

**Southwest Region University Transportation Center  
Project Proposal - FY 2013**

TITLE OF PROPOSED PROJECT: THE TENSIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT: DEVELOPING A POLICY AND TOOLS FOR PRESERVATION IN TODS

STRATEGIC GOAL(S) ADDRESSED: LIVABLE COMMUNITIES

CONSORTIUM MEMBER: UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS

TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET: \$42,728

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: JOHN L. RENNE

PHONE NUMBER: 504-280-6592

EMAIL ADDRESS: JRENNE@UNO.EDU

HAS THIS PROPOSAL BEEN SUBMITTED FOR FUNDING ELSEWHERE? NO

DID THIS PROPOSAL RECEIVE FUNDING FROM ANOTHER SOURCE? NO  
(MATCHING FUNDING ONLY)

DOES THIS PROPOSED RESEARCH INVOLVE THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS? NO

WILL THIS PROPOSED RESEARCH INVOLVE OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AS PARTNERS? YES

PROJECT MONITOR NAME, ORGANIZATION, ADDRESS AND TELEPHONE NUMBER:

SIDNEY BARTHELEMY

FORMER MAYOR OF NEW ORLEANS / HRI PPROPERTIES

812 GRAVIER STREET, SUITE 200

NEW ORLEANS, LA 70112

(504) 566-0204

ABSTRACT OF PROJECT:

In recent years, there has been much research on Transit Oriented Development (TOD) in the United States and abroad. There has been decades of study of historic preservation, both in the United States and internationally. Yet the intersection of TOD and historic preservation has received scant attention. This project will attempt to cross-reference data on TOD and historic preservation, examine case studies of where TOD and historic preservation intersect and develop a guidebook for policy and tools for preservation in TODs.

# ***The Tensions and Opportunities of Historic Preservation and Transit Oriented Development: Developing a Policy and Tools for Preservation in TODs Guidebook***

## ***A. PROBLEM STATEMENT***

In recent years, there has been much research on TOD in the United States and abroad. There has been decades of study of historic preservation, both in the United States and internationally. Yet the intersection of TOD and historic preservation has received scant attention. In truth, these twinned subjects deserve analysis.

## ***B. BACKGROUND***

While a restored/ adaptively reused historic building clearly can be a component of and asset to a TOD because of the amenity it affords and through its preservation of the linkage to the past history of a place, anecdotal reports suggest a much more complicated situation. There are cases where historic buildings are “challenged” in a TOD situation (threatened with demolition, or not part of the larger TOD plan) because the historic buildings, often built at the lower floor area ratios (FAR) common in the past, do not maximize density near transit. At the same time, there are cases of historic buildings being incorporated into the TOD as a vital component. A single TOD may have elements of both positive and negative TOD-preservation intersection. For example, in the Gateway TOD near the New Brunswick, NJ train station, some historic buildings were demolished-- to the consternation of preservationists-- to make way for a high-rise physically connected to this train station, while other historic buildings were preserved and protected specifically to maintain a pleasant neighborhood environment for the TOD high-rise.

A classic intersection of TOD and preservation is brewing in mid-town Manhattan, in the area near Grand Central Station. New York City is considering to up-zone this area (i.e., increase the allowed FAR) in order to maximize development near transit. Yet preservationists fear this zoning change, as they see this creating pressure to demolish lower FAR historic buildings in the neighborhood. At the same time, responsible developers interested in TOD in this Manhattan area recognize the importance of preserving this neighborhood’s world famous historic building because their cachet will make TOD here that much more desirable for residents or commercial tenants.

## ***C. OBJECTIVES OF STUDY***

The objective of this study is cross-reference TOD locations with one or more lists of locations of historic properties. The study will also aim to conduct case studies of locations where historic buildings have been preserved in a TOD, where historic buildings were demolished in a TOD and where historic buildings are currently threatened in a TOD location. These different typologies should help to better understand the challenges and issues present in seeking to

preserve historic buildings in TOD locations. Finally, the study aims to develop a guidebook that will highlight policy and tools for preservation in TODs that could be utilized by various stakeholders around the nation.

