RE-THINK-ING TRANSIT ASSETS: LAND FOR PEOPLE AND PUBLIC BENEFIT
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“Which would you rather be if you had the choice—divinely beautiful or dazzlingly clever or angelically good?” — L.M. Montgomery, Anne of Green Gables
IF YOU REALLY WANT TO DO SOMETHING, YOU’LL FIND A WAY. IF YOU DON’T, YOU’LL FIND AN EXCUSE.

- Is housing affordability a big public concern in your region?

- Is your region in the process of expanding transit?

- Are you from a region where most of your transit was built before 1990?

- Are you actively working NOW on prioritizing public lands for public benefit?
Public land is any site that is owned by a governmental or government-chartered entity.

Publicly-owned parcels, often referred to as ‘public sites,’ ‘public land’ and ‘surplus land’
- vacant or underutilized parcels,
- parcels with existing community/public facilities with redevelopment potential,
- land being purchased by a public agency for the development of community/public facilities including roads and transit corridors.

Inventory: To understand the scale of the opportunity, create an inventory of the sites available.

Analyze: Not all available sites are suitable for development. Analyzing sites and categorizing them based upon factors that influence their development potential, including scale, existing use, surrounding uses and neighborhood form and infrastructure needs, among other factors, is important.

Position for success: Refine agency processes and procedures. Ensure appropriate staff capacity. Build into Requests for Proposals and other kinds of solicitations.
THINKERS AND DOERS

- Brooke Belman – Sound Transit (WA)
- Lucy Galbraith – Metro Transit (MN)
- Pedro Galvao – Non-Profit Housing of Northern CA
- Heather Hood - Enterprise Community Partners (CA)
- Mariia Zimmerman, MZ Strategies, LLC (Moderator)
Sound Transit district

3 counties:
King | Pierce | Snohomish

51 cities

40% of the state’s population

More than 3 million residents
Statutory & Programmatic ETOD Direction

80% of property suitable for housing must be first offered to qualified entities for affordable housing creation

80% of created units must be affordable

Units must serve those earning no more than 80% of area median income

The Puget Sound affordable housing challenge by the numbers

- 244,000 Additional Affordable Homes needed by 2040
- Regional home prices increased 53% from 2012-2017
- King County lost 5,500 affordable homes over last decade
- >45,000 households in Seattle are spending >1/2 income on housing
- >2,800 people were homeless on typical night in Seattle in 2017
- Seattle Goal: 20,000 affordable and 30,000 market-rate homes created in 10 years
What Sound Transit is doing...
>1,300 units built or planned

Mount Baker Lofts, Seattle
57 - 100% Affordable Units

Othello Plaza, Seattle
108 - 100% Affordable Units

Senior Center, Federal Way
62 - 100% Affordable Units

Roosevelt Station, Seattle
≥230 - 100% Affordable Units

Capitol Hill, Seattle
249 - 100% Affordable Units
249 - Market Rate Units

First Hill, Seattle
≥250 - 100% Affordable Units
Do you have a sense of scale in your region about the opportunity?

- i.e. lots of developable land near transit or only a little

### Table 1: Public Land Suitable for Housing Near Transit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Capacity at 50 DU/ac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>248.0</td>
<td>12,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>5,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>1,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>3,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>234.2</td>
<td>11,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>470</strong></td>
<td><strong>698.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,920</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High Frequency Transit Map 2019

- ½ mile radius for transitway station areas
- ¼ mile buffer for high frequency local bus

Transitway

- Blue / Green Line
- METRO Blue Line
- METRO Green Line
- METRO A Line
- METRO C Line
- Green Line Extension
- Blue Line Extension
- Orange Line
- Gold Line
- D Line
- High Frequency Local Bus Network
27,950 MULTIFAMILY UNITS PERMITTED 2009-2018

• 40% of multifamily units in the region
• 17,868 units in LRT station areas*
• 4,891 units in BRT station areas*
• 8,663 units along high frequency local bus routes

Number of Units

- < 50
- 50 - 99
- 100 - 199
- 200 - 354

Located within a Station Area for select years

2009 - 2018 Data

+ 29,000 add’l PLANNED multifamily units!!

* Permits are counted for both LRT and BRT when station areas overlap
Metro Transit Public Property Database

Downtown
Minneapolis & UMN

Legend
Existing Transitway Alignments
- Existing LRT Alignment
- Existing BRT Alignment
- Northstar Commuter Rail
Planned Transitway Alignments
- Planned LRT Alignment
- Planned BRT Alignment
Public Parcels - Metro CTUs
- County
- Municipal
- Educational
- State
- State - MnDOT
- Metropolitan Council
- Park/Watershed Dist
- Federal
- Park And Ride Buffers
- Park & Ride Buffer
- Transit Station Buffers
- Half Mile Station Buffers

Public Property Online Database: Twin Cities Region Public Properties
Public Property Database example

Downtown Saint Paul

Public Property Online Database: Twin Cities Region Public Properties
Does your transit agency or city prioritize or create incentives specifically for affordable housing or other community-serving uses on its surplus public land?

