

The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission
Regional Policy Advisory Committee
October 23, 2023
SPC Office – 42 21st Street, Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Members present were: Darin Alviano, Mike Belding, Arthur Cappella, Pat Fabian, Rich Fitzgerald, Aadil Ginwala, Sheila Gombita, Mark Gordon, Dusty Elias Kirk, Ann Ogoreuc, Leslie Osche, Johnna Pro, Mark Rafail, Larry Shifflet, and Vince Vicites

Others: Dan Distler, Beaver County Office of Planning and Development; Toby Fauver, Rockland Planning; Lisa Frank, Mayor Gainey's Office; Chuck Kolling and Carrie Lewis DelRusso, Buchanan, Ingersoll & Rooney; and Betsy Zang, McCormick Taylor

Staff: Mary Brangan, Kirk Brethauer, Ronda Craig, Dominic D'Andrea, Linda Duffy, Lillie Gabreski, Chuck Imbrogno, Tom Klevan, Jenn Lasser, Caitlin O'Connor, DJ Ryan, Russell Singer, Ailisa Sobien, David Totten, Vincent Valdez, Sara Walfort and Andy Waple.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Commissioner Pat Fabian welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

2. Action on Meeting Minutes of August 28, 2023

Commissioner Mike Belding moved to approve the meeting minutes of August 23, 2023 and County Executive Rich Fitzgerald seconded. The motion carried.

3. Update on the Save the Allegheny River Initiative (STAR) – (DJ Ryan, Director of Strategic Initiatives and Policy)

SPC's been working with a diverse coalition that was originally started by the Army Corps of Engineers to solve the problems we're seeing on the Allegheny River with relation to the hours of operation. That has evolved into the Save the Allegheny River or Star Group. Now an independent group chaired by SPC and the Port of Pittsburgh Commission who are working in conjunction with the Army Corp and the other stakeholders to actually get some action done on this issue. So that group met for the first time here last month and we have two main courses of action and a few other side initiatives.

A federal piece of legislation called the Water Resources Development Act is the major authorizing legislation that does a lot of different water related things. But most primarily authorizes the Army Corps of Engineers to spend their money traditionally through two-year periods. That bill is currently in design and will then go through discussions at the Senate.

We have drafted a policy proposal that was approved by the STAR committee that asks for two things: 1) to prevent a decrease in the level of service on the Allegheny River for the next 10 years; and 2) to ask for an essentially economic impact study conducted by the Army Corps that would account for all of the different things that the Allegheny River does to impact our economy. We're asking for those two goals to be accomplished through an amendment to WRDA 2024.

The other course of action that we discussed at that meeting is a revision to the actual Army Corps guidelines related to this. The Inland Marine Transportation System Board of Directors is an internal board at the Army Corps of Engineers that sets these hours of operation for the locks. That board has not met since 2012 to discuss these levels of service, and they can revise their guidelines at any time.

The other thing that we have asked is for a letter from our members of Congress to Lt. Gen. Scott Spellmon at the Army Corps, simply saying, can you please change these, and that will also solve our problem, although not as permanently. To that end, we've asked Senator Bob Casey to lead the effort to amend WRDA. His standing in the Senate makes him ideal for this. He has a lot of experience in working with the

Corps and with WRDA specifically and Senator Fetterman's office and our house delegation are on board with that as well.

As far as the Inland Marine Transportation System goes, we have tasked the lead on that to Congressman Guy Reschenthaler. Congressman Reschenthaler sits on the Appropriations Subcommittee for energy and water which means USACE leadership will give his letter much attention. And we also wanted this effort to be bipartisan and bicameral. I should note here that both of these initiatives are going to be coordinated among all of our federal representatives. This isn't like these two in particular are going to be handling this. They are asking for support from all of our elected officials. We believe we're going to have a sign on from our entire federal delegation for the region with regard to both of these efforts.

A couple of other initiatives: One is SPC, the Port of Pittsburgh Commission, and Friends of the Riverfront are going to be leading up a group to conduct a full economic impact study. Friends of the Riverfront is going to chair this subcommittee for us. And we're going to do our own study, because we wanted to make one that includes what we believe are the best economic impacts for the Allegheny River. The idea here is that we'll be able to secure funding through them, and do exactly the study that we need. We're also working with state officials to get letters of support from them. The Port of Pittsburgh Commission has representatives, one for each house, one for each party on its board. So those four are taking the lead and getting a letter of support from our state officials that we can then make sure the federal officials are aware of so that they have the backing that you need going to bat for us there.