#### ***D. WORK PLAN***

The following proposal will expand our knowledge of the intersection of TOD and historic preservation, both with respect to potential friction and positive alignment of the two.

Our analysis will proceed in a series of linked tasks.

##### ***TASK I: EXPLORING ISSUES IN CROSS-REFERENCEING DATA***

How closely associated is the location of historic properties and TODs? While anecdotally they seem to be found cheek by jowl, what is the empirical geographic linkage? Do we tend to find “lots” or “few” historic properties in or near TODs? To our knowledge, no one has examined this question on a systematic grounded basis.

To do this, we will proceed on studying this according to three tiers of “geography”: national, state, and local. This tripartite approach makes sense logically and also reflects different implications of historic designation by national (federal), state, and local government respectively.

To summarize quickly a very complicated subject, there are different entities involved and different implications from federal, state, or local historic designation. Federal designation, or listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), results in procedures that have to be followed (e.g., Section 106) if a federal action affects a NRHP resource. Being listed on the NRHP also affords the owner eligibility for federal historic tax credits (HTC) for historical – appropriate building rehabilitation. The lead federal agency for all this is the National Park Service (NPS). Being listed on the NRHP does NOT constrain an owner’s ability to change or alter (even demolish) the property in any manner they desire.

State designation parallels the federal designation. Most states have a state register of historic places (SRHP) with the lead agency typically called the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Being listed on the SRHP may evoke review procedures to be followed if state action affects the resource (similar to the federal 106 process). About 30 states have a state level HTC, that piggy-backs onto the federal HTC. As at the federal level, state designation typically does not constrain a private owner’s right to change or demolish the property.

Local historic designation has been incorporated by over 2,000 jurisdictions nationally in the United States. The first two cities in the United States to do this were Charleston, SC and New Orleans, LA. Local designation is done by different local entities (e.g., landmarks preservation commissions--LPC) and the implications of local designation vary tremendously. In some case, it is simply honorific and procedural (much like the federal and state designations) while in other

instances, local designation has much greater importance to property control. For example, in New Orleans and Charleston (and in other cities, such as Boston, New York, Chicago, and Washington), an owner of a locally designated historic property cannot alter the property (typically the exterior) without approval of the LPC and may also be prohibited from demolishing the property.

Given the differences between federal, state, and local designation, it makes sense to examine the TOD-historic resource geographic intersection at the national state, and local levels.

### *National Data Sets*

#### TOD--National TOD Database

The National TOD Database is a project of the Center for Transit-Oriented Development. Intended as a tool for planners, developers, government officials, and academics, the Database provides economic and demographic information for every existing and proposed fixed guideway transit station in the U.S.

- The Database includes **4,416 existing stations** and **1,583 proposed stations** in **54 metropolitan areas**, as of December 2011
- Data are available at three geographic levels; the **transit zone** (the 1/2 mile or 1/4 mile buffer around the individual station), the **transit shed** (the aggregate of transit zones), and lastly, the **transit region** (aligns with the Metropolitan Statistical Area boundary)

**Nearly 70,000 variables** are derived from nationally available data sets including the 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census, the 2009 American Community Survey, the 2000 Census Transportation Planning Package, and the 2002 - 2009 Local Employment Dynamics

Not all rail stations are TODs. Dr. Renne's into TOD has determined a TOD index based on population density, employment density and walkability. This index has identified approximately 800 TODs across the United States and will be utilized for this study.

#### Historic--National Register of Historic Places

As noted above, the NRHP is the premier federal list of nationally designated historic entities. There are currently about 80,000 separate listings with a total of about 1.4 million resources (buildings, sites, structures, etc.) So, one federally designated listed district can contain many hundreds if not thousands of buildings.

The NPS maintains the National Register of Historic Places Database (NRHPD). The documentation in the NRHPD consists of the National Register Form (Resource location, physical description, history, significance, maps, etc.), photographs, and maps. (The NPS is plotting NRHP listings into Google Earth layers.)

