



# Pittsburgh Region Congestion Pricing Workshop

## Workshop Summary Report



Supported by:

Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission (SPC)

Pennsylvania Department of Transportation

Federal Highway Administration

Pittsburgh, PA

September 29, 2016





## INTRODUCTION

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), with the support of Battelle and the Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI), conducted a one-day workshop on Congestion Pricing on September 29, 2016 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The workshop involved stakeholders from the Pittsburgh region and around the state. This included many representatives of the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) from both District 11 and headquarters, Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission (SPC), and support contractors.

SPC is interested in investigating congestion pricing in the Pittsburgh region. One of the ideas under consideration is the conversion of the I-279 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes to a High Occupancy Toll (HOT) facility with congestion pricing.

The workshop was designed to engage participants in discussions on:

- Congestion pricing concepts and strategies.
- Specific implementation issues including:
  - Federal policy.
  - Planning considerations.
  - Design considerations.
  - Operations & maintenance.
- Peer operational and implementation case studies.
- Outreach and marketing.

The intended outcome of the workshop was to help PennDOT and other stakeholders with opportunities to:

- Develop a broad understanding of congestion pricing capabilities, limitations, and challenges.
- Gain an understanding of Federal programs related to pricing.
- Learn from other agencies that recently implemented pricing programs.
- Communicate why congestion pricing can be beneficial.

This summary report includes background and an overview of the discussions held at the workshop. A workshop session attendee list is presented at the end of this document, and presentations have been made available as separate attachments.



## RESOURCES

Many key resources are available to support the development and implementation of Congestion Pricing. These include:

### Manuals/Primers

- FHWA Priced Managed Lane Guide
  - <http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/fhwahop13013/index.htm>
- NCHRP Report 686: Road Pricing – Public Perceptions and Program Development
  - [http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/nchrp\\_rpt\\_686.pdf](http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/nchrp_rpt_686.pdf)
- FHWA Guidebook for State, Regional, and Local Governments on Addressing Potential Equity Impacts of Road Pricing
  - <http://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/fhwahop13033/index.htm>
- FHWA Roles of Transportation Management Centers in Incident Management on Managed Lanes
  - <http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/fhwahop14022/index.htm>
- NCHRP Report 777: A Guide to Regional Transportation Planning for Disasters, Emergencies, and Significant Events
  - [http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/nchrp\\_rpt\\_777.pdf](http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/nchrp_rpt_777.pdf)
- Federal-Aid Highway Program Guidance on High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV) Lanes
  - <http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/freewaymgmt/hovguidance/>
- Effective Approaches for Advancing Congestion Pricing in a Metropolitan Region
  - <http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/fhwahop12030/index.htm>
- Advancing Congestion Pricing in the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process: Four Case Studies
  - <http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/fhwahop11002/index.htm>
- FHWA Congestion Pricing Primer Series
  - [http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/congestionpricing/resources/primers\\_briefs.htm](http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/congestionpricing/resources/primers_briefs.htm)
- NCHRP Guidelines for Implementing Managed Lanes (Research Report 835)
  - <https://www.nap.edu/download/23660>
- FHWA Federal-Aid Highway Program Guidance on High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes September 2016
  - <https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/freewaymgmt/hovguidance/index.htm>
- FHWA and High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV)/Managed Use Lane (MUL) Pooled Fund Study panel: Safety Implications of Managed Lane Cross Sectional Elements
  - <https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/fhwahop16076/index.htm>
- FHWA Congestion Pricing Primer on Effective Approaches to Streamlining Back Office Operations
  - <https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/Publications/fhwahop15037/index.htm>
- FHWA Report to Congress on the Value Pricing Pilot Program through April 2016
  - [https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/congestionpricing/value\\_pricing/pubs\\_reports/rpttocongress/vppp16rpt/](https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/congestionpricing/value_pricing/pubs_reports/rpttocongress/vppp16rpt/)

