

**MEMORANDUM**

---

To: **Sharmila Mukherjee, Anna Lan, Rose Lisska, Jordan McGee – Capital Metro**

From: HR&A Advisors, Inc. and Nelson\Nygaard

Date: **February 3, 2022**

Re: Case Studies for Task 2 Deliverable

---

**Introduction**

HR&A Advisors, Inc. (HR&A) and Nelson\Nygaard (N\N) have drafted nine case studies to support Task 2 of the Equitable Transit-Oriented Development Study (ETOD Study) for Capital Metro (CapMetro). These case studies outline lessons learned and best practices from transit agencies and municipalities across the country. In particular, these examples focus on three primary themes: ETOD strategies, equity tools, and equitable engagement. While the case studies may address multiple themes, each case study specifically prioritizes one theme. As a result, the case studies differ in the level of detail that they develop for each theme. Taken together, the case studies intend to provide CapMetro with well-rounded recommendations to inform ETOD planning and policies. In addition, key takeaways from the case studies will directly inform the strategy and approach for subsequent tasks of the ETOD Study, including Task 5 and Task 7.

The nine case studies include six complete narratives and three “snapshot” case studies that focus on a specific policy or strategy. These “snapshot” case studies merit focused attention on specific elements of their success, but offer a less comparable start to finish narrative for Austin. The table below summarizes the nine case studies and categorizes them by the relevant theme that they prioritize:

Case Study	Type	Priority Theme
<b>Raleigh ETOD Guidebook</b>	Full	ETOD Strategies
<b>Chicago ETOD Policy Plan</b>	Full	ETOD Strategies
<b>Sound Transit ETOD Policy &amp; Strategies</b>	Full	ETOD Strategies
<b>Takoma/Langley Crossroads TOD Study</b>	Full	Equity Tools
<b>Diridon Station Community Benefits Agreement</b>	Snapshot	Equity Tools
<b>TOD and Equity Funds</b>	Snapshot	Equity Tools
<b>East San Jose Multimodal Transportation Improvement Plan</b>	Full	Equitable Engagement
<b>King County Metro Mobility Framework</b>	Full	Equitable Engagement
<b>Austin Climate Equity Plan</b>	Snapshot	Equitable Engagement

Following the Key Takeaways below, HR&A and N\N first summarize the transit characteristics and local conditions represented by each of the case studies. Subsequently, the case studies themselves develop the three core themes of Task 2 in greater detail. The takeaways from these themes will be incorporated into the Task 5 ETOD Policy Toolkit and Task 7 Station Area Plans. The ETOD Study team has integrated feedback from CapMetro, the Austin Transit Partnership (ATP), and the City of Austin.

## Key Takeaways

Building on the three themes, the case studies offer a range of key takeaways to support CapMetro, ATP, the City of Austin, and the ETOD Study team. While certain cities may differ from Austin in terms of demographic composition or transit modes, they reveal common patterns in how to plan and implement effective ETOD. We highlight several of these best practices across case studies below:

- **Integration of transit agency and municipality goals:** The case studies emphasize the importance of collaboration and alignment between transit agencies and municipalities. As an example, effective ETOD requires transit-friendly zoning; in Austin, as in other places, the municipality controls the zoning. When cities and agencies align on objectives, they can pursue policies that amplify each other, such as affordable housing tools or surplus land discounts. These policies are also more likely to garner the support of elected officials and other city leaders. When transit agencies and cities act independently of each other, misalignment can hinder ETOD implementation and, at times, increase the risk of community resistance.
- **Community ownership of the engagement process:** In traditional TOD planning, agencies often developed strategies and policies prior to sharing them with the community. Equitable engagement requires connecting with the community at a meaningful level to establish public priorities before formalizing ETOD approaches. In effective examples, these priorities directly influence the decision-making process, and transit agencies clearly articulate the framework for selecting ETOD policies or investments. Given historical disinvestment in many areas of the corridor, CapMetro would benefit from building trust through authentic, community-driven engagement.
- **Understanding the benefits and tradeoffs of ETOD policies:** Traditional TOD leverages market-based solutions to create value for the transit agency and, by extension, the community. Nevertheless, traditional TOD often misses opportunities to create new economic opportunities for residents and, in some cases, displaces them. By contrast, effective ETOD planning analyzes and articulates the impacts of the proposed policies, both positive and negative. In particular, the analysis identifies vulnerable communities and focuses on potential costs to these residents and business. These findings, in tandem with community engagement, reveal opportunities to not only mitigate displacement but advance public priorities in these neighborhoods.
- **Collaboration with local organizations and businesses:** Support from nonprofits and advocacy groups often translates to political support for transit agency objectives and policies. In effective examples, these organizations often drive the policy discussion through meaningful engagement. By contrast, resistance from these organizations may hinder or delay ETOD implementation. Similarly, agreements with private businesses or developers can create additional value for the community as transit agencies and municipalities direct private benefits from transit investments back to the public. Austin's position as a technology hub may offer distinct opportunities to work with growing companies with a local presence to support public priorities for affordable housing and small businesses.
- **Flexibility in policy solutions across stations:** While successful ETOD requires a cohesive framework across the transit system, it flexibly adapts to the distinct conditions and needs of different station areas. In some cases, it even requires creative solutions at an individual parcel level. Building on clear city-agency priorities, effective ETOD planning develops a toolkit of policy options that can be deployed in different ways across different station areas. As an example, the preferred land disposition approach may depend on the prevailing land values within a specific station area. Given the diversity of the ETOD Study corridor, CapMetro's ETOD strategy will benefit from an adaptable high-level framework with custom-tailored solutions for different station areas.

