

Paper presented at

CITY TRANS – CHINA 2004

Tongji University

Shanghai, China

November 17-18, 2004

Paper presented at

CITY TRANS – CHINA 2004

Tongji University

Shanghai, China

November 17 – 18, 2004

SPEAKER BIOGRAPHY

Robert C. Pearman, Jr. was educated at the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, and Yale Law School. His two decades of experience as a lawyer and consultant include transportation (rail, air, roads), other public works (redevelopment, schools) and real estate (housing, commercial). Major transportation projects and facilities where he has played a role include all of Los Angeles' Metro Rail lines, the California High Speed Rail Authority, and Los Angeles World Airports. He has offices in Los Angeles and San Diego Counties, and practices throughout California.

JOINT DEVELOPMENT AROUND TRANSIT PROPERTIES: PROJECTS, PLANNING AND PERFORMANCE

By: Robert C. Pearman, Jr. © 2004

I. INTRODUCTION

Local government and transit agencies in the United States have engaged in the **planning** process, including land use considerations, for the encouragement and facilitation of joint development around transit properties. This includes: study of transit oriented development districts surrounding rail stations; planning and assessment of joint development potential of specific government/agency owned real properties; and environmental due diligence, and land use alternatives assessment and economic analysis for development of properties along the length of an entire transit right-of-way.

But how do such planning theories translate into the practical and effective **implementation** of joint development programs?

In this paper, I look at case studies involving such programs' implementation: among them, the transit-oriented development (TOD) planning process for a new rail line; the proposal, sale and construction process for a mixed use, shared parking structure project with a private developer; rental housing, and large-scale mixed-use projects over and around the right-of-way and station site including shared parking; as well as the development of a high-rise headquarters project.

Using these experiences, and others, the initial land use and planning elements -- such as agency joint development policies, density bonuses, mixed-use encouragement, multimodal interfaces, environmental considerations, etc. - are traced from theory to the practical and real world development opportunities and constraints, and the all-important reactions of the community at large and the private development and finance communities in particular.

Unexpected problems unearthed, opportunities for cooperation and synergy, and overall "lessons learned", all will certainly resonate with the Asian market, as its populace becomes more politically vocal and environmentally concerned, and as its governments become more reliant on private development and financing to achieve successful fruition of joint development programs.

II. THE PROJECTS

The implementation of joint development programs and policies related to transit facilities has become in vogue in the past decade¹. As is often the case, its practical

¹ See news articles, e.g., "RTD Plans to Develop Land Above Red Line", LA Times, March 9, 1992; "Regional Transit District Board will authorize staff to negotiate ... for joint development of the Marconi/Arcade light-rail station", Sacramento Bee, November 23, 1997; "Muni (SF Municipal Railway) Plan for Hotel Draws Kudos, Flak", San Francisco Chronicle, December 17, 1999.

implementation has lagged behind its publicity. Nevertheless, as the concept matures and as mass transit expands, especially rail, joint development² around transit facilities is becoming a significant opportunity for private developers worldwide.³

As case studies for this paper, I examine the following transit projects with real estate development features from the Southern California experience.

A. Union Station

The refurbished Union Station – where five Metrolink lines (commuter rail) and the subway (Red Line) converge, along with six inter-city Amtrak runs -- has become the centerpiece of downtown Los Angeles' TOD. Catellus Development is owner of most of the 50⁺ acre site.

By 1998, transit officials say, an average of 20,000 people were using the Union Station each weekday. By 2003, with use of the Red Line, Amtrak and Metrolink growing, more than 200 trains and an average of 40,000 people pass through it on weekdays.

Although the total number of daily visitors is smaller than at many East Coast rail terminals -- Union Station in Washington, D.C., handles about 70,000 people a day, including on weekends -- local transit officials foresee a time when Los Angeles' Union Station will be just as busy. With the recent opening of the 14-mile Gold Line⁴ light rail connecting Pasadena and Los Angeles, and with future rail extensions within the decade, about 20,000 more riders are expected to use Union Station on most days⁵. *See Attachment #1.*

B. MTA⁶ Headquarters

The MTA's predecessor agency, Southern California Rapid Transit District, chose developer Catellus Development Corp., an adjoining landowner in the Union Station area, to jointly develop a mixed-use transportation, retail and headquarters

² For purposes of this article, the term "joint development" reflects a form of public/private partnership to leverage resources and create value from the synergy between development projects and their proximity to transit facilities.

³ For some years, China has been seeking U.S. developers to participate in the real estate market and in public developments, often in joint venture with local corporations or Hong Kong-based companies. (Source: *Real Estate Newslines*, Kenneth Leventhal & Company, Volume 11, Number 5).

⁴ The Los Angeles to Pasadena Metro Blue Line Construction Authority was charged with developing the Blue Line; subsequently the name was changed to the Gold Line and the Authority. As it moves to complete the second phase of the project, it is known as the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority ("Authority").