### Evaluation Reports

- Urban Partnership Agreement/Congestion Reduction Demonstration (UPA/CRD) National Evaluation Reports, Travel Behavior Studies, and Updates
  - Contemporary Approaches in Congestion Pricing: Lessons Learned from the National Evaluation of Congestion Pricing Strategies at Six Sites
    - [http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/55000/55600/55668/UPA\\_2015\\_Final\\_9-17-15.pdf](http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/55000/55600/55668/UPA_2015_Final_9-17-15.pdf)



- Lessons Learned on Congestion Pricing from the Seattle and Atlanta Household Travel Behavior Surveys
  - [http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/54000/54000/54065/UPA-CRD\\_Panel\\_Survey\\_Lessons\\_Learned\\_Final\\_Report\\_Volpe.pdf](http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/54000/54000/54065/UPA-CRD_Panel_Survey_Lessons_Learned_Final_Report_Volpe.pdf)
- Minnesota (I-35W HOT Lanes)
  - Report: [http://www.dot.state.mn.us/rtmc/reports/hov/20130419MnUPA\\_Evaluation\\_Final\\_Rpt.pdf](http://www.dot.state.mn.us/rtmc/reports/hov/20130419MnUPA_Evaluation_Final_Rpt.pdf)
- Seattle (SR 520 Bridge)
  - Report: [http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/54000/54400/54470/120214\\_seattle\\_upa\\_final\\_report.pdf0.pdf](http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/54000/54400/54470/120214_seattle_upa_final_report.pdf0.pdf)
  - Panel Study: [http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/54000/54000/54063/UPA\\_Panel\\_Survey\\_Seattle\\_Final\\_Report\\_Volpe.pdf](http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/54000/54000/54063/UPA_Panel_Survey_Seattle_Final_Report_Volpe.pdf)
- Atlanta (I-85 Express Lanes)
  - Report: <http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/54000/54000/54072/14-152.pdf>
  - Panel Study: [http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/54000/54000/54062/CRD\\_Panel\\_Survey\\_Atlanta\\_Final\\_Report\\_Volpe.pdf](http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/54000/54000/54062/CRD_Panel_Survey_Atlanta_Final_Report_Volpe.pdf)
  - Equity Impacts noted in Panel Study: [http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/54000/54000/54064/UPA-CRD\\_Panel\\_Survey\\_Equity\\_Final\\_Report\\_Volpe.pdf](http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/54000/54000/54064/UPA-CRD_Panel_Survey_Equity_Final_Report_Volpe.pdf)
- Los Angeles (I-10 and I-110 ExpressLanes & LA Express Park™)
  - Report: <http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/55000/55600/55669/FHWA-JPO-14-126-1.pdf>
  - Website: <https://www.metroexpresslanes.net/en/home/index.shtml>
- San Francisco (SFpark)
  - Report: [http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/54000/54900/54928/032515\\_rev\\_san\\_fran\\_508\\_final\\_FHWA-JPO-14-128.pdf](http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/54000/54900/54928/032515_rev_san_fran_508_final_FHWA-JPO-14-128.pdf)
- Miami (95 Express Lanes)
  - Website: <http://www.95express.com>

### Websites

- FHWA's Congestion Pricing Website
  - <http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/congestionpricing>
- FHWA's Congestion Pricing Webinar Series
  - <http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/congestionpricing/webinars/index.htm>
- FHWA's Urban Partnership Agreement (UPA) Website
  - [http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/congestionpricing/urb\\_partner\\_agree.htm](http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/congestionpricing/urb_partner_agree.htm)
- FHWA's Congestion Reduction Demonstration (CRD) Website
  - [http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/congestionpricing/cong\\_reduc\\_demo.htm](http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/congestionpricing/cong_reduc_demo.htm)
- FHWA's Value Pricing Pilot Program (VPPP) Website
  - [http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/congestionpricing/value\\_pricing/index.htm](http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/congestionpricing/value_pricing/index.htm)
- FHWA High-Occupancy Vehicle/Managed Use Lane Pooled Fund Study (HOV/MUL PFS)
  - <https://hovpfs.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/>