The NRHPD is the information source for the NRHP entities. It does have its limitations, however, with respect to digitization and the like. And some areas of the country are in "better

shape” than others with respect to the information that can be secured from the NRHPD. So an important component of our research will be to document what is the practical operating status of the NRHPD as a place-based information system.

A.3 Crosslinking A.1 and A.2 This step will link the national TOD Database to the NRHPD in order to answer as best as possible what is the concentration of nationally designated historic properties in or near the nationally- identified TODs.

### *State Data*

#### State TOD List

The National TOD Database described above can also be utilized at the state level, along with Dr. Renne’s index of TOD locations.

#### State Historic List

Numerous states have a central data base on state- designated historic properties. In New Jersey as an example, the New Jersey Register of Historic Places (NJRHP) is the official list of this state’s historic resources of local, state, and national significance. The NJRHP is closely modeled on the NRHP. The New Jersey Historic Preservation Office keeps an electronic record of listings on the NJRHP and is working on “information management” to integrate Geographic Information Systems (GIS) data with its NJRHP.

As with the NRHPD, the digital data of the NJRHP is often far from ideal. But to the extent possible, we will examine what is the concentration of New Jersey state register properties in or near New Jersey’s TODs.

The researchers will also seek to explore a state level in Louisiana or others states.

### *Local Data*

#### Local New Orleans TOD List

The researchers will utilize the National TOD database to isolate all of the stations in New Orleans that meet the TOD index criteria.

#### Local New Orleans Historic Preservation Data

Researchers will seek to layer a list of historically protected buildings in New Orleans based on data available from the City of New Orleans.

### *TASK 2: CASE STUDIES*

The researchers will explore case studies of where TOD in historic preservation intersect. We will choose at least one case study of where one or more historic buildings have been preserved

in a TOD location, one case study where one or more historic buildings have been demolished in a TOD location and one case study where one or more historic buildings are currently threatened in a TOD location. Some examples of successful conversions include Mockingbird Station, Dallas, Texas. Penn Station in New York City may be the most famous example of where historic buildings have been demolished for a major TOD-redevelopment and the Gates Factory in Denver, Colorado is an example of where a historic building is currently threatened in a TOD location. These are examples and might not be the final case studies chosen for the study.

For each case study, our team will study historical records, interview key stakeholders and summarize the findings with lessons learned for better integrating historic preservation into TODs.

### *TASK 3: POLICY AND TOOLS FOR PRESERVATION IN TODS GUIDEBOOK*

Our team will develop a guidebook about using policy and tools in preservation within TODs. There are numerous strategies to further preservation in TODs and we mention a few possibilities here that will be summarized in the Guidebook.

#### TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS (TDR)

Transfer of Development ( TDR ) programs allow property owners to sever development rights from properties in government-designated low density areas and sell them to purchasers who want to increase the density of development in areas that government have selected as higher density areas. The idea of TDR was first introduced in New York City with the passage of the first American zoning ordinance in 1916. It allowed property owners to sell their unused air rights to adjacent lots, which could then exceed the new height and setback requirements (Forde et al 2000). Decades later in the 1960s, New York City expanded the transfer area from adjacent lots to more distant locations.

TDR has been used in many places and for different applications. Many states have preserved farm land with this strategy by allowing farmers to sell the development rights to their farm acreage to allow heightened development density elsewhere. New Jersey has adopted TDR in its environmentally-sensitive Pinelands and Highlands regions. In these two special planning areas, acreage near aquifers, wetlands and similar locations have been downzoned to preclude development but the owners of these lands can sell the development rights to environmentally-appropriate high density development nodes within each of the regions. In a more urban setting, Boston, San Francisco and other cities have implanted TDR in their land use systems.