⁵ Source: *Los Angeles Times*, article by Kurt Streeter, Thursday, May 22, 2003.

⁶ The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority ("MTA") operates the Red (heavy), Green and Blue (light) rail lines, the countywide bus network, and the Gold Line (light), though that line was built by the Authority. MTA is successor to the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission, and the Southern California Rapid Transit District.

office complex (a.k.a. “Union Station Gateway”). *See Attachment #2.* The 26-story structure was completed in 1995. *See Attachment #3.*

C. Gold Line

The Authority was created and charged with the construction of a long-delayed light rail system. The initial 13.7 mile segment opened in late 2003. *See Attachment #4.*

Sites considered by the Authority’s joint development program for Phase 1 included the Chinatown station (5.6 acres), the Del Mar station (3.8 acres), Sierra Madre Villa station – the Phase 1 terminus (9.2 acres) and the Fillmore station (1.5 acres).

D. Sprinter

The new \$351.5 million light rail line in North County San Diego will have 15 stations along the 22 mile route. Seven of the stations will be within the City of Oceanside. Construction on the Oceanside-Escondido Rail Project will begin in 2003, and is anticipated to be completed in 2007. Passenger service will begin in December of 2007, with 12,000 passengers per day projected initially, 19,000 riders by year 2020. *See Attachment #5.*

In February of 2002, State of California awarded the City of Oceanside a grant to conduct a TOD study of potential districts around Oceanside’s new Sprinter transit stops. Oceanside is a city of 150,000, as the name implies, abutting the Pacific Ocean, with little high-rise development. The purpose was to “fund coordinated transportation and land use planning projects that have statewide or multi-regional significance, and encourage community involvement and partnership. Projects should support commonly understood livable community concepts, and promote community identity and quality of life.”

The City of Oceanside selected CityWorks, a renowned San Diego-based urban planning firm, to help them meet the goals of the grant. The study was to include several opportunities for community involvement, as well as recommendations for land use and zoning changes for potential TOD districts, with the Coast Highway demonstration site to include illustrations on the potential look and feel of the area.

III. THE PLANS – Joint Development Programs and Policies

A. Union Station

Catellus has long been poised to develop large swatches of terminal property that are unused or serve as parking lots. A number of years ago it received entitlements to develop 6.5 million square feet of mixed use. A recently expressed feeling about development prospects at the Station is similar to those voiced a decade

ago: "It is inevitable. More interest and building is going to happen there. The proximity to great transit and a great building is one of the drivers."⁷

The City of Los Angeles' Transportation and Land Use Policy contains the following incentives for transit station areas: (1) 3 to 10% reduction in standard city parking requirements (2) 25% floor area ration (FAR) bonus for combining lots (3) 25% density bonus for all housing types or ranges for combining lots (4) Combined hearing process to expedite project review.⁸

B. Joint Development Policies

1. LACTC/MTA

Los Angeles County Transportation Commission Joint Development Policies [Circa 1995] included the following:

"PURPOSE: LACTC shall actively pursue a joint development program in order to extract the optimum benefit from the utilization of property owned and acquired by the LACTC consistent with municipal and community development objectives and with LACTC transportation goals."

Subordinate goals included:

- Maximize limited capital resources by leveraging the public investment with private/public sector interests.
- Encourage development on, over, and adjacent to rail stations.
- Create joint development investment opportunities for the private sector and/or municipalities

2. Gold Line

See Attachment #6.

C. Gold Line Site Review and Analysis

The Authority also engaged a team of experts to perform a site review and analysis of its potential joint development properties. The first task was to prepare an environmental due diligence analysis and report for properties the Authority owned.

⁷ Article by Kurt Streecher, *Los Angeles Times*, Thursday, May 22, 2003, quoting Dan Rosenfeld, whose firm, Urban Partners, is now developing the California Endowment building at Union Station.

⁸ Source: California Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Database - Caltrans

This effort culminated in an analysis of the extent to which certain environmental issues may affect planning, and thus economic, considerations for the properties. The analysis interpreted the effect on development contemplated for the joint development sites of applicable current regulatory requirements, associated restrictions, and potentially binding and applicable mitigation measures established in previous environmental documentation regarding the Gold Line.

Second, a select number of land use alternatives were studied for preliminary assessment, and based upon this preliminary assessment, recommended land uses studied for a more rigorous economic analysis. The assessment was of the physical, legal and social constraints that attached to the Sites, and a preliminary indication of market acceptance of those land uses examined. *See Attachment ##7, 7a.*

As a result, among the sites that were promoted for possible joint development, and as to which solicitations of interest went out to the real estate community, was the Del Mar Station site. This had long been considered for a mixed use, multi-modal development site, including an uprooting and re-establishment of a historic depot, retail, residential, above and below ground parking for hundreds of spaces, and construction rights over the transit right-of-way including the transfer of air rights to aid in the entitlement process.