And we're working with other community initiatives, in particular, the group that's working on the rehabilitation of the former Cheswick Power Plant site to make sure that their voices are heard in this as well. We hope to have a concrete solution in the coming months. But a lot of this is at the whim of the federal government. And they have a lot going on right now. But we will certainly keep you posted on this.

There were no questions.

4. Update on the nuclear waste site in Armstrong County (DJ Ryan, Director of Strategic Initiatives and Policy)

We've talked about the site in Armstrong County that the Army Corps of Engineers is remediating the nuclear waste out of. I went to a public meeting last month that was primarily focused on addressing the immediate concerns of the residents who live in that area. Bottom line is the remediation itself is not going to start until 2025. As we get closer to that date, we're going to have a lot more information on the transport of these materials. Where exactly they're going through. What method they're being transported. And that is of the most concern for the regional group here. We're going to keep on this and determine what, if any, first responders need to be aware as far as they're going to transport on rail, where it's going, and everything like that. We're keeping on it and will keep everyone posted as far as the specific transport plans go.

Commissioner Fabia thanked DJ for attending that meeting. He was in attendance as well. It was more or less a listening session to hear the concerns from the residents and give them a project update. But as DJ said, those materials as it relates to the southwest region, won't be transported until somewhere in the calendar year of 2025. As they get closer to that date, they will pull it back in as it relates to how they're going to transport it out of Armstrong County and through Southwestern Pennsylvania by truck and rail.

There were no questions.

5. Transit Fare System Feasibility Study (Tom Klevan, Manager of Transit Planning) and a consultant from McCormick Taylor

In Federal Fiscal Year 2020 SPC got some Federal Transit Administration formula funding for operations. These funds were to help restore operations Post Covid. We took a look at the status of the regional van pool program. We took a look at our Transportation Demand Management and we wondered if there weren't some better ways to spend this money.

Our initial problem statement: "Is there a way to make funding available to the regions providers of public transit to help restore transit ridership post-pandemic?" We came up with idea: Could we utilize these funds to contract for mobile ticketing application and make sub-contracts available to all providers of public transit in the region for easier fare payment methods? And we felt like we could perhaps attract riders back to public transit all across the region. This was right in line with a couple of things. One of the goals of SPC's Long Range Plan was to make equitable, seamless linkages between the region's public transit services. And then on the follow up, the Regional Transit Vision *SmartMoves Connections* goal: "Coordinated fare payment systems and policies." Basically the idea is that if you can use more than one system easily, maybe you'll travel more, travel further. It's also a long-standing goal idea of leaders in this region to try to get the transit operations to work together better.

We took that initial idea and first thing we had to figure out was is FTA going to let us spend the money on that? And the next idea was, how would we spend the money on that? The first idea was for SPC to contract with a company doing mobile ticketing, and to somehow make sub contracts available to everybody. FTA said a couple of problems with that. First of all, you don't have enough money. And second of all, that type of procurement for an MPO and for specifically, your MPO, will be very, very difficult. But FTA thought we should do the study. So, we came up with a scope for this transit fare system feasibility study to conduct a feasibility analysis for regional mobile transit fare system for the transit agencies that operate in the 10-county region. The study goal was to identify simple payment technology options to provide riders, residents, students and visitors with the option to transfer between systems with a single fare. Instead, the study was going to look at recommendations for procurement and implementation of an appropriate mobile fare transit system. And we're also going to look at lessons learned and see what was going on in other parts of the country.

The transit agencies in the region currently set their own fare structure, prices, products, vendors, and policies. These individualized fare systems, although customized to each transit system, create challenges for riders who need to transfer or who use transit on multiple transit agencies/services for them to complete their trips. We took a swing at this before actually talking to a congressman. The most recent swing we took out was back in 2010. At that time Port Authority/Pittsburgh Regional Transit, advanced a regional fare collection system called the Connect Card. The bottom line was the Connect Card was intended to modernize and move forward with a smart card system and to phase out antiquated token and ticket systems. It was a major step forward. The system is now outdated. PRT is currently modernizing the system and so is everybody else. One of the things that we learned in this was that this wasn't just a simple thing of buying one thing that everybody uses. Payment convergent and integrated trip planning could be a way to attract more riders interested in a seamless experience.