TDR is an important tool for historic preservation. An early proponent of using TDR for this purpose was John Costonis. He proposed a TDR system for Chicago landmarks. New York City's landmark preservation approach has allowed TDR for historic preservation purposes for decades. For example, many landmarked Broadway theaters , typically low floor area ratio (FAR) buildings in areas where much higher FARs are allowed, have sold their unused (because of landmarked status ) development rights to office and other developers. Of historical and policy note, one of the reasons why the United states Supreme Court upheld the landmarking of Grand Central Station in the Penn Central decision was that Penn Central Railroad, the owner of

Grand Central, had the right to sell the unused development rights to the terminal via a TDR mechanism.

In theory, a TDR for historic properties in TOD would allow for the preservation of the historic resources within the TOD while at the same time permitting higher density development in suitable locations elsewhere within the TOD. While the mechanics for this would have to be worked out (e.g., how large is the TDR “Receiving Zone” in the TOD and is there a practical market and available financing for the transferred development rights), there is considerable potential for using TDR to harmonize historic preservation and development objectives in TOD. Our analysis will examine to what extent TDR is being used for the above-described preservation-development objectives; if not used, then what are the constraints; and finally to develop from our study the best practices for TDR in TOD.

### TAX INCREMENT FINANCING (TIF)

Applying tax increment financing could aid both the TOD and the preservation of historic resources within the TOD.

By way of quick background, TIF is a popular tool to finance new development or redevelopment (rehabilitation and new construction) by capturing the property appreciation and associated nominal higher property tax payments ensuing from the development or redevelopment. The mechanism works as follows.

1. The area where the development/redevelopment is to occur is designated as a TIF district.
2. Property values for standard property taxation purposes are then frozen in the TIF district for a given period of time (e.g., 10 to 20 years).
3. As property values from the frozen levels increase over time, the appreciation (or “increment”) is applied for development or redevelopment purposes. The amount captured is equal to the increment in property value multiplied by the property tax rate (the full rate or a portion, such as the municipal but not the school property tax rate).

To understand TIFs and historic preservation better, we shall briefly discuss this program in Chicago, Illinois. Chicago and other Illinois cities are allowed to use a TIF to generate property tax dollars for economic development purposes in specifically designated areas. The TIF allows the city to invest all new property tax dollars generated from the designated TIF district (property value appreciation from the frozen tax base multiplied by the property tax rate) for as long as 23 years. There are over 130 TIFs in Chicago comprising 30 percent of Chicago’s land area. Chicago. TIFs have been used to preserve historic theaters in the downtown and other Chicago landmarks. (Note: TIF in Chicago has aroused controversy and its application in this city may be constrained in the future.)

Many other preservation projects nationally have used a TIF. The successful renovation of the historic Gateway/Statler hotel in St. Louis, a \$200 million project, which used Missouri’s state historic tax credit (HTC), also utilized \$34 million secured by TIF. This TIF resource matched

the combined equity obtained from the Federal HTC (\$26 million) and state HTC (\$12 million). The \$0.7 million rehabilitation of the 1870s Summer Street apartments in Houston, Texas was largely funded by a \$0.3 million TIF. In other instances, the TIF is proportionally smaller yet nonetheless is an important part of the preservation financing.

In short, it behooves the TOD and historic preservation communities to consider the potential of to TIFs. We will examine the current state of the art here and will propose best practices.

## TRANSPORTATION-PRESEVETRATION CONNECTION

Preservation in TOD can gain from existing programs trying to foster a closer transportation-preservation connection. Again, a brief background is in order. Relevant programs have included The Intermodal Service Transportation Act (ISTEA) of 1991, its successor (1998), the Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21), and the more recent (2005) Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act—A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU).

All of the above were transportation funding behemoths (ISTEA, about \$155 billion; TEA-21, about \$220 billion; and SAFETEA-LU, about \$280 billion). More important for our purposes was their underlying change in transportation philosophy. They broke from the federal governments near sole transportation focus on the automobile, to encouraging “intermodalism” (i.e. many forms of getting about, including auto, mass transit, bicycle and walking). As the history, location and complex density of activities that characterize historic locations tended to imbue them with intermodalism as opposed to auto-dependency, this shift in transportation funding orientation was important.