Also moving forward was the Fillmore Station site, a parcel of land that had been programmed for surface parking only, and whose previous ownership interests included a railroad and a petroleum company. A plan was created for the sale of the site to a private developer of medical/office/retail, who in turn would build a multi-use parking garage to include a permanently reserved easement for a number of spaces for transit riders.

D. Sprinter

With respect to the Sprinter and the pilot TOD study, the draft of the planning ordinance was the intended end product in and of itself. It had the following features:

An overall goal was to promote intensification of land use at appropriate locations, consistent with the Land Use Element of the General Plan, and foster development patterns that offer alternatives to automobile use by establishing densities and intensities that help make frequent transit service feasible and encourages walking, bicycling and transit use.

A separate district, titled the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) district, was added to the Zoning Ordinance to establish specific requirement for transit-supportive development and intensification of land use around the transit station. The proposed language for the TOD district includes specific use regulations and development standards for each of the three TOD designations:

- TOD-RC Regional Commercial was to serve regional as well as local neighborhood users. These sites will include a broad range of retail, office, service, hotel and residential uses to serve nearby neighborhoods and attract people from throughout the city. Buildings in this area will have ground level commercial, public and institutional uses in a pedestrian oriented setting with additional commercial, office or live/work space on the floors above. Buildings in this district will have a maximum height of 45 feet.
- TOD-NC Neighborhood Commercial - This sub-district is intended to serve the needs of the local residents by providing neighborhood commercial, retail and dining opportunities. Residential, office space, live/work, bed and breakfast hotels and limited institutional uses are also allowed in this sub-district.
- Throughout the ¼ mile radius surrounding the transit station, TOD-RH Residential High Density will provide opportunities for high-density residential uses, only a limited amount of commercial development is permitted.

Among other features, the maximum residential density shall be 100 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) in the TOD-RC, 75 in the TOD-NC, and 43 in the TOD-RH.

Residential densities may reach a maximum of 150 du/ac in the TOD-RC, 100 du/ac in the TOD-NC, and 75 du/ac in the TOD-RH in the following instances:

- If they justified an Affordable Housing Density Bonus.
- If the projects met specific pedestrian oriented design criteria, such as the provision of reduced parking, street landscaping, and public plazas
- Upon the completion and operation of the Sprinter.

As to required parking, upon the completion of the Sprinter rail line, parking requirements shall be one space per dwelling unit for residential uses and 25% of the parking currently required for all other uses, with provisions for further reduction up to 25 percent upon certain findings.

As an example of the type of projects which might ensue in such a TOD district, *See Attachment #8*, which reflects a survey of similar districts along the west coast of the United States that have TOD planning ordinances.

Of interest is a report entitled, *Land Value Impacts of Rail Transit Services in Los Angeles County*, by Robert Cervero and Michael Duncan (June 2002) prepared for the National Association of Realtors and Urban Land Institute. It examined the notion that transit investments create benefits, as real-estate markets tell us:

“Location theory holds that land prices rise in synch with travel-time savings, thus to the degree transit expedites travel, properties near stations should sell for more. Transit’s “capitalization benefits” are thought to be especially pronounced in highly congested areas. This report presents research results on the land -value impacts of high performance transit services – heavy rail, commuter rail, light rail, and bus rapid transit (BRT) – in Los Angeles County, the nation’s most populated county (9.8 million inhabitants in 2002).”

The report was divided into 4 parts. First, recent investments in transit and development activities around transit nodes in Los Angeles County are reviewed. Second, the methodologies and data sources used in this study are discussed. Third, descriptive statistics and research results are presented. Lastly, the policy implications of these findings are elaborated upon.

The thought-provoking conclusions to that study are discussed later in this paper.

IV. THE PERFORMANCE – Implementation and Lessons Learned

A. MTA

By MTA’s own admission, its track record of sparking joint development around its initial Metro Red, Blue and Green Line has been spotty at best. *See Attachment #9*. Recent positive results have come about in part as the real estate economy has improved in Los Angeles, but still with significant public subsidies, such as the Hollywood-Highland project.

A comparison to Hong Kong’s development depth and scope around its rail lines is noteworthy. What is striking is not merely the number of developments in and about the Hong Kong lines, but their wide-ranging size and scope. A look at the details behind these projects shows a number of them are not limited to government institutional components, but have significant private commercial square footages. Of course, by the nature of the light-rail (and bus) lines which are predominant in America’s west coast, the ridership and density and scope of development in those corridors is likely to be less than that along heavy rail lines, such as in Hong Kong or Singapore, or in America’s Northeast corridor. *See Attachment #10*.

