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• 5-year old partnership dedicated to improving practice through technical assistance, research + policy reform

• Creating a national marketplace for TOD, working with cities, transit agencies, developers, investors + communities

• Developing new tools and collaborative and equitable planning models

• On-line Clearinghouse of TOD + Transit Best Practices
How Can We Plan Strategically for Transit + TOD?

- No one-size-fits-all to TOD
- Multiple questions that we’re trying to answer
- Transit + TOD planning and investment happen at different scales

Decisions need to be made within a framework and shared with multiple stakeholders.
Why Consider Differences in TOD?

- Create aspirational vision of future land uses in station area
- Prioritize stations for investment
- Provide guidelines and actions for implementation
- Measure performance on a range of metrics

Fruitvale Transit Village  Midtown Manhattan
Drawing from Existing Practice

• Center for TOD Typology Development
  – “Place” Types that support station area planning and benchmarking
  – Corridor Types that support land use and transit planning
  – Market and Opportunity Types that support strategic planning

• Typology Systems Developed By Others

• Implications for the Portland Region
New Transit Town Typology

Goal: Illustrate “one size does not fit all” concept for TOD

- Provided density, use mix guidelines
- Mainly applicable to new development
- Qualitative approach
## New Transit Town Typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOD Type</th>
<th>Land Use Pre</th>
<th>Minimum Housing Density</th>
<th>Planning Level</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Regional Connectivity</th>
<th>Transit Models</th>
<th>Frequency of</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Downtown</td>
<td>Residential, commercial, mixed-use</td>
<td>&gt;60 units/acc</td>
<td>Multi-family</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Chicago, Washington, DC, Atlanta, Boston, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>&gt;20 units/acc</td>
<td>Multi-family</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>Portland, Oregon, Seattle, San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>Residential, commercial, mixed-use</td>
<td>&gt;50 units/acc</td>
<td>Multi-family</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>Minneapolis, St Paul, Denver, Atlanta, Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>&gt;10 units/acc</td>
<td>Multi-family</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>Columbus, Cincinnati, Charlotte, Nashville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Zone</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>&gt;5 units/acc</td>
<td>Multi-family</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>Austin, Minneapolis, Denver, Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Center</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>&gt;5 units/acc</td>
<td>Multi-family</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>Atlanta, Charlotte, Denver, Nashville</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CTOD: Center for Transit-Oriented Development*
Denver TOD Strategy

Goal: Provide a vision for future land uses in station areas without the expense of individual plans

• Prioritize stations for planning efforts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOD Typology</th>
<th>Desired Land Use Mix</th>
<th>Desired Housing Types</th>
<th>Commercial/Employment Types</th>
<th>Proposed Scale</th>
<th>Transit System Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Office, retail, residential, entertainment, and civic uses</td>
<td>Multi-family and loft</td>
<td>Prime office and shopping location</td>
<td>5 stories and above</td>
<td>Intermodal facility/transit hub. Major regional destination with high quality feeder bus/streetcar connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Regional destination. Some Park-n-ride. Linked with district circulator transit and express feeder bus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Regional destination. Some Park-n-ride. Linked with district circulator transit and express feeder bus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood walk-up station. Very small Park-n-ride, if any. Local bus connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capture station for in-bound commuters. Large Park-n-ride with local and express bus connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bus or streetcar corridors. District circulator or feeder transit service. Walk-up stops. No transit parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large Commuter destination. Large parking reservoirs but not necessarily for transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Area Typology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Station Area Prioritization

### Denver TOD Typology and Activity Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stations</th>
<th>TOD Typology</th>
<th>Market Opportunity</th>
<th>Phasing Priority of City Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denver Union Station</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;D&quot; Line, existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33rd &amp; Downing (new station)</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Monitor &amp; Respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welton Street Stops</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Monitor &amp; Respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th Street Stops</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Monitor &amp; Respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th &amp; Osage</td>
<td>Urban Neighborhood</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>Urban Center</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Major Urban Center</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>Urban Neighborhood</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>Monitor &amp; Respond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Denver TOD Strategy

Implementation Lessons Learned:

• More community buy-in would have facilitated implementation + future station area plan process

• Typology should have included more detail on attributes of places

• Market feasibility could have played larger role
Goal: Understand development potential across cities, and where investment can help generate more density