The largest and most flexible component of the above troika of transportation legislation was the Surface Transportation Program (STP)—federal block grants to states for non-national highway purposes (Costello and Schamess 2006, 13). In turn, 10 percent of the STP was dedicated to what are referred to as Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEAs), which we will see in a moment are both directly and indirectly supportive of TODs and preservation. The TEA resources are very significant (ISTEA, \$2.6 billion; TEA-21, \$3.8 billion; and SAFTEA-LU, \$4.2 billion

To receive TEA funding, a project must (1) be related to surface transportation *and* (2) must include an eligible enhancement activity. There were 12 eligible activities. These are listed and illustrated in Table 1 and total and average annual funding by activity is shown for the period fiscal year 1992 through fiscal year 2010.

In brief, of the \$9.87 billion distributed nationally in TEA support over this 19 year span, the activities which have received the most funds are pedestrian and bicycle facilities, (\$4,891 million or 49.6 percent), landscaping and other scenic beautification (\$1,863 million or 18.9 percent), and rehabilitation and operation of older historic transportation infrastructure (\$926 million or 9.4 percent).

Of the 12 eligible activities, numerous investments are directly supportive of historic preservation. These include acquisition of scenic or historic sites (Activity 3), historic

preservation (Activity 6), rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation infrastructure (Activity 7), and archaeological planning (Activity 9). The other activities are indirectly helpful to preservation of historic or older areas. For instance, an historic area would surely benefit from such TEA activities as enhanced pedestrian facilities and removing unsightly billboards.

Recently (July 2012) a new transportation bill (Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, or “MAP-21”) was signed into law. Budgeted funding for MAP-21 is about \$105 billion for fiscal years 2013 and 2014, and for Transportation Enhancement Activities, an estimated \$809 million for 2013. This new law implemented changes to the TEA program. (See Table 2.)TEAs are now called Transportation Alternatives, and the number of eligible activities has been reduced from 12 to 9. Activities that are no longer eligible include TEA 3 (funding for acquisition of easements or sites), and TEA 12 (funding for transportation museums). Also not included are funding for pedestrian and bicycle safety and educational programs, and funding for scenic or historic highway programs including tourist and welcome centers. Historic preservation and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities remains an eligible activity.

There is good national, state, and local data on the allocation and location of the TEAs under ISTEA, TEA-21, and SAFETEA-LU. We may also be able to identify the early allocation and location of Transportation Alternatives under MAP-21. The goal here is to analyze the extent to which TEA and Transportation Alternatives monies been used for preservation purposes in TODs; if not used, then what are the constraints; and finally to develop from our study best practices for capturing the above described resources to foster preservation in TODs.