### Case Studies Summary Table

#	Case Study	Sponsor Agency	Other Agencies Involved	Project Background					City Stats		
				ETOD Report	Scope	Transit Type	Transit Project Type	Transit System Length & Stations	Pop. Growth 2010-2020	Race (2020)	Tech Hub?
	<b>Austin</b>	Capital Metro	City of Austin, Austin Transit Partnership	--	Corridor, Station	LRT	Transit Expansion	27 miles 31 stations	22%	48% White Non-Hispanic 8% Black 34% Hispanic	Y
1	<b>Raleigh Equitable TOD</b>	City of Raleigh		<a href="#">ETOD Guidebook</a>	City	BRT	Transit Expansion	24 miles 30+ stations	15%	53% White Non-Hispanic 29% Black 11% Hispanic	Y
2	<b>Chicago ETOD Policy Plan</b>	City of Chicago	Mayor's Office, Chicago Transit Agency, Elevated Chicago (nonprofit)	<a href="#">ETOD Policy Plan</a>	City	Heavy Rail	Existing Transit	106 miles 144 stations	2%	33% White Non-Hispanic 30% Black 29% Hispanic	N
3	<b>Sound Transit: ETOD Policy &amp; Strategies</b>	Sound Transit	City of Seattle	<a href="#">ETOD Policy; Racial Equity Toolkit Report</a>	City, Corridor, Station	LRT	Transit Extension	62 miles 37 stations	21% (City of Seattle)	64% White Non-Hispanic 7% Black 7% Hispanic	Y
4	<b>Takoma/Langley Crossroads TOD Study</b>	MD-Nat'l Cap. Park & Planning Comm.	Prince George's County, Purple Line Corridor Coalition	<a href="#">ETOD Planning &amp; Implementation Study</a>	Station	LRT	Transit Extension	16.2 miles 21 stations	2% (Study area)	1% White Non-Hispanic 9% Black 87% Hispanic	N*
5	<b>Diridon Station Community Benefit Agreement</b>	City of San Jose		<a href="#">DA Summary</a>	Station	LRT, Commuter, Heavy Rail	Station Area Redevelopment	N/A	7%	26% White Non-Hispanic 3% Black 32% Hispanic	Y

Note: Tech Hubs are defined as markets ranked within the top 15 of "Top Tech Markets" by [CBRE](#) in 2021. While the Takoma/Langley Crossroads area is not considered a tech hub, it is located within the Washington DC region, which is the nation's #3 ranked tech hub.

Source: Population growth and race statistics sourced from U.S. Census Bureau 2010 and 2020 data.

Project Background									City Stats		
#	Case Study	Sponsor Agency	Other Agencies Involved	ETOD Report	Scope	Transit Type	Transit Project Type	Transit System Length & Stations	Pop. Growth 2010-2020	Race	Tech Hub?
6	<b>TOD Funds: Denver</b>	City of Denver	County of Denver, RTD, Enterprise	<a href="#">Denver Fund Summary</a>	City	LRT	Affordable Housing Investment	113 miles 74 stations	19%	54% White Non-Hispanic 9% Black 30% Hispanic	Y
	<b>TOD Funds: Atlanta</b>	MARTA	City of Atlanta	<a href="#">MARTA Fund</a>	City	Heavy Rail	Affordable Housing Investment	48 miles 38 stations	19%	38% White Non-Hispanic 51% Black 4% Hispanic	Y
	<b>Equity Fund: Amazon</b>	Amazon	King County Housing Authority, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority	<a href="#">Housing Equity Fund</a>	Multiple Cities	N/A	Affordable Housing Investment	N/A			
7	<b>East San Jose Multimodal Transport. Improvement Plan</b>	City of San Jose		<a href="#">En Movimiento: Transportation Plan for East San José</a>	City	LRT	Transit Extension	42 miles 61 stations	7%	26% White Non-Hispanic 3% Black 32% Hispanic	Y
8	<b>King County Metro Mobility Framework</b>	King County Metro		<a href="#">Mobility Framework Report</a>	City	LRT, Bus	Existing Transit	N/A	18% (County)	58% White Non-Hispanic 7% Black 10% Hispanic	Y
9	<b>Austin Climate Equity Plan</b>	City of Austin		<a href="#">Draft Summary; Public Presentation</a>	City	N/A	N/A – not related to transit	N/A	22%	48% White Non-Hispanic 8% Black 34% Hispanic	Y