There are 13 transit operators that participated in this study. And that's pretty much everybody. Although I will note that we did take a look at shared ride type systems across the country, and how this is used for other types of trips. But in the end, we concentrated on those folks that represent the counties, and by and large, provide fixed route transit. The exceptions to that would be Heritage Community Transportation and the Airport Corridor Transportation Association, those two shuttle services. So what we found out is that six of the 13 operators currently offer some kind of mobile ticketing. BCTA, PRT and WCTA use an app called Masabi. That was the one we were most interested in in the beginning because PRT already had an existing contract with them. BTA and ICTA use an app called Token Transit. And WASH uses an app called Modeshift. Most providers offer multiple payment options including mobile/web applications, cash, credit/debit cards at ticket machines/windows, fare cards/passes, and tickets. ACTA and GCHS are cash-only with no credit/debit card, fare card, or mobile payment options. Cash use varies throughout the region from 100% use on the cash-only providers to 6% in the PRT system.

Some basic study elements. The collection of cash and accounting for unbanked users is a very important element across the country and other places where they've done this. Sometimes it's really easy to imagine paying for everything with our phone, but not everybody has that available to them. So, you have to make sure that if you're going to have a fare system, it includes everybody. We talked to PennDOT because what became obvious to us was that at some point, folks are going to have to utilize PennDOT funding to enter into these contracts or indeed to do anything with fare collection by fare boxes or anything. So, we wanted to make sure that as we went along with this, we were in line with PennDOT's

thinking on how to go about doing this. Turns out PennDOT is very supportive of this. There are other parts across the state where PennDOT has funded contracts for mobile ticketing. There are other parts of the state where PennDOT is doing some things with multiple systems using the same fare instrument. So, they're very much supportive of anything that we come up with here. And being supportive is the first step to getting money off of them.

We also wanted to see what was going on with the folks that use transit. We did a little survey and it gave us some general ideas. It also reinforced things that we kind of already knew. A lot of folks who use transit in this region do use tickets and passes. We also found out that the use of the mobile apps on the six systems that are using them, are pretty popular at this point. And of course, cash is certainly part of it. There are still a lot of people who use Connect Cards. And that 16% also includes the students at Pitt, CMU and Chatham, who ride Port Authority with their ID cards.

I want to acknowledge Betsy Zang and any other members of the consultant team on here. They put together just a wonderful study. But probably the most important thing they did for us is they did a really deep dive into some of the stuff that's going on in other parts of the country. The bottom line is that there are different ways to approach this. And none of them are bad, none of them are quite perfect either. Probably the most sophisticated practice that we looked at is called Cal-ITP, California Integrated Travel Project.

A member of our team was Toby Fauver, who currently is with Rockland Planning. He was former Deputy Secretary of Multimodal Transportation at PennDOT and he did a lot of independent work for the Cal-ITP project. Basically, they leveraged a lot of systems and they leveraged the buying power of the state of California to get the vendors and the banks to back and be a part of this and to agree to only provide products that contain open system. So, if you have mobile ticketing, your system has the option of what's called Open Payment. That's basically using your credit card to pay for your fare. Another practice we looked at was an operation called NEORIDE. It's out of Ohio. And right now, they're in for as many as 16 different operators. They operate as a co-op. They have contracted with mobile ticketing services. The best comparison I can make for you is it kind of operates like a Council of Governments. Everyone agrees to be part of the co-op. And they agree to purchase this stuff together. And it's pretty interesting. And we did look at it. And there are possibilities going forward to take a look at this kind of thing, not just for mobile ticketing, but for other types of things, too. As I mentioned, PennDOT is funding some of this and one of the places they're funding it is in Luzerne County here in PA.

Toby Fauver – I'm here to say the more about Cal-ITP. When the state did it, they wanted a lot of the back-office work to be open source technology. They've done a lot that's open source in terms of the software, so others can borrow it and use it. It does require purchase of hardware to have on the transit vehicle. And it does require developing a relationship with a banking institution. If you've worked through a direct vendor, like one of the fare vendors that can do open source already, they would come to you with a relationship with a bank or a back-office banking institution to take care of the fees. Another major component of Cal-ITP is real time GTFS technology, which provides real time transit information through Google Maps and Apple Maps so you can see where your buses are, where your train is, and what the travel time is, etc., Through Google Maps and Apple Maps, you don't have to go to a separate transit app.