**TABLE 1: Transportation Enhancement Activities: Eligible Activities and Funding (FY 1992-2010)**

<i>List and Examples</i> <i>The term Transportation Enhancement Activity means any of the following as they relate to surface transportation.</i>		<i>United States: FY 1992-2010 Funding (\$millions)</i>	
		<i>Total</i>	<i>%</i>
1	<b>Pedestrian and bicycle facilities:?</b> New or reconstructed sidewalks, walkways, curb ramps, bike lane striping, paved shoulders, bike parking, bus racks, off-road trails, bike and pedestrian bridges and underpasses.	4,891	49.6
2	<b>Safety and educational activities for pedestrians and bicyclists:</b> Programs designed to encourage walking and bicycling by providing potential users with education and safety instruction through classes, pamphlets, and signs.	33	0.3
3	<b>Acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites, including historic battlefields:?</b> Acquisition of scenic land easements, vistas and landscapes, including historic battlefields; purchase of building in historic districts or historic properties.	218	2.2
4	<b>Scenic or historic highway program including tourist and welcome center facilities:</b> Construction of turnouts, overlooks, visitor centers, and viewing areas, designation signs, and markers.?	548	5.6
5	<b>Landscaping and other scenic beautification:</b> ?Street furniture, lighting, public art, and landscaping along street, highways, trails, waterfronts, and gateways.	1,863	18.9
6	<b>Historic preservation:</b> Preservation of buildings and facades in historic districts; restoration and reuse of historic buildings for transportation-related purposes; access improvements to historic sites and buildings.	343	3.5
7	<b>Rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation buildings, structures, or facilities:</b> Restoration of historic railroad depots, bus stations, canals, canal towpaths, historic canal bridges, and lighthouses; rehabilitation of rail trestles, tunnels and bridges. ?	926	9.4
8	<b>Preservation of abandoned railway corridors and the conversion and use of the corridors for pedestrian or bicycle trails:?</b> Acquiring railroad rights-of-way; planning, designing and constructing multi-use trails; developing rail-with-rail projects; purchasing unused railroad property for reuse as trails.	713	7.2
9	<b>Inventory, control, and removal of outdoor advertising:?</b> Billboard inventories or removal of nonconforming billboards.?	40	0.4
10	<b>Archaeological planning and research:</b> Research, preservation planning and interpretation; developing interpretive signs, exhibits, guides, inventories, and surveys.?	47	0.5
11	<b>Environmental mitigation to address water pollution due to highway runoff or to reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality while maintaining habitat connectivity:?</b> Runoff pollution mitigation, soil erosion controls, detention and sediment basins, river cleanups, and wildlife crossings.	100	1.0
12	<b>Establishment of transportation museums:?</b> Construction of transportation museums, including the conversion of railroad stations or historic properties to museums with transportation themes and exhibits, or the purchase of transportation related artifacts.	148	1.5
	<b>TOTAL</b>	9,870	100.0

<b>TABLE 2: MAP-21's Changes to Historic Rehabilitation-Related Transportation Alternatives</b>		
	<i>SAFETEA-LU Transportation Enhancement Activity</i>	<i>Historic preservation-related changes in MAP-21 Transportation Alternative</i>
3	<b>Acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites, including historic battlefields:</b> Acquisition of scenic land easements, vistas and landscapes, including historic battlefields; purchase of building in historic districts or historic properties.	<b>Not included in MAP-21</b>
4	<b>Scenic or historic highway program including tourist and welcome center facilities:</b> Construction of turnouts, overlooks, visitor centers, and viewing areas, designation signs, and markers.?	<b>Construction of turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas</b>  Note: Instead of all scenic and historic highway programs being eligible, MAP-21 only covers construction of turnouts and overlooks
6	<b>Historic preservation:</b> Preservation of buildings and facades in historic districts; restoration and reuse of historic buildings for transportation-related purposes; access improvements to historic sites and buildings.	<b>Historic preservation and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities</b> [Combined with TEA 7]  Note: Historic preservation is combined with historic transportation facility rehabilitation. Operation of historic transportation facilities is no longer covered
7	<b>Rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation buildings, structures, or facilities:</b> Restoration of historic railroad depots, bus stations, canals, canal towpaths, historic canal bridges, and lighthouses; rehabilitation of rail trestles, tunnels and bridges. ?	[See above]
8	<b>Preservation of abandoned railway corridors and the conversion and use of the corridors for pedestrian or bicycle trails:</b> Acquiring railroad rights-of-way; planning, designing and constructing multi-use trails; developing rail-with-rail projects; purchasing unused railroad property for reuse as trails.	<b>Conversion and use of abandoned railroad corridors for trails for pedestrians, bicyclists, or other nonmotorized transportation users</b>  Note: Instead of “preservation,” there is now emphasis on “conversion and use”
10	<b>Archaeological planning and research:</b> Research, preservation planning and interpretation; developing interpretive signs, exhibits, guides, inventories, and surveys.?	<b>Archaeological activities relating to impacts from implementation of a transportation project eligible under this title</b>  Note: Before, only archaeological activities related to surface transport but not required as part of a Federal-aid highway project were eligible. Now restricted to only archaeological activities relating to impacts from implementation of a transportation project.
12	<b>Establishment of transportation museums:</b> Construction of transportation museums, including the conversion of railroad stations or historic properties to museums with transportation themes and exhibits, or the purchase of transportation related artifacts.	<b>Not included in MAP-21</b>

## STAFFING PLAN

This project will be completed under the direction of Dr. John L. Renne with assistance from Jim Amdal at UNO and Dr. David Listokin of Rutgers University. HRI, a national leading developer on historic preservation and infill development will also assist with this project.