B. Land Value Impact Study – Conclusions

The report concluded:

“CONCLUSION:

Compared to experiences in Santa Clara County and San Diego County, land value impacts of high-performance transit in Los Angeles County were uneven and inconsistent. In the case of the Red Line subway, premiums were recorded only for multi-family rental housing; for other uses, properties within half-mile rings of stations tended to sell for less . . . In the case of LRT lines, premiums were found for multifamily housing and commercial uses as well as single-family properties in the case of the Blue Line; discounts were found for condominiums and single-family properties in the case of the Green Line. Lastly, residential properties near BRT stops generally sold for less whereas commercial properties generally sold for more. Why impacts were uneven and inconsistent is unclear, however one explanation for the absence of premiums and in instances the ostensible presence of discounts is that the half-mile rings around many of the County’s rail and BRT stops correspond to redevelopment districts. Lying in distressed inner-city settings apparently lowers land values in many instances despite transit’s presence . . . Other corridors, like the Ventura BRT line, are substantially outside of the redevelopment zones, thus other factors, including proximity to transit itself, are explaining value -losses. Because some of the County’s high performance transit services are relatively new, land value trends should be monitored in order to gauge longer term impacts.” *See Attachment #11, 11a.*

C. GOLD LINE

The Gold Line joint development effort has had modest success. The effort has been successful at gaining the revenue generation intended by and necessary to the project’s budget, though some projects have been delayed beyond their initial completion date.

A developer, Urban Partners, was selected in the fall of 2000 to carry out the joint development at the Del Mar Station. Development of the residential, retail, and parking complex has broken ground. Originally expected to have a completion date in early 2004, a target date now is the winter of 2005, though the transit parking may be available earlier.

On the Fillmore Station site, a developer has paid the Authority for the site and will be required to construct a multi-story, shared use parking structure serving the transit riders, as well as the private developer’s tenants – a medical office complex. Completion of construction is anticipated in 2005.

D. LESSONS LEARNED

What lessons can we take from the divergence that often occurred between the actual performance in the real world and the promise of the plans, policies and programs of the transit agencies?

1. Multi-Modal, Multi-User Complexities

The policies and programs encouraged, and in part are dependent upon, a mixed-use, multiple-user, and a multi-modal bus, various forms of rail scenario. The downside though, is that these features can create tremendous complexity, in terms of the breadth of real estate interests that come into play, nature of easements, number of involved entities and property owners, and differing approvals and consents needed for project completion.

Due to the common use of Union Station for the passengers of the various transit systems (not all under one ownership in LA County), the Union Station Gateway Project involved complex documentation and negotiation to allocate responsibilities for costs and maintenance, and to ensure that no party's facilities are adversely impacted by the construction of the Project. The multi-level parking structure with some subterranean elements also required a complicated series of easements to protect all parties. The transaction was facilitated by a land swap since the transit agency involved also had ownership of a few acres on the Union Station site.

The Del Mar project is another good example. As indicated by the attachment, a working draft of its Reciprocal Easement Agreement's Easement section, the required documentation of various easement rights was a lengthy, complex affair. *See Attachment ##12, 12a, 12b.*

Negotiation and documentation in such detail is fairly typical whenever there is a mixture of private development and operating transit properties, inevitably easements need to be reserved for i) the benefit of the transit riders, to utilize the parking structure and to access the transit facilities through the private development if need be, and ii) access for necessary maintenance by the transit agency of its ROW and transit facilities.

Key operational concerns and conflicts with shared use garages include: the long term maintenance of the parking structure; requirements to rebuild in case of damage and destruction; the rates; hours of operation; security for the parking structure; management contracts; advertising content and revenues; and the implementation of controls to ensure the availability to transit users of their allocated spaces.

2. Developer Concerns

In the real world, the programs developed by the transit agencies to entice development may be viewed as impractical and unattractive to the private development community. In part this can be due to the transit-mandated safety and operational constraints⁹ that may limit the real property interests that can be conveyed by the agency or the uses and activities adjacent to the transit facilities. Land within a certain

⁹ Rigorous engineering guidelines for construction near transit facilities and operations are a universal feature. *See Attachment #13*, and see Singapore MRT Corp. 1993 Annual Report.

distance from the track centerline may be off-limits to construction activities, and the need for overhead clearances will restrict use of airspace above the tracks. All this may lead to increased costs.

The complexity, as described in IV.D.1, of these projects also may have a negative impact on acceptance by private developers. Certainly, in the United States, working with public agencies and the need to wrestle with their approval requirements and timetables for action can retard the participation of private developers.

The agency may have general design and aesthetic standards for facilities that impact its system (e.g., shared use garages). Private developers, perhaps scarred by bureaucratic delays in working with other public entity “partners”, will be leery of excessive agency review and approval powers and the potential adverse impact on its private development. One way to handle the design review and approval in a manner that won't involve micromanagement of the developer's construction activities is to first agree upon an initial level of design documentation, e.g., conceptual plans. Thereafter the agency approval rights would be limited to aspects inconsistent with the original approved plans or changes that may directly affect transit operations.

A more detailed level of review and approval by the agency may be unpalatable to the private developer, particularly where the agency is not funding any part of the private development.

