



SCAN TEAM REPORT: DISSEMINATION SUPPLEMENT
NCHRP Project 20-68A, Scan 10-02

Best Practices for Addressing Access and Parking Needs of Non-Resident Users of Rail and Intermodal Transportation Stations in Transit-Oriented Developments

FINAL DISSEMINATION-ACTIVITY REPORT
Transit-Oriented Development Peer Exchange

Sponsored by the NCHRP Domestic Scan Program

May 6 - 8, 2014

Supported by the
National Cooperative Highway Research Program

The information contained in this report was prepared as part of NCHRP Project 20-68A U.S. Domestic Scan, National Cooperative Highway Research Program.

SPECIAL NOTE: This report IS NOT an official publication of the National Cooperative Highway Research Program, Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, or The National Academies.



Acknowledgments

The work described in this document was conducted as part of NCHRP Project 20-68A, the U.S. Domestic Scan program. This program was requested by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), with funding provided through the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP). The NCHRP is supported by annual voluntary contributions from the state departments of transportation. Additional support for selected scans is provided by the U.S. Federal Highway Administration and other agencies.

The purpose of each scan and of Project 20-68A as a whole is to accelerate beneficial innovation by facilitating information sharing and technology exchange among the states and other transportation agencies, and identifying actionable items of common interest. Experience has shown that personal contact with new ideas and their application is a particularly valuable means for such sharing and exchange. A scan entails peer-to-peer discussions between practitioners who have implemented new practices and others who are able to disseminate knowledge of these new practices and their possible benefits to a broad audience of other users. Each scan addresses a single technical topic selected by AASHTO and the NCHRP 20-68A Project Panel. Further information on the NCHRP 20-68A U.S. Domestic Scan program is available at <http://144.171.11.40/cmsfeed/TRBNetProjectDisplay.asp?ProjectID=1570>.

This report was prepared by the scan team as part of their effort to disseminate their findings reported previously, following their completion of **Domestic Scan 10-02: Best Practices for Addressing Access and Parking Needs of Non-Resident Users of Rail and Intermodal Transportation Stations in Transit-Oriented Developments** whose members are listed below. The scan team's initial report, published in July 2013, is available from the URL shown above. Scan planning and logistics are managed by Arora and Associates, P. C.; Harry Capers is the Principal Investigator. Dissemination Support is provided by CTC & Associates LLC, sub-consultant to Arora and Associates, P.C.; Patrick Casey is the Task Manager. NCHRP Project 20-68A is guided by a technical project panel and managed by Andrew C. Lemer, Ph.D., NCHRP Senior Program Officer.

Sharon Edgar, Michigan DOT, AASHTO Chair

Charles Carr, Mississippi DOT

Michael Connors, Connecticut DOT

Dylan Counts, Washington State DOT

Connie Morrison, Principal Author, Subject Matter Expert

Jila Priebe, California DOT

Disclaimer

The information in this document was taken directly from the submission of the authors. The opinions and conclusions expressed or implied are those of the scan team and are not necessarily those of the Transportation Research Board, the National Research Council, or the program sponsors. The document has not been edited by the Transportation Research Board.

Scan 10-02

Best Practices For Addressing Access And Parking Needs Of Nonresident Users Of Rail And Intermodal Transportation Stations In Transit-Oriented Developments

FINAL DISSEMINATION-ACTIVITY REPORT
Transit-Oriented Development Peer Exchange

REQUESTED BY THE

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials

PREPARED BY

Sharon Edgar,
Michigan DOT, AASHTO Chair

Dylan Counts,
Washington State DOT

Charles R. Carr,
Mississippi DOT

Connie Morrison,
Principal Author, Subject Matter Expert

Michael Connors,
Connecticut DOT

Jila Priebe,
California DOT

SCAN MANAGEMENT

Arora and Associates, P.C.
Lawrenceville, NJ

May 6 - 8, 2014

The information contained in this report was prepared as part of NCHRP Project 20-68A U.S. Domestic Scan, National Cooperative Highway Research Program.

SPECIAL NOTE: This report IS NOT an official publication of the National Cooperative Highway Research Program, Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, or The National Academies.