### **Dr. John L. Renne**

Dr. John L. Renne, AICP is an Associate Professor of Planning and Urban Studies at the University of New Orleans (UNO) and Director of the Merritt C. Becker Jr. University of New Orleans Transportation Institute. Dr. Renne is a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP). His research focuses on transportation and land use planning, including livable communities and sustainable transportation. He is a leading expert on the topic of Transit Oriented Development.

Dr. Renne is an author and editor of *Transit-Oriented Development: Making It Happen* (Ashgate, 2009). Since moving to New Orleans in August 2005, Dr. Renne has shown leadership in the city's recovery. He serves on a number of local and national boards within the transportation and planning fields. Dr. Renne has convened several national conferences and workshops on issues related to transit-oriented development and livability, sustainable transportation, and evacuation planning.

### **Jim Amdal**

Mr. Amdal is involved in a variety of transportation research and outreach activities undertaken by UNOTI. His professional efforts focus on maritime and intermodal transportation systems as well as public transit initiatives. Mr. Amdal has extensive experience and expertise in transportation infrastructure planning and development, urban planning, historic preservation and community design. He has a wealth of experience and expertise with New Orleans' Central Area Riverfront development and downtown neighborhoods.

He served as Associate Project Manager and private-sector NGO President for the planning, design, construction and operation of Phase 1 and 2 of the New Orleans Riverfront Streetcar, the first new streetcar line developed in New Orleans since 1926. He also authored the Strategic Policy Plan for the New Orleans Riverfront, a project sponsored by the New Orleans City Planning Commission that encompassed the entire 26 mile riverfront corridor within Orleans Parish. From 1993 thru 2006, Mr. Amdal served as a consultant on the development and implementation of the Statewide Intermodal Transportation Plan and the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan.

He maintains long-standing professional relationships with key decision makers in New Orleans (City Council, City Planning Commission) as well as the LA Department of Transportation and Development and the Regional Planning Commission. Mr. Amdal currently serves on the WTC's

Transportation Committee and is Chairman of the New Orleans Central Business District Historic District Landmarks Commission. Mr. Amdal continues to serve on the Board of Directors of the Louisiana Steam Train Association.

### **Dr. David Listokin**

Dr. David Listokin is Professor at the Center for Urban Policy Research of Rutgers University. Dr. Listokin, co-director of the Center, is a leading authority on community and fiscal impact analysis, housing policy, land-use regulation, and historic preservation. He has written and edited 25 books, including *The Subdivision and Site Plan Handbook*, *Development Impact Assessment*, *The Fiscal Impact Handbook*, *Living Cities*, *Landmarks Preservation and the Property Tax*, and *Mortgage Lending and Race*. Over the past two decades, Dr. Listokin has served as principal investigator for a wide range of clients, including the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of State, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Fannie Mae Foundation, and the Twentieth Century Fund. Dr. Listokin's model residential subdivision and site plan ordinance has been adopted by New Jersey as the statewide uniform code. Dr. Listokin is currently working on a HUD-funded study analyzing regulatory impediments to rehabilitation and on an analysis funded by the National Parks Service that quantifies the economic benefits of historic preservation.