In practice, undoubtedly there will be contentious negotiations on these points, as developers will want to minimize the agency's ability to delay work or increase costs through any review and approval rights and remedies. Developers will tend to want to limit the time period for any allowable agency review, preferring, for example, a “deemed approval” process whereby if the agency comments aren't delivered within a certain number of days, the developer can treat that stage of plans as deemed approved. A solution may be to refer certain disputes to a rapid mediation/arbitration process to obtain speedy decisions and prevent litigation.¹⁰

3. Environmental Concerns

From the transit agency standpoint, an attractiveness of these public/private ventures is to minimize open-ended environmental liability on its holdings of contaminated properties. In the disposition agreement, it may seek to place hazardous substances clean up responsibility on the developer. One way to accomplish this is to make the transfer as-is, but giving the developer a sufficient pre-closing due diligence period to determine if the risks are acceptable. Lands near a former freight rail ROW, a frequent locale of public rail routes, are likely to have some hazardous substances history.

It is also possible that, in the event the subject property is contaminated, the seller (e.g., the railroad referred to above) is liable to the buying

¹⁰ “Joint Development of Transit Properties” by Robert C. Pearman, Jr., *Real Property Law Reporter* (2004) Continuing Education of the Bar (CEB) – California.

agency for its share of cleanup costs for the period of railroad ownership, and any such obligation may be applied to the benefit of the. In practice, the agency, especially if it has held title to the property for some time, is likely to have to share in clean up costs. Certainly, the agency will seek indemnification for any claims or liabilities that might arise due to uses after its title transfer.

America's, and California's emphasis on environmental review is well documented. In fact, one reason the Sprinter TOD draft ordinance has not been enacted is that an environmental impact report is needed for its adoption and the funding is still being obtained for that effort. It is not a concern limited to America, however, it has been¹¹ and potentially will grow as an issue that transit agencies in the Asian marketplace must face. Sensitivity to environmental problems created by real projects and their related development, and the fact that rail properties often have a history of contamination issues, is a hurdle that transit-oriented developments must overcome.

4. Financing Concerns

As important as the developers are the lenders and financiers. The complexity of these projects and the environmental concerns, as noted above, may also limit developers' access to capital. Money tends to flow to a simpler project, all things being equal. Lenders have to consider the effect of possible default by the developer and the need to foreclose and take over the project. They want a project that they understand, one that has risks that they are used to managing. Successful joint development projects may require the agency to educate the lending community, and perhaps make certain concessions in the program documents to assuage their concerns.

When joint development included mixed use or joint use with, for example, a parking structure that will serve both the private development and transit riders, the transit agency will want to make sure that any liens and encumbrances on the joint use parking structure cannot easily take lien priority over its reserved parking easement and therefore eliminate the parking rights of transit users. The developer's banks will be asked by the agency to agree to continue to maintain the primacy of the reserved transit parking easements in case of foreclosure. Negotiations will definitely ensue among the agency, developer and its lender to determine how the lender's requested remedies in case of a loan default are to be balanced with the agency's similar competing rights in case of a project default.

5. Strength of the Real Estate Market

As is often the case in real estate development, the economics of the local real estate market, and indeed the national market, is a crucial factor in determining if development opportunities will be embraced or delayed. It cannot be denied that through much of the 1990's the Los Angeles region was suffering through a real estate recession.

¹¹ Singapore MRT 1993 Annual Report.

The lengthy gap in development commitments for the Union Station site may be evidence of that. Developments began in 1993 with an adjoining landowner/transit agency (MTA's headquarters project), and then another public agency, the Metropolitan Water District followed suit three years later. Then there was a gap of almost eight years before a non-profit moved to place its headquarters there. The nonprofit California Endowment will soon build a new 6 story headquarters on six acres, with occupancy planned for early 2006.

But essentially it has taken a decade before a private for-profit developer decided to build at Union Station. In the last year a project broke ground on a two-building Class A apartment complex. Once completed, the apartment community will feature subterranean parking, a rooftop pool, a bridge over Union Station's service entry and other amenities. It should be completed by summer 2005.

V. CONCLUSIONS

These Southern California experiences demonstrate that for effective joint development programs:

- Transit oriented development planning districts are aides to facilitate such development, but are no panacea;
- As in almost any area of real estate, the local and overall market helps drive the pace of development around transit properties;
- Public agencies need to ease the complexity of such transactions, and avoid project micromanagement; and
- Perhaps expectations should be lowered -- the successful programs take longer and they generate less revenue than lofty expectations indicate.

These lessons learned can assist Asian public entities in their TOD programs, as they drive to introduce private development and financing to transit property development programs, and as their citizenry becomes increasingly sophisticated and environmentally concerned.