Table of Contents

Background and Goals.....	1-1
Participants.....	1-1
Agenda Structure and Topics.....	1-3
Findings and Observations.....	1-5
Next Steps for Peer Exchange Participants	1-8
Next Steps for Scan Team	1-12

Table of Appendices

Appendix A TOD Resources	A-1
Appendix B Peer Exchange Participants	B-1

Table of Figures

Figure 1 Scan 10-02 AASHTO Chair Sharon Edgar Leading Discussion1-1

Figure 2 Bay Area Rapid Transit and Partner Agencies.....1-2

Figure 3 DOTs and Transit/MPO Partners1-2

FINAL REPORT ON DISSEMINATION ACTIVITY

Transit-Oriented Development Peer Exchange

Background and Goals

The U.S. Domestic Scan Program¹ promotes the transfer of innovative technologies and practices between transportation agencies by facilitating in-person site visits with innovation leaders. In 2013, one of these “scan” tours focused on best practices in transit-oriented development (TOD). A scan team of representatives from DOTs in California, Connecticut, Michigan, Mississippi and Washington State visited five TOD locations around the country to learn about successes and challenges experienced by the host organizations. These scan findings are documented in a final report².

To help the scan team further disseminate the project findings and stimulate expanded discussion on TOD nationally, the Domestic Scan Program sponsored a two-and-a-half-day follow-up peer exchange from May 6-8, 2014 in Walnut Creek, California. The scan team planned the event, inviting representatives from other state departments of transportation and their local partners in transit agencies or metropolitan planning organizations to discuss the role that state DOTs can play in transit-oriented development. The scan team focused the agenda and discussions on three aspects of DOT involvement in TOD: the potential benefits of TOD to DOTs, the role of state DOTs in TODs, and effective TOD partnerships.

This report documents the peer exchange discussions that took place and the ways in which the participants plan to use what they learned to improve and further TOD activities in their states. Local and state transportation organizations nationally can use the report to prompt discussions about DOT involvement in TOD and as a resource for connecting with other TOD professionals around the country.

Participants

The peer exchange brought together representatives from states experienced in TOD (California, Florida, Maryland and New Jersey) and states newer to TOD (Kentucky, Michigan, New Mexico, Mississippi and Washington) to share experiences, challenges, and effective practices. In addition, representatives from Bay Area Rapid Transit, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, the Bay Area Joint Policy Committee, and Contra Costa County



Figure 1: Scan 10-02 AASHTO Chair Sharon Edgar Leading Discussions

1 <http://www.domesticscan.org/>

2 http://www.domesticscan.org/wp-content/uploads/NCHRP20-68A_10-02.pdf

gave presentations on TOD using the nearby Contra Costa Centre development at Walnut Creek as a case example. Representatives from FHWA – California Division and FTA Region IX also attended the peer exchange. Refer to the full participant list in **Appendix B** for names and contact information.



Left to right:
 Val Menotti
 Allison Brooks
 Therese Trivedi
 Maureen Toms
 John Rennels
 Jeff White
 Gail Murray
 Jeff Ordway

Not pictured:
 Valerie Knepper

Figure 2: Bay Area Rapid Transit and Partner Agencies



Back row (left to right):
 Dylan Counts,
 Diane Quigley,
 Eric Eidlin,
 Sharon Edgar,
 Jila Priebe,
 Linda Wheaton,
 Jana Ecker,
 Jason Coffey
Front row (left to right):
 Brian Lagerberg,
 Thomas Witt,
 Aida Copic,
 Ben Bakkenta,
 Carol Hunter,
 Vivian Baker,
 Andy Swords,
 Marty Baker,
 Erick Aune,
 Kenneth Yarrow

Figure 3: DOTs and Transit/MPO Partners

Agenda Structure and Topics

The first day of the peer exchange consisted of presentations by the experienced states (case examples, policies, challenges, successes), along with roundtable discussions aimed at addressing the following two topic areas:

Topic #1: Potential Benefits to DOTs

- Supporting policy goals (economic development, mobility, environmental, community, CCS, etc.).
- Using State DOT land assets to benefit the community and economy.
- Using TODs as revenue sources.

Topic #2: The Role of State DOTs in TODs

- Building transit and TOD into system wide planning efforts (traffic, mobility, access, etc.).
- Ensuring State DOT infrastructure and system operations are taken into consideration (freeway, interchange, transit, etc.) to maximize TOD benefits.
- Assisting with planning, implementing and supporting TOD development.
- Engaging in financial partnerships.
- Participating in performance measurement of TODs.
- Partnering with other state agencies that have interests in land use planning and economic development.
- Considering environmental impacts and air quality issues when TOD housing is located by the highway.