### Research Underway and Resources Available Soon

- FHWA: Dynamic Pricing Primer
- NCHRP: Methods to Analyze Environmental Justice Issues Related to Tolling Mechanisms (Project 08-100)
- FHWA: Congestion Pricing: Engaging Public Awareness on the True Cost of Driving



# AGENDA

## Morning Executive Session

9:00 – 9:15 am **Introduction**

(Wayne Berman, FHWA)

9:15 – 9:45 am

**The Basics of Congestion Pricing: “Congestion Pricing 101”**  
(Joerg ‘Nu’ Rosenbohm, Battelle)

9:45 – 10:30 am

**Congestion Pricing Implementation Issues: Part I**  
(Nick Wood, Texas A&M Transportation Institute)

- **Legislation (State-level focus)**
  - Crafting a message and developing a business case
  - Fostering champions
  - Developing political support
  - Maintaining support
- **Planning and Policy**
  - Funding and Finance
  - Federal requirements and legislation (Sec 166 and 129)
  - Regional and Corridor Planning
  - Travel and revenue forecasting
  - NEPA
  - Public engagement
  - Equity

10:30 – 10:45 am

**Break**

## Morning General Session

10:45 – 11:15 am

**Congestion Pricing Implementation Issues: Part II**  
(Nick Wood, Texas A&M Transportation Institute)

- **Design**
  - Access points
  - Barrier separation
- **Operations and Maintenance**
  - Signage
  - Technology
    - Types of technologies
    - Location of gantries
  - Enforcement

11:15 am – 12:00 pm

**Congestion Pricing Case Study #1** – Minnesota Department of Transportation  
(MnDOT) Experiences  
(Brad Larsen, MnDOT)

12:00 – 1:00 pm

**Lunch** (provided by SPC)



## **Afternoon General Session**

- 1:00 – 1:45 pm      **Congestion Pricing Case Study #2** – Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Experience – SR 237 (Murali Ramanujam, VTA)
- 1:45 – 2:00 pm      **Southwestern Pennsylvania Regional Operations Context** (Doug Smith / Domenic D’Andrea, SPC)
- 2:00 – 3:00 pm      **Interactive Session:** Local example: I-279 HOV-to-HOT Conversion Feasibility (tabletop exercise) – Participants will:
- Review and mark-up maps of the corridor
  - Discuss potentially desirable changes or extensions to the HOV lane and corridor
  - Identify key questions, potential barriers and other items that would need to be addressed in assessing the feasibility of HOT in the corridor
- 3:00 – 3:15 pm      **Review / Action Items / Evaluation**



## DISCUSSION ITEMS

This section captures the questions that stakeholder participants asked throughout the workshop, as well as the responses and other comments.

1. Q: *Could you do congestion pricing if you have ramp metering involved?*
  - A: Yes, agencies can do ramp metering in concert with congestion pricing and other active traffic management strategies. California and Minnesota are examples of states that operate ramp metering for corridors with priced managed lanes facilities. For those corridors, it would be best to house the operation of the managed lane in the same traffic management center as the ramp metering operation.
  
2. Q: *How do implementers handle event parking?*
  - A: The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) and the North Central Texas Council of Governments (the regional MPO) are reaching out to the City of Arlington and the Dallas Cowboys to coordinate parking and carpooling for trips to and from the stadium. TxDOT operates special game-day plans for managing operations during game-day events to coordinate flow on the reversible facility with the timing of special events.
  
