additionally, what about electric cars? As these were not available when the regulation was enacted, should the regulation include how many parking spaces should be available for these types of vehicles and if charging stations are present how the price is determined that those who utilize Commonwealth parking pay when charging?
- Proposed changes to Section 71.43 (2) remove prohibitions relating to trucks parking in underground garages. Does the inclusion of the term “passenger vehicles and motorcycles” instead actually include trucks? Since it is not defined, clarification may be needed on the term “passenger vehicles.”
- The Department’s response to Regulatory Analysis Form Question 16 states in part: “it is important to note that Commonwealth agencies, boards, commissions and councils are already functioning under the procedures set forth in the rulemaking and will not be coming under any new burdens.” As those who utilize the parking facilities on a regular basis, again it might be helpful for the Department to hear from the regulated community on whether there are any other potential parking issues this rulemaking could address.

Again, I do not object to revisions to out of date provisions, nor do I object to the fine increase. However, why rush the process? While the regulatory review process can take up to two years to complete, it does not *have* to. Having the very first update 50 years later without any opportunity for further discussion, much less promulgation of this final rulemaking occurring very close to the legislative session drawing to a close, causes me to question the unintended consequences that this regulation on “the fast-track” may unnecessarily create.

I respectfully ask IRRC to review these concerns when considering the regulation.

Thank you.



Brad Roae