The second day began with a series of presentations related to BART and the development of the Pleasant Hill Contra Costa Centre, a BART TOD located next door to the hotel where the peer exchange took place. Following the presentations, the group toured the TOD to learn more about this mixed-use development firsthand. In the afternoon the group continued the roundtable discussions, focusing on one additional topic area:

Topic #3: Effective TOD Partnerships

- Responsibilities of state DOTs when partnering with transit agencies, MPOs and private sector organizations.
- Opportunities for cross-agency collaboration.
- Specific processes for scoping and implementing TOD (roles, timing, challenges).
- Financial agreements for state and federal support of TODs.
- Opportunities for road owners and operators to provide infrastructure in TOD developments.
- Examples of TOD projects in which the road owners or operators created obstacles to effective planning.

During the final morning of the peer exchange, the group summarized their key findings and next steps for applying what was learned. These summary findings are presented on the pages that follow.

Findings and Observations

Below is a high-level summary of the key outcomes from the discussions on the three agenda topics (benefits of DOT involvement, role of state DOTs, and effective TOD partnerships), the lessons learned from the participants' TOD experiences, and the common themes that emerged when discussing TOD challenges.

Benefits to DOTs of TOD involvement

- Maximize and leverage statewide investment in transit systems.
- Support statewide strategic transportation and housing goals.
- Protect, preserve and leverage state assets.
- TOD is a tool to achieve accessibility and mobility.
- Boost local and regional support for TOD through state policies.
- Maintain state policy influence (such as promoting affordable housing, environmental sustainability, public health).
- TODs can generate revenue in the long term.
- TODs support state economic development goals. DOTs are heavily involved in setting goals.

The Role of State DOTs in TOD

As a leader

- Develop policies and guidance documents that set the stage for DOT assistance in TOD.
- DOT review of state planning laws for needed revisions.
- Define TOD and goals. Set standards and criteria as goals to achieve.
- Provide technical assistance and grant funding for project planning and development.
- Provide funding, incentive programs, and assets.
- Integrate TOD into state goals related to land use, smart growth, transit/transportation, housing, and environment.
- Performance measurement (track performance, ensure appropriate performance measures, ensure measures are TOD friendly).

- Conduct research to support TOD planning and development models.
- Support provision of quality transit.

As a facilitator

- Facilitate communication between stakeholders – help them understand TOD and potential benefits, get them to the table, encourage local and regional leadership.
- Initiate design changes that support TOD (such as designated lanes).
- Coordinate statewide transportation planning across modes.
- Facilitate investments in a complete, multimodal system.

Effective TOD Partnerships

- Form partnerships within the DOT (planning, design, delivery, environment, traffic, safety), both for strategic transportation planning and for considering how DOT assets will be affected.
- Foster partnerships with other state agencies (housing, economic development, air quality/environment, natural resources, public health, elder affairs).
- Recognize the many external TOD partners that need to be involved – transit agencies, MPOs, local communities, developers.
- Educate ourselves in the DOT and our external partners about what we all do and the issues we face. Then we can find ways to work together toward TOD.

Lessons Learned

- No one size fits all. TOD approaches vary tremendously based on the unique communities, location context, partners, and funding.
- Momentum for TOD grows out of varying goals (at state or local levels) – integrating land use and transportation, smart growth, housing, environment, sustainability.
- TOD can't be mandated. The DOT has to be supportive and make it a win-win for the community. Focus on measurement and value added.
- Strong leadership from key individuals is needed for success.
- Planning and development take a long time (years). Need to be patient.

-
- State planning laws can set a strong foundation for involvement by DOTs, other state agencies, and MPOs.
 - Absent planning laws, DOTs can still establish a policy framework to justify state DOT involvement in TOD. These policy frameworks are strengthened when done in partnership with other state agencies (housing, economic development, environment).