- Established corridor density minimums to secure funding
- Place types defined by quantitative analysis: density and actual station connectivity

### TABLE 1: Resolution 3434 Transit Extension Projects Subject to Corridor Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>THRESHOLD IS MET WITH CURRENT DEVELOPMENT?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BART East Contra Costa Rail Extension</td>
<td>BART/CCTA</td>
<td>Commuter Rail</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART — Downtown Fremont to San Jose/Santa Clara</td>
<td>(a) BART (b) VTA</td>
<td>BART extension</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Fremont to Warm Springs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Warm Springs to San Jose/ Santa Clara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit Berkeley/Oakland/ San Leandro Bus Rapid Transit: Phase 1</td>
<td>AC Transit</td>
<td>Bus Rapid Transit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Downtown Extension/Rebuilt Transbay Terminal</td>
<td>TJPA</td>
<td>Commuter Rail</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNI Third Street Light Rail Transit Project Phase 2 — New Central Subway</td>
<td>MUNI</td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma-Marin Rail</td>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>Commuter Rail</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumbarton Rail</td>
<td>SMTA, ACCMA, VTA, ACTIA, Capitol</td>
<td>Corridor Commuter Rail</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Ferry Service Phase 1: Berkeley, Alameda/Oakland/ Harbor Bay, and South San Francisco to San Francisco (Note 1)</td>
<td>WTA</td>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Ferry Service Phase 2: Alameda to South San Francisco, and Hercules, Antioch, Treasure Island, Redwood City and Richmond to San Francisco (Note 1)</td>
<td>WTA</td>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: The WTA Ferry Expansion “Corridor” for the purposes of the TOD policy consists of all new terminals planned in Phase 1 and Phase 2.
### MTC TOD Strategy

- "Benchmarked" place types and targets for station area planning
- Potential criteria for regional funding priority

#### STATION AREA PLANNING MANUAL

**DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Guidelines</th>
<th>Regional Center</th>
<th>City Center</th>
<th>Suburban Center</th>
<th>Transit Town Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Mix (New Development) [2]</td>
<td>High rise &amp; mid rise apartments/condos</td>
<td>Mid-rise, low-rise, some high-rise and townhomes</td>
<td>Mid-rise, low-rise, some high-rise and townhomes</td>
<td>Mid-rise, low-rise, townhomes, small lot single family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Area Total Units Target [3]</td>
<td>8,000 - 30,000</td>
<td>6,000 - 15,000</td>
<td>2,500 - 10,000</td>
<td>3,000 - 7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Area Total Jobs Target</td>
<td>40,000 - 150,000</td>
<td>5,000 - 30,000</td>
<td>7,500 - 50,000</td>
<td>2,000 - 7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum FAR (New Employment Development)</td>
<td>5.0 FAR</td>
<td>2.5 FAR</td>
<td>4.0 FAR</td>
<td>2.0 FAR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Districts</strong></th>
<th>Urban Neighborhood</th>
<th>Transit Neighborhood</th>
<th>Mixed Use Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-rise, low-rise, townhomes</td>
<td>Low-rise, townhomes, some mid-rise and small lot single family</td>
<td>Mid-rise, low-rise, townhomes, small lot single family off immediate corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,500 - 10,000</td>
<td>1,500 - 4,000</td>
<td>2,000 - 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 - 100 du/acre</td>
<td>20 - 50 du/acre</td>
<td>25 - 80 du/acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Urban Neighborhood</th>
<th>Transit Neighborhood</th>
<th>Mixed Use Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>750 - 1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 FAR</td>
<td>1.0 FAR</td>
<td>2.0 FAR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MTC TOD Strategy

Implementation Lessons Learned:

• Approach offered way to attach accountability to allocation of regional funds

• Words used in typology mattered: added “suburban” to be more inclusive

• TOD Strategy responded primarily to housing need, less so to where jobs go
BART Access Study

Goal: Identify stations where small access improvements could leverage large changes in station access modes (from car to other)

- Classified stations based on both current and aspirational place types
- Considered potential for undeveloped land to transform place types
- Quantifiably integrated land use and access conditions
Is downtown Walnut Creek (a local downtown)...

...really like downtown Berkeley (a local downtown)?