By Robert C. Pearman, Jr., Esq © 2004

OUTLINE

- I. INTRODUCTION
- II. THE PROJECTS - Case Studies
 - A. Union Station
 - B. MTA Headquarters
 - C. Gold Line
 - D. Sprinter
- III. THE PLANS – Joint Development Programs And Policies
 - A. Union Station
 - B. Joint/Development Policies
 - 1. LACTC/MTA
 - 2. Gold Line
 - C. Gold Line Site Review and Analysis
 - D. Sprinter – TOD study
 - E. Land Value Impact Study of Los Angeles Transit
- IV. THE PERFORMANCE – Implementation And Lessons Learned
 - A. MTA
 - B. Land Value Impact Study – Conclusions
 - C. Gold Line
 - D. Lessons Learned
 - 1. Multi-Modal, Multi-User Complexities
 - 2. Developer Concerns
 - 3. Environmental Concerns
 - 4. Financing Concerns
 - 5. Strength of the Real Estate Market
- V. CONCLUSIONS

ATTACHMENTS

MTA Rail Map



Union Station Gateway

Intermodal Transit Center

The Union Station Gateway joint development project includes:

- 600,000-square foot MTA headquarters building
- 11 bay Patsaouras Transportation Plaza
- Union Station East Portal providing access to Metrolink and Amtrak trains, Metro Red and Gold Line stations
- 2,800 space below-grade parking garage.
- Space for an additional 2 million square feet of commercial/retail
- Union Station has 35,000 weekday boardings
- Construction of the Gateway project, covering over 12.3 acres, started in February 1993 and was completed in late 1995.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Union Station Gateway Headquarters Building



Los Angeles to Pasadena Metro Gold Line

The Pasadena Gold Line was constructed by the Los Angeles to Pasadena Metro Construction Authority. The Authority was created by State Legislation (SB1847) effective January 1, 1999. Metro now operates the light rail system.

Route	Union Station/Los Angeles to Pasadena
Length in Miles	13.7 miles
Opened	July 26, 2003
Number of Stations	13
Average Weekday Boardings	14,425
Average Weekend Boardings	11,088

Total Metro Rail System

Average Weekday Boardings	199,135
Average Weekend Boardings	129,954
Miles in Service	73.1

SPRINTER

North County Transit District (NCTD) will offer a new mobility link between Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos and Escondido – the SPRINTER rail line. The SPRINTER will run 22 miles along the Highway 78 corridor, effortlessly transporting passengers to work, school, shopping centers and other activities. Riders will have the freedom to read, work or relax as the state of the art rail vehicles sprint to the 15 stations on the line.

The SPRINTER will make North County a nicer place to be by:

Offering an affordable, reliable, stress-free transportation alternative to one of North County's most heavily traveled corridors.

Providing new mobility, connectivity and freedom for seniors, students and workers.

Getting cars off the road and reducing air pollution.



SPRINTER service features include:

State of the art rail vehicle & safety technology.

Sleek, quiet and efficient transportation system.

Short, convenient trips to 15 stations.

22-mile long SPRINTER rail line.

64 SPRINTER trips daily.

Train set carrying capacity of 452.

Maximum speed of 55 mph.

Affordable flat fare.

Passenger service seven days a week; week day service every 30 minutes in each direction, from approximately 4 a.m. to 11 p.m.

**LOS ANGELES TO PASADENA BLUE LINE CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY
JOINT DEVELOPMENT POLICY (2000)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND

PURPOSE

JOINT DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

Primary

- A. Revenue Generation
- B. Acquire Investment Capital

Corollary

- A. Coordinate Comprehensive Planning and Development Around Station Sites
- B. Transit Patron Services
- C. Participation in Increased Property Values Over Time
- D. Interim Uses
- E. Anticipate Joint Development Opportunities
Station Design

Process

- A. Utilization of Third Party Skills
- B. Outreach to the Broadest Development Community
- C. Efficient Program Management
- D. Prudent Financial Management
- E. Working with MTA

SITE REVIEW AND ANALYSIS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	<i>Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations</i>	1
A.	<i><u>Site Location and Characteristics</u></i>	1
B.	<i><u>Highest and Best Use</u></i>	2
C.	<i><u>Opportunities and Constraints</u></i>	2
D.	<i><u>Recommendations</u></i>	3
E.	<i><u>Implementation Steps</u></i>	4
2.	<i>Existing Site Characteristics</i>	4
A.	<i><u>Site Location</u></i>	4
B.	<i><u>Site Conditions</u></i>	5
	1. <i><u>Physical Site Conditions.</u></i>	5
	2. <i><u>Adjacent Uses.</u></i>	5
	3. <i><u>Title.</u></i>	5
C.	<i><u>Environmental</u></i>	6
	1. <i><u>CEQA Documentation and Analysis.</u></i>	6
	2. <i><u>Hazardous Materials Issues.</u></i>	6
	3. <i><u>Conclusion.</u></i>	7
D.	<i><u>Market Conditions</u></i>	7
	1. <i><u>Area Development.</u></i>	7
	2. <i><u>General Supply/Demand.</u></i>	8
	3. <i><u>Developer Interest Expressed To Date.</u></i>	8
	4. <i><u>Conclusions.</u></i>	9
E.	<i><u>Land Use and Community Considerations</u></i>	9
	1. <i><u>Zoning/Land Use/Redevelopment Existing Conditions.</u></i>	9
	2. <i><u>Community Concerns.</u></i>	10
F.	<i><u>Timing and Sequence of Transit Construction on Site</u></i>	10