TOD Challenges

- Funding availability.
- Keeping the “T” in TOD.
- Managing expectations among the stakeholders.
- Modeling outcomes.
- Integrate TOD into traffic modeling.
- Balancing goals/interests.
- Fluctuating real estate market demand and economic cycles.
- Capacity at the local level.
- Maintaining affordable housing and avoiding displacement due to gentrification.
- Addressing issues of access, environmental justice (due to location by highways), affordability and availability.
- Planning long-term for transit-based systems while building TODs that are geared toward auto-based access.
- Transit capacity – becoming a victim of success.
- Finding right balance for DOT role in local transit.

Next Steps for Peer Exchange Participants

The primary purpose of this peer exchange was to improve and enhance TOD practices nationally by facilitating the sharing of effective TOD approaches among state and local transportation agencies. To document this anticipated impact, the peer exchange participants shared some of the ways in which they planned to use what they learned during the event to change TOD practices in their own states.

Sharon Edgar and Jana Ecker (Michigan)

- Look at possible peer exchange among transit agencies and MPOs looking at BRT in MI. Learn from one another.

Aida Copic (Kentucky)

- Work on implementation of a fully developed BRT system on two major corridors.
- Amend the land use regulation with TOD planning developments.
- Strengthen communication with MPO and ask for proactive role in TOD assessment and implementation.
- Choose a pilot project – determine location and do preliminary assessment.
- Align stakeholders and advocates for support of rapid transit and TOD developments.
- Include recommendations for TOD implementation in all ongoing transportation planning efforts (including land use planning efforts).
- Find the right balance between urban and rural transportation needs and funding.

Thomas Witt (Kentucky)

- Establish a pilot project to demonstrate that TOD is doable in state (look at Louisville). Work on Louisville and MPO plans to incorporate TOD.
- Present at quarterly statewide transportation meetings with MPOs, highway district offices, area development districts.

Andy Swords and Vivian Baker (New Jersey)

- Develop a progress report on the NJ Transit Village program, based on interviews with each of the 28 TVs.

-
- Using the output of the report, hold a peer exchange with NJ transit villages to share best practices and identify TOD training needs, in order to improve TOD performance.
 - Encourage NJ DOT leadership and asset owners to recognize TOD as a key transportation strategy.

Diane Quigley (Florida)

- Look at MTC parking study.
- Look at traffic impacts of TOD at local level.
- Pursue park and ride lot, potential revenue generation.
- Keep thinking about my continued role in DOT in promoting TOD.

Jila Priebe (California)

- Focus on DOT role in promoting TOD in partnership with local stakeholders and State Departments of Housing and Community Development and housing finance agencies.
- Try to bring more funding to areas that haven't gotten started with TOD. Conduct pilot programs or studies.
- Have a stronger part for TOD in transitwiki.
- Look at BRT toolbox and how well or not well we're considering access for BRT in highway design.
- Park and ride – work on in terms of policy and coordination.

Linda Wheaton (California)

- Increase focus on supportive corridor and broader catchment area development
- Work with housing and community partners on anti-displacement strategies, including role of systematic provisions for inclusion of affordable housing
- Establishing greenhouse gas emission metrics for TOD

Jean Finney (California)

- Do a study developing criteria for when to relinquish park and ride to locals

- Look at opportunities for TODs looking at pricing of park and ride lots
- Explore how to make more use of off peak capacity

Kenneth Yarrow (Mississippi)

- Meet with Charles to brainstorm about potential strategies to get TOD to work in the state.
- Start exposing our people to it through outreach, education through MPO meetings, conferences in the state.
- Get TOD mentioned in long-range plans and goals.
- Incorporate strategies in to MPO and state processes.

Marty Baker (Maryland)

- Clarify and formalize partnerships with other state agencies on TOD agenda.
- Finalize the TOD guidelines with the modal administrations.
- Strengthen processes for multimodal planning.

Dylan Counts (Washington)

- Encourage Sound Transit to take another look at retaining property.
- Do more research on revenue generation for DOT and what you can do with that money.
- Start to draft a state TOD policy to get conversation going.

Ben Bakkenta (Washington)

- Implement PSRC TOD work program. Ensure DOT participation in that program and in a new TOD advisory program.

Carol Hunter (Washington)

- Look at Network Analyst for how we can reduce barrier of I 5 (access).
- How incorporate comments from state on what communities can be doing regarding comprehensive planning to address either TOD development or better multimodal access to transit.

-
- Share what I've learned with my staff.