- Reduced land costs
- Priority points in RFP
- Tax abatements
BRINGING OAKLAND HOME

Creating a Public Land Policy To House Oaklanders
DEMOGRAPHIC CONTEXT: AFRICAN AMERICANS

MORE INFO HTTP://WWW.ANTIEVICTIONMAPPINGPROJECT.NET/BLACK.HTML
### How Does Public Land Help Meet Oakland’s Housing Goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 8 Goal</th>
<th>Year 7 Goal</th>
<th>Year 6 Goal</th>
<th>Year 5 Goal</th>
<th>Year 4 Goal</th>
<th>Year 3 Goal</th>
<th>Year 2 Goal</th>
<th>Year 1 Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>12,240</td>
<td>10,860</td>
<td>9,300</td>
<td>7,740</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td>4,620</td>
<td>3,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Rate Homes</td>
<td>Affordable Homes</td>
<td>Homes</td>
<td>Homes</td>
<td>Homes</td>
<td>Homes</td>
<td>Homes</td>
<td>Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,760</td>
<td>4,165</td>
<td>3,570</td>
<td>2,975</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,341 Market Rate Homes: Year 3: 2016 - 2018</td>
<td>751 Affordable Homes: Year 3: 2016 - 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 4760 needed
- 751 produced
- 1730 in pipeline (inc density bonus units)

4760 affordable homes

28% AH of 17,000 TOTAL = 4760 affordable homes
### City Estimated Housing Production on City Property under Future Solicitation for Development
**City Staff Report 5/10/2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Land Area</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Units Allowed</th>
<th>Potential Affordable Units @ 15%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1800 San Pablo Ave</td>
<td>44,347</td>
<td>LDU-A</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 36th &amp; Foothill</td>
<td>34,164</td>
<td>RU-5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 10451 MacArthur</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>CN-3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 27th &amp; Foothill</td>
<td>22,581</td>
<td>RU-5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 66th &amp; San Leandro</td>
<td>274,428</td>
<td>IG</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Clara &amp; Edes</td>
<td>26,311</td>
<td>RM-4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Hill Elmhurst</td>
<td>28,802</td>
<td>CN-3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Coliseum City</td>
<td>1,504,670</td>
<td>D-CO-2</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Rotunda Garage Remainder</td>
<td>6,697</td>
<td>CBD-C</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 8280 MacArthur</td>
<td>6,720</td>
<td>RU-4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 8296 MacArthur</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>RU-4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 73rd &amp; International</td>
<td>5,435</td>
<td>CC-2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Oak Knoll **</td>
<td>205,337</td>
<td>RH-3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Wood Street **</td>
<td>147,081</td>
<td>D-W5</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Golf Link Rd/82nd Ave/MacArthur **</td>
<td>41,072</td>
<td>RU-4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These numbers correlate with the numbers on the map.
**MOVING TOWARDS AGREEMENT**

**100 Unit Building**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash Sale</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordable</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Value</td>
<td>$3,269,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Impact Fee</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% of land price</td>
<td>$980,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash for Housing Trust Fund</td>
<td>$3,180,807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Onsite Units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordable</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Value</td>
<td>$2,167,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Impact Fee</td>
<td>$650,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% of land price</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash for Housing Trust Fund</td>
<td>$-510,592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subdivided Site**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordable</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Impact Fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% of land price</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash for Housing Trust Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enterprise**

**Onsite %**

- Income Level: 15%
- 50% of AMI

**LIHTC Local $/Unit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share of Land $ for Housing</strong></td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FALSE: Charge Impact Fee on Market units
Even with onsite affordable Units

35% Split between affordable and Market Rate Sites
25 Minimum LIHTC Site
CALIFORNIA’S APPROACH

- **California Surplus Land Act (1968):** Requires public agencies when selling or leasing surplus land to give first priority to affordable housing developers who will build the greatest number of affordable units at the deepest level of affordability.

- **Update to the California Surplus Land Act (AB 1486):** Creates oversight and enforceability for the law addressing basic issues around what to declare “surplus,” how, and enforceability around the law.
Governor’s Executive Order on Surplus Land:
Requires state agencies to identify surplus land that they own that could be used for affordable housing and to issue RFP for those parcels (100+ identified so far)

AB 1486 Implementation*: Online notices at the state level for all available Surplus Land from local agencies statewide
FOR MORE INFORMATION

- Public Benefit from Publicly Owned Parcels: Effective Practices in Affordable Housing Development (Enterprise 2017)
  https://www.enterprisecommunity.org/resources/public-benefit-publicly-owned-parcels-19782

- Prioritizing Public Lands for Affordable Housing and other Public Benefits Model Ordinances & Best Practices (MN Family Housing Fund and MZ Strategies 2018)