3.	<i>Highest and Best Use Analysis</i>	11
A.	<u><i>Unconstrained Highest And Best Use</i></u>	11
1.	<u>Summary of Most Feasible Uses.</u>	11
2.	<u>Entitlement Modifications Required.</u>	13
3.	<u>Detail of Feasible Scenarios.</u>	13
4.	<u>Market Values.</u>	14
5.	<u>Cash Flow/Ground Lease Analysis.</u>	15
6.	<u>Environmental Considerations Raised by Feasible Development Scenarios.</u>	15
B.	<u><i>Transit/Site Constrained Development</i></u>	16
1.	<u>Description of Constraints.</u>	16
2.	<u>Impact on Marketability and Value.</u>	17
3.	<u>Impact on Environmental Impact Analysis.</u>	18
4.	<u>Options with Respect to Modifying or Eliminating Constraints.</u>	18
C.	<u><i>Value Added Opportunities</i></u>	18
4.	<i>Interim Site Uses</i>	19
5.	<i>Recommendations</i>	19
6.	<i>Implementation Steps</i>	20
7.	<i>Appendices</i>	20

Comparative Analysis: Built Projects in Similar Districts

Project	Location	Site area	Residential Development Maximum Density (units per acre)	Building Height (storys)	Building Square Footage	FAR	Total # of Units	Unit Size (range in feet), type (# of bedrooms)	Parking Ratio (spaces per dwelling unit)
Front and Beech Apartments	Little Italy, San Diego, CA	1.38 acres (60,113 sq. feet)	169	6	420,791	6	233-Residential with Live/work and Commercial/Office at base	634-1,750	1.34
Doma	Little Italy, San Diego, CA	1.36 acres (59,242 sq. feet)	89	7	200,000	3.4	121-Residential and Live/work	725-1700	1
Fifth Avenue Lofts	Bankers Hill San Diego, CA	0.2 ac (8730 sq. feet)	120	4	33,480	4	24-Residential	647-1003	1
Dutra-Brown Building	Little Italy, San Diego, CA	.007 acres (336 sq. feet)	571	5	1344	4	4-Live/work	500-1200 live/work studio	0.75
Archstone Harborview	Marina District, San Diego, CA	1.3 acres	297	4	-	-	387-Residential	500-900	1.12
Pearl Court	River District, Portland, OR	.94 acres (40,946 sq. feet)	211	6	-	-	199-Residential	312-1148 Studio	0.09
Gregory Lofts	Pearl District, Portland, OR	unknown	unknown	12	340,000	-	145-Residential, 21-Office, 17-Retail	750-3350	1

Source: CityWorks 2003

COMPLETED PROJECTS

- 7th Street Metro Center, 1993
- Union Station Gateway, 1995
- Metro Blue Line Willow Station, 1999
- Metro Red Line Hollywood/Highland Station, 2001
- Metro Red Line Hollywood/Western Station, 2004

MTR (Hong Kong) Property Development

Airport Railway

Development Overview

Hong Kong
Kowloon (Union Square)

Olympic
Tsing Yi

Tung Chung

Urban Lines

Development Overview

Hongway Garden
Southorn Garden
World-wide House
Admiralty Centre
Fairmont House
Choi Hung Station
Fortress Metro Tower

Kornhill
Kornhill Gardens
Felicity Garden
Perfect Mount Garden
Heng Fa Chuen
Paradise Mall
Telford Gardens

Telford Plaza I
Telford Plaza II
New Kwai Fong Garden
Luk Yeung Galleria
Luk Yueng Sun Chuen

Tseung Kwan O Lines

Development Overview

Tiu Keng Leng
Tseung Kwan O

Hang Hau

Area 86

Land Value Impacts of Rail Transit Services in Los Angeles County

Robert Cervero and Michael Duncan

June 2002 Report prepared for
National Association of Realtors
Urban Land Institute

CONCLUSION

Compared to experiences in Santa Clara County and San Diego County, land value impacts of high-performance transit in Los Angeles County were uneven and inconsistent. In the case of the Red Line subway, premiums were recorded only for multi-family rental housing; for other uses, properties within half-mile rings of stations tended to sell for less. The least consistent pattern was for Metrolink stations. For the Antelope Valley and San Bernardino corridors, premiums were measured for condominiums, single-family homes, and commercial uses; discounts were found for multi-family housing. For the Metrolink Riverside line, premiums were measured for all but commercial properties. Impacts along the short segments of the Orange line that lies within Los Angeles County were inconsequential and for the Ventura line, they were generally negative. In the case of LRT lines, premiums were found for multifamily housing and commercial uses as well as single-family properties in the case of the Blue Line; discounts were found for condominiums and single-family properties in the case of the Green Line. Lastly, residential properties near BRT stops generally sold for less whereas commercial properties generally sold for more.