Tom Klevan – Probably the two most important things if you're going to take a trip on multiple providers is knowing how to pay and knowing when to transfer. So those two things together. The analysis of options takes us from the most basic to what we think is possible to what now exists. The Single Pooled Contract for Region was our basic idea when we first started. You first purchase a contract and then make sub-contracts available. Now there's some other issues besides just how to pay for it and how to make the contract. Because as we work down through these options, we find out that probably the biggest issue that we have to approach is the idea of the system's actually wanting to share their customers and actually wanting to share their revenue. And that kind of thing requires more than just a contract that requires some agreements.

Toby Fauver –

- 1) Option one is a Single Pooled Contract for Region which would be a single procurement, single contract, with a single vendor that all of the transit agencies would participate in. It does require some kind of governance structure or ability to share fair revenue and distribute revenue between systems and it requires systems working together on fare policy.
- 2) Option two is Individual Contracts with Regional Agreement. It's a single pooled procurement. But each transit agency would have their own contract with the vendor that was selected. So single vendor individualized contracts. And it would allow you to use the single fare instrument to travel between systems. Again, it does require some governance and administration of the funding between the systems, whether it's bilateral, meaning one-on-one agreements between systems or regional agreement and it still requires something to be able to share revenue between systems.
- 3) The third one is Individual Procurements with Bilateral Agreements. Each system would select whatever vendor they want to select, which is sort of where things are today. Except, what we're recommending is that you develop bilateral agreements between the individual systems, so that they could get to fare reciprocity so that some people could transfer between systems at a discount. Even if they're on different technology bases, you could come up with a way, either through a paper transfer, QR code, or even a visual verification with the driver, which may create some union issues you'd have to sort out or work through. But there are ways that other systems work through those issues, and allowed transfers to take place.
- 4) The next one is really going to establish a Regional Policy – Open Payment. So that system, no matter what vendor they select, move toward or implement Open Payment with that vendor. And that basically sets up the region so that anybody traveling, like a visitor coming into the region, or people living in the region could use their ATM, TAP card, ATM card, credit card, they could use Apple Pay, Google Pay, use their phones, use other mobile devices to basically tap on the reader and pay the fare. A lot of times the systems would have a policy, that the more you use it, then you would get a discount on your fare. If you use it 10 times in a month, you might get a discount as if you're buying a 10-trip ticket. Or if you use it 20 times a month, it might be equivalent to getting a monthly pass and so then all your trips would be free after so many trips, that kind of thing. So, systems can track that by the card. But again, it would require the individual consistently using the same card or the same phone or whatever to tap on, tap off.
- 5) The last one is Individual Contracts with no transfer, which is basically how we are today. There's really no discount of transfers between systems today. So, if somebody rides one system into Pittsburgh and then needs to transfer to PRT, they're going to pay the full fare on both systems or discounted if they're buying monthly passes or discounted bearer instruments.

The write up in the report talks about some of the trade-offs with each one of those scenarios as part of the study.

Tom Klevan – Throughout the study, we presented it monthly at the Transit Operators Committee and have continued it as a discussion item. And then two committee meetings ago we put together a workgroup and that workgroup has met. The question we anticipate the most is “what does it cost”? It's a really tough one to answer because the contracting in each one of these options is fundamentally different and the costs vary greatly depending on what vendor you're going to use. The vendors are all independent and some vendors work on an older model where you have to pay for your capital upfront. And that's a fee. And then you have a yearly fee. Other vendors have subscription-based cost models where you pay based on what it cost. They amortize the capital costs across the length of the contract. But the bottom line is, these vendors are in competition with each other. And so, what it costs is not always crystal clear.

We did want to take a look at these cost options. We sort of figured out that we as an MPO, staff probably couldn't do the first idea that we had. We also found out that administering this on a regional basis, or statewide basis is not cheap. The NEORIDE folks in Ohio, their administrative costs run into the millions a year. And of course, the co-op pays for the staff and the administration. So, keeping everything straight can get expensive, depending on how complicated your situation is. That's why one of the reasons we favor the Open Payment option, is because it's the regional policy that I want to draw your attention to, because that's what we do. That's what the MPO does. And I think that at some point, at some level, that's the thing that we can bring to these folks in the region that want transit to work better. What we can bring

to them is some technical expertise, figuring out what works, and then hopefully some policy type things we can make happen that ultimately makes it easier for folks to get a ride.