Brian Lagerberg (Washington)

- Spend more time figuring out roles and responsibilities between DOT and MPOs (particularly PSRC).
- Restructure some of our grant programs.
- Public Transportation Conference coming up in August. Theme is delivering 21st century transportation system. I'll invite some folks to come to present on TOD.

Charles Carr (Mississippi)

- Facilitate serious discussion on TOD at MPO level
- Revisit potential for BRT in and around MPO areas, this time not with DOT as lead—get MPOs to take the lead
- Incorporate TOD alternatives in statewide transportation plan update under way
- Revise our strategic plan to work through some things

Erick Aune (New Mexico)

- Provide a 15-minute presentation on lessons learned at the June 10th New Mexico MPO Quarterly Meeting with NMDOT in attendance.
- Provide suggested input regarding TOD considerations to the respective 2015 NMDOT State Long-Range Plan and MPO Metropolitan Transportation Plans.
- Seek out any pending or potential TOD developments along the New Mexico Rail Runner Stations and highlight the details for MPO/NMDOT discussions (i.e. Zia Station Santa Fe).
- Coordinate regional discussions regarding any pending BRT planning initiatives (i.e. Albuquerque Ride and Santa Fe Trails).

Next Steps for Scan Team

The scan team members that planned this peer exchange expect to continue their leadership in promoting TOD information sharing nationally. To support their efforts, the peer exchange participants identified the following topics needing more research/best practices syntheses/scans/peer exchanges (for DOT audiences):

- BRT in state ROW.
- Dedicating a state lane to transit.
- Leveraging state DOT real estate (including carpools and P&R lots) for TOD or just D.
- Modernizing state highway/road manuals/standards (such as LOS) to support TODs, ped-centric, bike-centric, transit-centric. Look at best practices of other states.
- State DOT plans/policies that support/facilitate DOTs role in accessibility/mobility/transit development/TODs.
- State laws/policies that support strong MPO/RTC role in accessibility/mobility/transit growth management vs. non-growth management.
- State agency partnerships – what, why, results/benefits. How are DOTs partnering with other state programs?
- Look at more incremental approaches to implementing TODs.

Potential avenues for sharing findings or further exchange:

- Pursue peer exchanges amongst practitioners. Look to Railvolution and New Partners for Smart Growth as places where some exchange happens. Look for other venues. Need for interdisciplinary conversation (not just with other transit folks).
- AASHTO committee partnerships/outreach between planning and highway committees – Sharon can present at upcoming meetings.
- FTA and APTA roles and positions, especially through the APTA sustainability committee. Need to get them into the discussion.

Following the peer exchange, the scan team submitted a proposal to present the findings from the peer exchange at the AASHTO Annual Meeting in November 2014. The proposal was accepted. The scan team will share some of the lessons learned on how state DOTs are advancing both TOD and the role of transit within their states.

Appendix A: TOD Resources

New Jersey Transit-Oriented Development

www.njtod.org

TOD resource website developed through a partnership between NJ Transit and Rutgers University. Includes TOD news, research and other information.

New Jersey Transit Village Initiative

<http://www.state.nj.us/transportation/community/village/>

Summary of the Transit Village initiative, including TV application and criteria, an FAQ page, and a manual of best practices in TOD.

NJT Website and Link to Transit Friendly Planning Page

http://www.njtransit.com/tm/tm_servlet.srv?hdnPageAction=CorpInfoTo

Summary of several TOD activities in which NJ TRANSIT is the lead or a key participant.

California Department of Housing and Community Development TOD Housing Program

<http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/tod>

Caltrans/UCLA Transit Resource Website

www.transitwiki.org

Metropolitan Transportation Commission Parking Policy for Smart Growth

http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart_growth/parking/

Summaries and reports from earlier work are described here, including the brief videos, posters, and the analysis of parking structure costs.

Choosing Where We Live: Attracting Residents to Transit-Oriented Neighborhoods in the San Francisco Bay Area

http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart_growth/tod/briefing_book.htm

MTC examined what attracts San Francisco Bay Area home-seekers to transit oriented development (TOD) neighborhoods and how to improve these neighborhoods to better attract home seekers, based on a market analysis of surveys of over 900 households.