3. Q: *Can you describe a new finding from dynamic pricing?*
  - A: Managed lanes often serve travelers with a diverse set of demands. From data collected on the I-10 Katy Freeway Managed Lanes in Houston: Roughly 83% of all travelers on the corridor (from both the managed and general purpose (GP) lanes) did not change their lane choice for all trips. In other words, those travelers only made managed lane trips or only made trips in the GP lanes. Roughly 55% of managed lane traffic came from travelers who switched their lane choice between the managed and the GP lane (Source: Burriss, M., et al. *Travelers' Value of Time and Reliability as Measured on Katy Freeway*. Transportation Policy Research Center, Texas A&M Transportation Institute. Report PRC 15-37-F. September 2016.).
  - A: Recent research from Southern California states that three data elements are strong predictors of whether travelers will choose to take a variably priced roadway facility: expected travel time savings, the amount of the toll price, and the difference in speed between the priced and non-priced alternative (Source: Campbell, R. *Estimating Drivers' Willingness to Pay by Using Empirical Data from a Variably Priced Freeway Facility*. Transportation Research Record, No. 2554, Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C., 2016, pp. 1–9.).
  
4. Q: *How do agencies address the critique, "Is tolling (i.e., congestion pricing) just double taxation?"*
  - A: Agencies commonly provide alternatives other than tolled, or priced options, such as carpooling or taking transit. Agencies also describe scenarios with limited revenue used for transportation (e.g. no gas tax increase over a number of years) and increased congestion. One common example is the need for a traveler to pick up a child at daycare. The traveler would rather pay the cost of the toll than to arrive later and pay more for daycare.



5. Q: *Can PennDOT collect [pricing] tolls? Are there other DOTs that can collect tolls?*
  - A: The Texas, Minnesota, and Washington State departments of transportation are agencies with tolling divisions responsible for managing and collecting tolls.
  - A: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) is not a DOT but joined together with other agencies to provide this capability.
  
6. Q: *How do agencies manage toll rates with the metro area (MPO)?*
  - A: Typically, agencies prefer to manage a uniform set of toll and operational policies across a region. These policies include items related to type of toll rate schedule, maximum and minimum toll rates, open and closed times, and exempt vehicles (e.g. carpools, electric vehicles). Tolls are based on either a non-variable flat rate, changeable time-of-day schedule (e.g. pre-set toll rates that change based on time-of-day), or are dynamic (e.g. vary based on real-time conditions). Agencies use regular report performance metrics to the respective policy board and they make decisions based off data. Optimally, agencies should attempt to have their policy board approve an operational framework that allows operators to make changes without requiring approval from the policy board. For example, if the average travel speed falls below a pre-established threshold, then the maximum toll rate would be increased. The North Central Texas Council of Governments, based in Arlington, TX, is a good example of regional policy coordination with respect to congestion pricing and managed lanes.
  
7. Q: *Related to example of MnPASS, how are buses in the HOT system not using transponders?*
  - A: MnPASS does not require transit vehicles and carpools to equip toll transponders. Agencies monitor enforcement by equipping detectors inside police vehicles that indicate passing vehicles with transponders. If a vehicle does not have a transponder, the police officer visually checks the moving vehicle to see if additional passengers are inside. If no other passengers are observed, then the officer pulls over the suspected vehicle.
  
8. Q: *How do the before and after volume numbers in the I-35E corridor compare to I-279?*
  - A: Brad Larsen indicated that he had made a cursory review of the Pittsburgh volume numbers and he thought that these are comparable to the I-35E.
  
9. Q: *How does an operating agency decide to increase capacity in HOV-HOT conversion lanes?*
  - A: Agencies make operational and tolling decisions by regularly monitoring performance to assess which aspects are operating poorly. Agencies also estimate the impact of various operational changes (e.g. increasing the occupancy requirement or changing the toll rate) by using engineering judgement and microsimulation modeling.
  
10. Q: *Can the example of VDOT be added to slide 103?*
  - A: The VDOT example on vehicle occupancy validation will be added for the next workshop.



## FACILITATED DISCUSSIONS

### Lessons learned from peer representatives

The objective of this portion of the workshop is to discuss items of interest from the earlier presentations and establish some lessons learned and key points of agreement for further discussion.

At the Pittsburgh workshop the discussions occurred during the presentations with many questions from the attendees. Those sessions lasted a little longer than expected and there was limited time for additional facilitated discussion at the end—but many of the questions had already been answered.