Keven Burgess; Bytemark article – “What are Open Payments in Transit”? Imagine this scenario – you walk up to a vehicle or gate, pull out your credit card, tap it on a payment terminal, instantly, you have access to the public transit system. The entire process took three seconds. Now you can go sit down in a chair and read the latest John Grisham novel while you're whisked off to your destination. You didn't have to search from the App Store, download an app, enter credit card details on an app or website, stand in line waiting to purchase a ticket, figure out what type of pass you need to buy, count out cash to make the purchase, wait for a traditional credit/debit card transaction to complete, worry that the transaction will incur a low balance fee. Behind the scenes, the payment is charged to your credit or debit card account. It shows up in your statement with a nominal “tap to ride” fee.

Betsy Zang, our lead consultant with McCormick Taylor, has just recently returned from a trip out to Chicago where they have Open Payment. And she was with her family. And she told the story to our TOC workgroup. They rode transit the whole time they were out there from the airport to around the town. And all they used was their credit card. They didn't have to work or worry about what transit pass to buy or what the fare was. It was easy and it worked and everybody was happy. So, I think it can work.

So, what are the next steps? Well, it might be possible for a regional policy to be drafted and endorsed by the MPO. That would encourage transit operator cooperation by requiring all mobile ticketing contracts entered into to include an open payment option. What does that mean? That means that when PRT is negotiating its upcoming contract with Masabi, they tell them you have to include Open Payment as part of this contract. For folks that are using PennDOT money to buy a Modeshift or Transit Token, when they go into negotiations for that contract, they tell the vendor to have Open Payment as part of this contract. Now, there's two things about that. It sounds basic, right? It's not. First of all, every vendor out there will tell you they can do Open Payment. So, when we even found the same thing with Modeshift, they're probably the most sophisticated of the vendors and probably the most successful low-ticket vendors, even they kind of balked when it gets to the details of Open Payment, although they do have it, they do offer it on their contracts. So that's the first thing. The second thing about this is that if you want that in your contract, it's going to cost you. You're going to pay us this much more to have that in your contract. The first thing to have is some kind of a policy that says if you're going to offer mobile ticketing and have an Open Payment option, we can continue to work with the individual transit operators to establish these bilateral type agreements in effect. Right now, we're working with Beaver County Transit and PRT to try to figure out a way for them to share customers at one place in the system, which is the output department. It's not as simple as it sounds. And basically, what it boils down to is just an agreement to share customers, which means an agreement to share revenue. The simplest way that it could work is if a rider is going inbound from Rochester from somewhere in Fayette County, and gets off a bus in Aliquippa then gets on a Port Authority Bus. That entire fare, the inbound fare, goes to Beaver County. When they're coming back in the evening and gets off a PRT bus at Aliquippa and gets on the BCTA bus and goes wherever they're going in Beaver County, that entire outbound fare goes to PRT. Seems like it would be a simple thing to do because of the way fare reconciliation goes within each system. You have to have some sort of a special agreement to have anything like that happen. And those agreements obviously have to be worked out with lawyers.

Our MPO transit planning staff continue to work with mobile ticketing/fare system vendors to encourage collaboration across multiple individual contracts. We talked to all these vendors, Masabi being the one that we've talked to the most when in the beginning we were thinking about buying their products that they were relaxed. And we learned a lot about how they do business and we think we can help when it comes time to negotiate contracts. We think we could provide technical assistance to the transit operators to negotiate those contracts. If these contracts are going to contain a clause to include Open Payment and if it's going to cost more, maybe there is a way that we can utilize this extra FDA money that we have and help pay for those extra costs in the individual contracts as we have ways to do that. They're not simple. They're kind of complicated. But we have ways. For example, right now, as part of the federal formula sub allocation process, those transit operators that utilize the busways pay a fee to utilize those postulates to PRT. Those fees are counted for and are somehow a local sub allocation process. So, there are ways to

trade money back and forth to make this happen. And it's all federal formula money. So, we might be able to do it that way. Also, we do pass federal formula funds through to entities in the region by sub recipient agreement. We currently have sub recipients for federal transit and three or four sub recipients for Federal Transit Administration funds. So, there are ways for us to create agreements so that we can make some of that Federal Transit Administration money available. And we could continue to look for ways to do that.

I would encourage you to go on to the file sharing File Transfer Site and take a look at the whole study. It's an excellent study. We have the consultants who just did a tremendous job with us, and especially the research into what was going on in other places.