MTC Resolution 3434 Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Policy for Regional Transit Expansion Projects

http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart_growth/tod/TOD_policy.pdf

There are three key elements of the regional TOD policy:

(a) Corridor-level thresholds to quantify appropriate minimum levels of development around transit stations along new corridors; (b) Local station area plans that address future land use changes, station access needs, circulation improvements, pedestrian-friendly design, and other key features in a transit-oriented development; and (c) Corridor working groups that bring together CMAs, city and county planning staff, transit agencies, and other key stakeholders to define expectations, timelines, roles and responsibilities for key stages of the transit project development process.

VPP Parking Project (in progress)

http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart_growth/parking/

The Value Pricing Pilot (VPP) Parking Pricing Regional Analysis Project will analyze regional parking policy approaches and develop and demonstrate local parking strategies, both using a new regional parking database.

Smart Parking Toolbox

http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart_growth/parking/parking_seminar.htm

Appendix B

Peer Exchange Participants

BART and Partner Agencies

Jeff Ordway

Bay Area Rapid Transit

jordway@bart.gov

510-464-6114

John Rennels

Bay Area Rapid Transit

jrennel@bart.gov

510-464-6893

Valerie Knepper

Metropolitan Transportation Commission

vknepper@mtc.ca.gov

510-817-5824

Gail Murray

BART Board, Contra Costa County

Val Menotti

Bay Area Rapid Transit

VMenott@bart.gov

510-287-4794

Allison Brooks

Bay Area Joint Policy Committee

Abrooks@mtc.ca.gov

510-464-7942

Therese Trivedi

Metropolitan Transportation Commission

TTrivedi@mtc.ca.gov

Maureen Toms

Contra Costa County

Maureen.Toms@dcd.cccounty.us

California (DOT and DHCD)

Jila Priebe

California Dept. of Transportation

jila.priebe@dot.ca.gov

916-651-8243

Linda Wheaton

California Dept. of Housing and
Community Development

linda.wheaton@hcd.ca.gov

916-263-7400

Jean Finney

California Dept. of Transportation
(District)

Jean.finney@dot.ca.gov

510-286-6196

Craig Morrow

California Dept. of Housing and
Community Development

cmorrow@hcd.ca.gov

Florida

Diane Quigley

Florida Dept. of Transportation

Diane.Quigley@dot.state.fl.us

850-414-4520

Kentucky

Thomas Witt

Kentucky Transportation Cabinet

thomas.witt@ky.gov

Aida Copic

Transit Authority of River City

acopic@ridetarc.org

502-213-3490

Maryland

Marty Baker

Maryland Dept. of Transportation

mbaker1@mdot.state.md.us

410-865-1285

Michigan

Sharon Edgar

Michigan Dept. of Transportation

EdgarS@michigan.gov

517-373-0471

Jana Ecker

City of Birmingham

jecker@bhamgov.org

248-321-9244

Mississippi

Charles Carr

Mississippi Dept. of Transportation

ccarr@mdot.ms.gov

601-359-7976

Kenneth Yarrow

Gulf Regional Planning Commission

kyarrow@grpc.com

228-864-1167

New Jersey

Andy Swords

New Jersey Dept. of Transportation

andrew.swords@dot.state.nj.us

609-530-2866

Vivian Baker

New Jersey Transit

vebaker@njtransit.com

973-491-7822

New Mexico

Jason Coffey

New Mexico Dept. of Transportation

jason.coffey@state.nm.us

505-827-6840

Erick Aune

Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning
Organization

ejaune@santafenm.gov

505-955-6664

Washington

Dylan Counts

Washington State Dept. of Transportation

CountsD@wsdot.wa.gov

206-464-1232

Carol Hunter

Washington State Dept. of Transportation

HunterC@wsdot.wa.gov

206-464-1129

Brian Lagerberg

Washington State Dept. of Transportation

LagerbB@wsdot.wa.gov

360-705-7878

Ben Bakkenta

Puget Sound Regional Council

bbakkenta@psrc.org

206-971-3286

FTA and FHWA

Eric Eidlin
FTA Region IX
Eric.Eidlin@dot.gov

Cecilia Crenshaw
FHWA - California Division
Cecilia.Crenshaw@dot.gov

Consultant Support

Kim Linsenmayer
CTC & Associates LLC
Kim.linsenmayer@ctcandassociates.com
608-628-3806

Li “Melissa” Jiang
Arora and Associates, P.C.
mjiang@arorapc.com
609-482-2642