Discussion questions:

- What did you hear in the presentations on the Minnesota and Los Angeles projects that you find particularly applicable here in Pittsburgh?
- What is unique about Pittsburgh relative to these (and other) peer cities that may make messaging for managed lanes more difficult? What are some lessons learned elsewhere that might not be applicable here and why?

Outcome:

- Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission (SPC) desires to study to convert the HOV to HOT.

### Identification of the business case for Pittsburgh:

The objective of this portion is to begin crafting the business case for developing managed lanes in Pittsburgh that can be easily communicated in a consistent manner while allowing for tailoring and refinement to specific stakeholder groups.

Discussion Questions:

- Past history has shown that the public generally has the following issues with regard to managed lanes. Based on what you have heard in this workshop thus far, how should these issues be framed for Pittsburgh?
  - Project benefits and goals
  - Travel impacts
  - User fees
  - Project cost and use of funds
  - Equity
  - Geographic Equity
  - Technology
  - Enforcement
- Are there specific groups/communities/stakeholders that will require detailed messaging? What are those groups and what are their interests in this regional transportation in general and these managed lanes projects specifically?
- What is the “elevator speech” for managed lanes in Pittsburgh? How would you quickly and succinctly describe why this is something Pittsburgh should pursue?

Outcomes:

- PennDOT district performed the study years ago to create a bi-directional facility, but have challenges to direct traffic safely at the split. The issue of using a traffic signal was being examined, but this was not recommended as a viable option.
- The Port Authority is also leading a CMAQ project to expand the park and ride facility at the northern terminus of the HOV.



- A facilitator noted that the region needs to consider growth in the future. The stakeholders noted that Cranberry Township north of the corridor is the fastest growing area in the region.

**Where things stand and where they go:**

The objective of this portion of the discussion is to assess the current state of public involvement for managed lanes in Pittsburgh, establish a timeline for messaging on these projects, and identify relevant messengers to engage.

Discussion Questions:

- Where do you think the region is right now with its messaging?
- Do you think that enough has been done to get the managed lanes concept out in the public? What else needs to be done?
- Who needs to be engaged in messaging that has not been engaged? Who will reach out to these people?
- Who should coordinate messaging efforts?

Outcome:

- SPC came to the conclusion to consider a study to examine congestion pricing.

**Post workshop resources:**

After the workshop, the SPC posted the following presentation materials from the workshop to the SPC website on the Transportation Operations and Safety – Intelligent Transportation Systems page ([http://spcregion.org/trans\\_ops\\_its.shtml](http://spcregion.org/trans_ops_its.shtml)).

- Congestion Pricing Workshop Pittsburgh (PDF, 3.85 MB)  
<http://spcregion.org/pdf/ops/cmp/Congestion%20Pricing%20Workshop-General.pdf>
- Congestion Pricing, California Example (PDF, 4.19 MB)  
<http://spcregion.org/pdf/ops/cmp/Congestion%20Pricing%20Workshop-California%20experience.pdf>
- Congestion Pricing, Minnesota Example (PDF, 1.29 MB)  
<http://spcregion.org/pdf/ops/cmp/Congestion%20Pricing%20Workshop-Minnesota%20experience.pdf>



# AREA OF INTEREST

The map below depicts the area of interest for possible consideration of congestion pricing. Currently, PennDOT has a reversible two-lane HOV facility on I-279.



Source: PennDOT<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> URL: <http://www.penndot.gov/RegionalOffices/district-11/Pages/HOV.aspx>



## WORKSHOP ATTENDEES

The following table lists the workshop invitees and persons noted in attendance.

