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SAFETEA-LU

Section 5309: “The Secretary may approve a grant . . . for fixed guideway capital project only if [it] is justified based on . . .

- mobility improvements
- environmental benefits
- cost effectiveness
- operating efficiencies
- public transportation supportive land use policies/future patterns
- economic development effects
History FTA Land Use Rating

ISTEA introduces “additional consideration” 1991

Land Use measure outlined in FTA Policy Paper 1994

Federal Register Notice on New Starts criteria 1996

Pilot Test of Land Use evaluation/rating 1996-7

1\textsuperscript{st} time applied in project rating 1998-99

SAFETEA-LU 2005

Land use is fully part of justification criteria
Economic development benefits added as criteria
Land Use Rating

Based on:

1/3 Existing Land use
1/3 Transit Supportive Plans / Policies
1/3 Past Performance / Potential Impact
CORRIDOR & STATION AREAS

**Quantity:**
- Population and employment
- Total employment served by system
- Development
- Parking

**High trip generators**

**Character of development**

**Pedestrian accessibility**
Transit-supportive Plans / Policies

Growth Management

Transit Supportive Corridor Policies

Transit Supportive Station Area Zoning

Tools to Implement Land Use Policies

(outreach / collaboration with other agencies and developers, and incentives for TOD)
Past Performance / Future Impacts

Performance of LU policies

Potential impact of transit on regional land use
Strong Ratings for Established Urban Corridors

New York
Boston
San Francisco
Chicago
Pittsburgh
Cleveland
Los Angeles
FOCUS: Plans and Policies

Case Study Projects – how they improved their LU ratings

Hiawatha, Minneapolis, MN +5
South Sacramento Ph.II +5
Dulles Corridor Metrorail +2
Salt Lake City East Line +1
Hiawatha Line +1
FY 2000-2001 Improvements

Growth Management
Regional growth management policies that support TOD
Hiawatha Line +2

Transit Supportive Corridor Policies

TOD zoning made part of Minneapolis comprehensive plan
Hiawatha Line +2

Station Area Zoning
TOD Master Planning at stations
Reduced parking in station areas

Tools
Investment policy to foster station development that is pedestrian oriented
Public involvement initiatives
Sacramento South Ph.II +2

2005-2006 Plan/policy improvements

Growth Management

SACOG is developing “Preferred BLUEPRINT Scenario for 2050” based on regional smart growth principles
Sacramento South Ph.II +1

Transit Supportive Corridor Policies

SacRT’s Transit for Livable Communities Project highlights development opportunities at stations.
Morrison Creek Station plans are revised to be transit-oriented.

Cosumnes River College Station development includes retail, housing, pedestrian paths, plazas.
Dulles Corridor Metrorail +1

FY 2005-2006 Plan/Policy improvements

Transit-supportive Corridor Policies

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan 2003 -
In rapid rail station areas, allows higher density, mixed use, and streetscape changes to create pedestrian scale
Dulles Corridor
Metrorail +1

Tools

• In 2000 VA Dept Rail & Public Transport’n funded Fairfax County for full-time land use planner for project.

• Outreach and collaboration with County, residents, developers.
Dulles Corridor Metrorail

Tools

Special improvement TAX district to support transit – passed!

Incentive zoning used to increase development near transit stations.
Salt Lake City East LRT +1

FY1999 – 2000 Plan and Policy Improvements

Transit Supportive Station Area Zoning

Zoning in place to allow high-density, mixed-use development in station areas esp. CBD, East Downtown.
Challenges in Rating

- Measure transit-land use relationship more quantitatively
- Incorporate regional market forces into measuring system
- Improve assessment of future impact of the project on region / corridor
- Achieve a consistent application of criteria across projects
- Avoid clustering of “medium” ratings (better distinguish between projects)
# Land Use Ratings FY99-FY06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med-High</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Med</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rating</td>
<td><strong>3.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FTA to revise LU evaluation criteria to address challenges

Urban Land Institute Workshop Dec. 2003

Recommended --
- Raise the bar, reduce “mediums”
- Increase weight given to Plans and Policies
- Use simple station types (*High TOD, Med TOD, P&R*)
- Encourage LU considerations earlier in planning
FTA proposes new Land Use Framework

Development Potential
Transit Supportive Policies / Actions
Development Climate
Transit Accessibility
Development Potential

Development/redevelopment potential
  - Difference between existing and allowable under current regulations and ordinances
  - Indicators of vacancy / underdevelopment

Local Conditions
  - Availability of infrastructure
  - Availability of parcels of adequate size
  - Environmental cleanup constraints
Transit Supportive Policies/Actions

- Zoning and Design Regulations
- Public Agency Support for Development
- Performance of Policies
- Permitting / regulatory process
Development Climate

- Recent development trends
- Expected future economic conditions
Transit Accessibility

User benefits per station area employment*

+ 

User benefits per station area population*

* Within station area, population & employment from MPO Long Range Plan forecasts