Implementation Lessons Learned:

- Place Types not accepted by all BART staff – ended up with access types instead
- Needed to be more explicit about purpose, and limitations of typology approach
- Quantifiable place types held more weight – but couldn’t agree on aspirations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic:</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Station footprint</th>
<th>Street network</th>
<th>Proximity to freeway off-ramp</th>
<th>Parking capacity</th>
<th>Parking fill time</th>
<th>Transit service types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure:</td>
<td>Weekday Entries</td>
<td>Physical Size</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Distance from highway exit to station</td>
<td>Spaces</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Service Areas/Types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Measures:</td>
<td>Low: &lt; 5,000 Moderate: 5,000 - 10,000 High: &gt; 10,000</td>
<td>Underground: 0 Small: &lt; 10 Medium: 10 - 20 Large: &gt; 20</td>
<td>Urban grid / historic grid Suburban grid Suburban residential Suburban hillside</td>
<td>Adjacent: &lt; 0.5 mi Nearby: 0.5 - 1.5 mi Far: &gt; 1.5 mi</td>
<td>No Parking Small: &lt; 700 Medium: 700 - 1,800 Large: &gt; 1,800</td>
<td>No parking Before 8 a.m. After 6 a.m. Does Not Fill</td>
<td>Local Corridor Regional All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Proposed Station Types | |
|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Urban                  | High            | Underground or Small | Urban grid / historic grid | Far | No Parking | No parking | All |
| Urban w/ Parking       | High            | Underground or Small | Urban grid / historic grid | Far | Small | Early | All |
| Balanced               | Moderate        | Small or Medium | Urban grid / historic grid, suburban grid | Far or Nearby | Small or Medium | Early | Corridor, Local |
| Intermodal - Auto Reliant | Moderate | Medium | Suburban grid, suburban residential | Adjacent or Nearby | Medium or Large | Morning | Local, Regional |
| Auto Dependent         | Low - Moderate  | Large            | Suburban residential, suburban hillside | Adjacent | Medium or Large | Morning | Local |
Initial Themes

Typology Approaches:
- Describing land use mix and intensity
- Moving from qualitative to quantitative information about land use
- Looking at long term development opportunity, but not more immediate market conditions

Early Typology Purposes:
- Communicate long term vision/expectation for individual stations
- Create framework for future land use plan
  - Illustrate that not all TOD is the same
  - Understand what’s appropriate in given station context
Corridor Level Analysis

• Helps us understand role of transit in shaping station areas
• Connectivity enhances understanding of what the “potential” is in any place
• Not so much about technology as about:
  – Frequency
  – Linking origins and destinations
• Development opportunities shape potential future roles for corridors
Corridor Typology

Commuter

District Circulator

Planned Growth

Destination Connection

Center for Transit-Oriented Development
Los Angeles Corridor Studies

• **Goal:** Understand how transit could change station area market potential

• Began to consider how one station area could influence its neighbors in terms of:
  – Market Strength + Development Opportunity
  – Origins and Destinations

**Opportunity sites represent about 35% of the land in all station areas.**
Los Angeles Corridor Studies

Potential to change market by

Expanding reach of strong market trade areas
Improving access to destinations
Los Angeles Corridor Studies

Improving access to destinations: a look at current commutes relative to transit
Los Angeles TOD Analysis

- **Goal:** Convene TOD stakeholders around multiple TOD goals to understand issues and determine next steps
- Not just new development, but access, environmental, and equity considerations
Los Angeles TOD Analysis

Bringing Equity into the Picture
Los Angeles TOD Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Change</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College graduates (1990-2000)</td>
<td>+4.3%</td>
<td>Nominal change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfamily households (1990-2000)</td>
<td>-15.6%</td>
<td>Rapid decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income (1990-2000)</td>
<td>+8.4%</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income diversity (1990-2000)</td>
<td>+3.5%</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Units (2009-2015)</td>
<td>0 units, 0% expiring</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Opportunity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underutilized Land</td>
<td>85 acres</td>
<td>Small, clustered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. commercial &amp; industrial parcel</td>
<td>0.55 acres</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slauson compared to regional average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Station Boardings</td>
<td>4,018 riders</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Barriers</td>
<td>Block size</td>
<td>Semi-walkable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Auto Work Trips from Area</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Auto Work Trips to Area</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents with 1 or 0 cars</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Ways to Look at Stations in Relation to Each Other
Benchmarking Performance