Name	Organization	E-mail Address
<b>Facilitators and Peers</b>		
Wayne Berman	FHWA	<a href="mailto:Wayne.Berman@dot.gov">Wayne.Berman@dot.gov</a>
Nick Wood	Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI)	<a href="mailto:N-Wood@tti.tamu.edu">N-Wood@tti.tamu.edu</a>
Nu Rosenbohm	Battelle	
Brad Larsen	Minnesota DOT	<a href="mailto:Brad.Larsen@state.mn.us">Brad.Larsen@state.mn.us</a>
Murali Ramanujam	Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)	<a href="mailto:Murali.Ramanujam@vta.org">Murali.Ramanujam@vta.org</a>
<b>Stakeholder Participants</b>		
Darin Alviano	SPC	<a href="mailto:dalviano@spcregion.org">dalviano@spcregion.org</a>
Dan Alwine	SPC	<a href="mailto:dalwine@spcregion.org">dalwine@spcregion.org</a>
Chris Bova	Westmoreland Co. Planning Dept.	<a href="mailto:cbova@co.westmoreland.pa.us">cbova@co.westmoreland.pa.us</a>
Ross Buchan	Whitman, Requardt & Associates	<a href="mailto:rbuchan@wrallp.com">rbuchan@wrallp.com</a>
Anthony Castellone	Pennoni	<a href="mailto:acastellone@pennoni.com">acastellone@pennoni.com</a>
Frank Cavataio	PennDOT Central Office	<a href="mailto:fcavataio@pa.gov">fcavataio@pa.gov</a>
Dan Cessna	PennDOT District 11-0	<a href="mailto:hcessna@pa.gov">hcessna@pa.gov</a>
Frank Cippel	PennDOT District 11-0	<a href="mailto:fcippel@pa.gov">fcippel@pa.gov</a>
Domenic D'Andrea	SPC	<a href="mailto:ddandrea@spcregion.org">ddandrea@spcregion.org</a>
Keith Johnson	Gannett Fleming	<a href="mailto:kajohnson@gfnet.com">kajohnson@gfnet.com</a>
Jim Katsafanas	Michael Baker International	<a href="mailto:jkatsafanas@mbakerintl.com">jkatsafanas@mbakerintl.com</a>
Todd Kravits	PennDOT District 11-0	<a href="mailto:tkravits@pa.gov">tkravits@pa.gov</a>
Jeff Leithauer	Washington Co. Planning Dept.	<a href="mailto:leithauj@co.washington.pa.us">leithauj@co.washington.pa.us</a>
Joel MacKay	Butler Co. Planning Dept.	(not noted as in attendance)
Mark Magalotti	University of Pittsburgh	<a href="mailto:mjm25@pitt.edu">mjm25@pitt.edu</a>
Breen Masciotra	Port Authority of Allegheny County	(not noted as in attendance)
Jeff Moore	Whitman, Requardt & Associates	<a href="mailto:jsmoore@wrallp.com">jsmoore@wrallp.com</a>
Ann Ogoreuc	Allegheny Co. Economic Development	(not noted as in attendance)
James Paral	FHWA	<a href="mailto:james.paral@dot.gov">james.paral@dot.gov</a>
Andy Rebovich	Michael Baker International	<a href="mailto:arebovich@mbakerintl.com">arebovich@mbakerintl.com</a>
Kelly Rigot	Lochner	(not noted as in attendance)
Doug Smith	SPC	<a href="mailto:dsmith@spcregion.org">dsmith@spcregion.org</a>
Josh Spano	SPC	<a href="mailto:jspano@spcregion.org">jspano@spcregion.org</a>
Doug Tomlinson	PennDOT Central Office	<a href="mailto:dtomlinson@pa.gov">dtomlinson@pa.gov</a>
Commissioner Vicites	Fayette County Board of Commissioners	(not noted as in attendance)
Andy Waple	SPC	<a href="mailto:awaple@spcregion.org">awaple@spcregion.org</a>
Joe West	Beaver County Office of Planning	(not noted as in attendance)
David Wohlwill	Port Authority of Allegheny County	<a href="mailto:dwohlwill@portauthority.org">dwohlwill@portauthority.org</a>
David Totten	SPC	<a href="mailto:dtotten@spcregion.org">dtotten@spcregion.org</a>