Land Value Impacts of Rail Transit Services in Los Angeles County

CONCLUSION CONT'D

Why impacts were uneven and inconsistent is unclear, however one explanation for the absence of premiums and in instances the ostensible presence of discounts is that the half-mile rings around many of the County's rail and BRT stops correspond to redevelopment districts. Lying in distressed inner-city settings apparently lowers land values in many instances despite transit's presence. Los Angeles County's Community Redevelopment Agency today operates 31 redevelopment projects covering 21,065 acres, many of which are situated near rail and BRT stops. Map 4 shows the locations of various enterprise, empowerment zones, and revitalization zones -- collectively defined as redevelopment districts -- that lie in the County. Many align along the Red Line, the LRT corridors, the Wilshire-Whittier BRT line, and central-city portions of Metrolink lines. Other corridors, like the Ventura BRT line, are substantially outside of the redevelopment zones, thus other factors, including proximity to transit itself, are explaining value -losses. Because some of the County's high performance transit services are relatively new, land value trends should be monitored in order to gauge longer term impacts.

WORKING DRAFT OF DEL MAR RECIPROCAL EASEMENT AGREEMENT

- 3.1 Easements for At Grade Pedestrian Ways and Parking Structure Entrances if Multi-Purpose Parking Facility is Completed.
 - 3.1.1 Easement for At Grade Pedestrian Ways and Transit Parking Vertical Transportation Elements.
 - 3.1.2 Easement for Parking Structure Entrances.
- 3.2 Easements for Parking Structure Pedestrian Ways, Vehicular Ways and Vertical Transportation Elements if Multi-Purpose Parking Facility is Completed.
 - 3.2.1 Grant by Transit Parking Owner In Favor of Developer
 - 3.2.2 Grant by Developer In Favor of Transit Parking Owner
 - 3.2.3 Grant by Developer In Favor of Transit Parking Owner for Transit Parking Vertical Transportation Elements
 - 3.2.4 Grant by Transit Parking Owner In Favor of Developer for Private Parking Vertical Transportation Elements
- 3.3 Easements if Stand Alone Parking Transit Facility is Completed
 - 3.3.1 Easement for At Grade Pedestrian Ways and Vertical Transportation Elements.
 - 3.3.2 Easement for Vehicular Access to Stand Alone Transit Parking Facility.
 - 3.3.3 Grant by Developer In Favor of Transit Parking Owner for Transit Parking Vertical Transportation Elements
 - 3.3.4 Grant by Transit Parking Owner In Favor of Developer for Private Parking Vertical Transportation Elements
- 3.4 Operation of Pedestrian and Vehicular Ways
- 3.5 Easements For Parking Connection Tunnels and Other Parking Structure Improvements in Transit Right of Way Parcel
- 3.6 Easements to Transit Parking Owner for the Stand Alone Transit Parking Facility.

WORKING DRAFT OF DEL MAR RECIPROCAL EASEMENT AGREEMENT

- 3.6.1 Construction Easement for Transit Parking Owner During Initial Construction.
- 3.6.2 Permanent Easement for Stand Alone Transit Parking Facility
- 3.7 Utility Easements.
 - 3.7.1 By Developer.
 - 3.7.2 By Transit Parking Owner.
 - 3.7.3 By Rail Transit Owner.
- 3.8 Maintenance Easements.
 - 3.8.1 Developer to Rail Transit Owner
 - 3.8.2 Developer to Transit Parking Owner.
 - 3.8.3 Transit Parking Owner to Developer.
 - 3.8.4 Transit Parking Owner to Rail Transit Owner.
 - 3.8.5 Rail Transit Owner to Developer and Transit Parking Owner
- 3.9 Column Easement.
- 3.10 Inspection, Maintenance, Repair and Replacement of Parking Structure Improvements within Transit Right of Way Parcel.
- 3.11 Emergency Access
- 3.12 Security

WORKING DRAFT
OF
DEL MAR RECIPROCAL EASEMENT AGREEMENT

- 3.13 Construction Easement.
- 3.14 Easement for Common Structural Support
- 3.15 Pedestrian Crossing Safety Equipment
- 3.16 Construction Easement for Developer During Initial Construction.
- 3.17 Lateral and Subjacent Support.
- 3.18 Easement for Minor Encroachment.
- 3.19 Increased Use of Easements
- 3.20 No Public Dedications.

MTA DESIGN CRITERIA AND STANDARDS
VOLUME III
ADJACENT CONSTRUCTION DESIGN MANUAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 REVIEW PROCEDURE	2
3.0 MECHANICAL CRITERIA	4
4.0 OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENTS	5
4.1 General	5
4.2 Overhead Protection - Station Entrances	5
4.3 Overhead Protection - Operation Right-of-Way Trackage	6
4.4 Other Metro Facilities	6
4.5 Safety Regulations	7
5.0 CORROSION	8
5.1 Stray Current Protection	8