Speaker – two questions for you and/or Toby? Did you look at or did you think about is there an appetite from the Multimodal Bureau to enter into some type of single pooled contract, be it either regionwide or statewide?

Tom Klevan – I think it depends on what you mean by appetite. I think that there would be some kind of a statewide pass or a statewide way to pay. But I'm not sure that they know exactly how to go about doing that. Now, in terms of regionwide, they know about this study. They know what we're doing. We've had good conversations with them all along the way. And I think where they will help us is if, for example, we were in Indiana last Thursday, and we talked to the folks up there and they are going to extend their current contract. And they're doing a transit development plan as well. So, it's time to talk to them as part of that transit development plan. How are you going to work with Westmoreland County? Are you going to work with that? Are you going to work together? And so, they're part of the ongoing discussion, and they're going to bring the checkbook to the table. They've said all along that we will pay for fare collection, especially if you're going to go in a technological direction, we want to encourage that. And so I think it's very hopeful, very, very positive.

Toby Fauver - In discussions I've had with PennDOT in the multimodal area that, like Tom said, they're very supportive, especially of regional things, but I don't think PennDOT is going to advance, at least in the short term, any kind of statewide IT projects that would do any kind of statewide fare collection technology. They've got staffing issues the same as everybody else. And I know they have a couple of statewide IT projects going on now still supporting eco lane, and also the Vail technologies project, which is out there. And the last time I talked to them about this, they were supportive of local and regional fare collection activities and decisions and would continue to work with local regions, but weren't looking at any kind of statewide project.

Speaker – Then, second, what's the option for the Regional Policy – Open Payment? How does the equity piece play into that if you're not going to be interoperable?

Tom Klevan – That's a great question. That's probably the weakest of that option. Open Payment, I think for the region, would be a really cool thing. The coolest part of it that I can think of is somebody coming in here from out of town, and coming into the airport, and being able to take the 28X and be able to come downtown and be able to go up to Oakland and being able to avail themselves of what we have here. And all they need is a credit card. But then does that help the person who maybe has to make a two or three seat ride from the upper Allegheny or Mon Valley or somewhere like that? No, it really doesn't. And so I would have to admit that whatever happens with fare collection, regionwide, the cash option cannot and will not go away, and just can't. But the options for the unbanked are an interesting part. And there's a couple of these places that we looked at in other parts of the country, they've done some really good things to figure out ways to have cards or have the option to pay, even if you're "unbanked".

Toby Fauver – What California did on a statewide basis has worked with the major banks. The lot of the people that are low income, a lot of them have very low credit ratings and don't have bank accounts. And so, when they get a paycheck, they go to check cashing places and cash their checks, or they may be able to cash it with their employer, that kind of thing. And so one of the things that California did is they worked with the major banks, to help create a program where those people that are lower income that normally would struggle to be able to open a bank account, can open bank accounts or get ATM cards, and be able to use those to use transit and also begin to help build credit, which helps those individuals in

the long term. So, they're using this transit project as a way to help people begin to financially improve themselves. But it required a lot of negotiation with some of the bigger banks to be able to do it. I don't know if there's enough buying power in the Pittsburgh region to do that or not. But you might want to do that with one of the local or regional banks to make something like that happen.

Speaker – Just on this point, you mentioned a bunch of places already do this. You talked about Chicago. I've had that experience in London where they do this. I think a lot of them do this. Do they not already have some solutions for these kinds of questions, like I think are called machines, right? Maybe it's the DC airport. With the cash machine, you get a temporary card. You're on your way, right? So I just assumed that there are ways. I love the idea of banks creating credit for the “unbanked”, that's wonderful but even before that, it feels like most of these big challenges, lots of people saw this as a brand new leading edge. There's nothing about this technology that's leading edge.

Tom Klevan – The thing that's different here is the governance structures in place to sort of have everything come together in some way. And this idea of bilateral agreements is one way to create it.

Sheila Gombita – I think overall, all the transit operators are supportive of the initiative and want to take the next steps to make something happened.

Pat Fabian – This appears that the state wouldn't have the appetite or the resources at this time to do something like this. So the transit operators workgroup is supportive of these efforts on seems like it would be a regional thing and I thought we'd bring cash to the table and be supportive because it's a regional effort.

6. Next Meeting Date – December 11, 2023 at 2:00 p.m. at SPC.

7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:57 p.m.