Twin Cities Region Walkable Centers Analysis

Downtown Minneapolis
(Nicollet Mall @ 8th Street S)

Regional Locator Map

Walker Centers Indicators
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Connectivity Index
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Implementation
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Benchmarking Performance

Twin Cities Region Walkable Centers Analysis

Southdale Area
(W 66th Street & York Ave S, Edina)

Regional Locator Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mix of Uses (Work/Residences)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity of Use (Work, + Res./Acre)</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk Score</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Block Size</td>
<td>10.0 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity Index</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Density</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin Mode Split</td>
<td>93% Non-auto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Mode Split</td>
<td>4% Rail-auto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Opportunity</td>
<td>116 Acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

June 30, 2009
Central Maryland TOD Strategy

- **Goal:** prioritizing investment and coordinating stakeholders to become more proactive
- “Place types” didn’t suggest how to deal with *implementation*
- Regional scale creates new challenges of jurisdiction and collaboration
Central Maryland TOD Strategy

1. Regional Priority
   Map based on TOD goals

2. Station-level TOD approach based on current conditions
TOD OPPORTUNITY ANALYSIS

KEY QUESTIONS
- Is there land available for development?
- Is there the potential for some uses to transition to others?
- Are the opportunities to intensify existing residential or employment concentrations?

KEY INDICATORS
- Underutilized Commercial/Industrial Land
- Holding Capacity
- Non-programmed public land

KEY QUESTIONS
- Is there development happening now?
- Are values going up quickly?
- Is there a lot of transaction activity?

KEY INDICATORS
- Permit activity
- Sales Activity
- Median Income
KEY QUESTIONS
• Who is living in the station area currently?
• What is the strength of the housing market?
• Are there challenges of gentrification or disinvestment?

KEY INDICATORS
• Market Value Assessment
• Jobs Housing Balance
• Income Diversity and Median Income

NEIGHBORHOOD STRATEGY ANALYSIS
Central Maryland TOD Strategy

Implementation Lessons Learned:

• Need to find the right methodology to define priorities and bring stakeholders together

• Typology can address process as well as places, but it can be difficult conceptually

• In a weak real estate market, sometimes you just have to wait
Still questions to be answered

- GHG Emissions benchmarks
- Employment patterns and performance
- Economic development and jobs
Influential Non-CTOD “Place Type” Efforts

- New Urbanist Transect - CNU
- Station Design/Function Typology – PB Place Making
- Glatting Jackson Access Types
- Arup Transportation Access Types
- Portland Centers and Corridors Work
CNU Transect/SmartCode

- Categorizes places along a continuum from rural to urban
- SmartCode codifies an approach to land use regulation based on the transect
- Provides clear standards and guidelines
Charlotte Station Types

- Outlines City/Transit Agency responsibilities at each type of station
- Combines access type and community context
- Developed prior to completion of first segment of regional transit plan
Implications of Transit Design

- Decisions in transit design have impact on TOD potential
- Transit agencies need to be willing partner in catalyzing TOD
Comparison of Portland and LA

Los Angeles vs Portland Station Matrix B
Intensity & Land Use Mix

INTENSITY (residents+workers per half mile)

Station References
- Downtown Portland
- Non-Downtown Portland
- Non-Downtown LA
- Downtown LA

HOUSING ← MIX (ratio of workers to residents) ← EMPLOYMENT
Reflections for Portland

Typology / TOD Strategic Plan Can:

• Frame issues around transit and affordability, environment, economic performance
• Establish aspirational place types for station areas to guide development, implementation
• Measure current performance, identify areas of strength / improvement
• Layer information to prioritize investments
Reflections for Portland

Typology / TOD Strategic Plan Can:

• Frame issues around transit and affordability, environment, economic performance
• Establish aspirational place types for station areas to guide development, implementation

✓ Measure current performance, identify areas of strength / improvement
✓ Layer information to prioritize investments
Reflections for Portland

Focus on Prioritizing Investments, Measuring Outcomes

• Well performing CBD and Streetcar stations, but suburban areas in need of catalytic efforts
• What vision makes sense for more outlying areas?
• Strong foundation of data to benchmark performance
Intensity (Workers + Residents)
Land Use Mix (Workers/Residents)