### **Pres Kabacoff**

Pres Kabacoff co-founded HRI Properties, based in New Orleans. HRI is a full-service real estate company and a leader in the adaptive reuse of historic structures. Its mission statement is to revitalize cities by creating diverse, vibrant, and sustainable communities. HRI is dedicated to the pursuit of rebuilding neighborhoods and recreating entire communities. HRI has completed 50 large-scale projects, including 4,496 apartment units, 3,487 hotel rooms, over 500,000 square feet of office and retail space, with a total funding value of \$1.4 billion. These developments were made possible by established and trusted partnerships between HRI and governmental units at the city, state and federal levels along with private sector lenders and equity investors.

### **HRI Team**

Other key staff members of HRI will also contribute to this project, including Hal Fairbanks, Director of Acquisitions at HRI. Mr. Fairbanks is also affiliated with the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Sidney Barthelemy, Vice President of Civic Affairs at HRI will also contribute to this study. Mr. Barthelemy is the former Mayor of New Orleans.

## ***E. SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES***

It is proposed that the project will from August 15, 2013 – May 15, 2014.

<b>Project Work Plan</b>	<b>Month of Project</b>									
Task	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May
Task 1: Exploring Issues in Cross-Referencing Data										
Task 2: Case Studies										
Task 3: Policy and Tools for Preservation in TODs Guidebook										

## ***F. ANTICIPATED DELIVERABLES***

- A report summarizing the national, state and local data availability of TOD and historic preservation data (Task 1) as well as the case studies (Task 2)
- A Policy and Tools for Preservation in TODs Guidebook

## ***G. PLAN TO PURSUE ADDITIONAL FUNDING AFTER CONCLUSION OF SWUTC PROJECT:***

The team could utilize the results of this study to approach a number of groups for additional funding, including:

- Historic preservation organizations and/or associations
- State governments
- Municipal governments
- Private developers

Future projects could include specific work to utilize the cross-referenced database for identifying a prioritized list of endangered structures within TODs at various scales across the nation and developing a way to save such structures from demolition and/or neglect. Developers might be interested in this list to take advantage of the historic preservation tax credit at a way to preserve iconic structures in TODs across the United States.

## ***H. REFERENCES***

- Arrington, GB, and Cervero, Robert. Effects of TOD on Housing, Parking and Travel. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, Transportation Research Board, TCRP Report 128.
- Austin, Mason, et al. 2010. Performance-Based Transit-Oriented Development Typology Guidebook. Center for Transit Oriented Development. Accessible at: <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/resource-center/books-and-reports/2010/performance-based-transit-oriented-development-typology-guidebook/>
- Bertolini, Luca, Curtis, Carey and Renne, John. 2012. Station Area Projects in Europe and Beyond: Towards Transit Oriented Development? Built Environment, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 31-50.
- Broberg, Brad. 2010. Generation Y: The Future Generation of Home Buyers. On Common Ground, Summer 2010: Megatrends for the Decade. National Association of Realtors, pp. 4-9. Accessed 18 April 2013, Available at: <http://www.realtor.org/publications/on-common-ground/summer-2010-megatrends-for-the-decade>
- Cervero, Robert, et al. 2004. Transit Oriented Development in America: Experiences, Challenges, and Prospects. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, Transportation Research Board, TCRP Report 102.
- Cervero, Robert and Guerra, Erick. 2011. Urban Densities and Transit: A Multi-dimensional Perspective. Institute of Transportation Studies, University of California, Berkeley, Working Paper UCB-ITS-VWP-2011-6. Accessible at: <http://www.its.berkeley.edu/publications/UCB/2011/VWP/UCB-ITS-VWP-2011-6.pdf>
- Debrezion, Ghebreegziabihier , Pels, Eric, and Rietveld, Piet. 2007. The Impact of Railway Stations on Residential and Commercial Property Value: A Metaanalysis. Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics. 35:161-180.
- Ewing, Reid and Cervero, Robert. 2010. Travel and the Built Environment: A Meta-Analysis. Journal of the American Planning Association. Vol. 76, No. 3, pp. 265-294.
- Leichenko, Robin, Coulson, N. Edward and Listokin, David. 2001. Historic Preservation and Residential Property Values: An Analysis of Texas Cities. Urban Studies. 38.11. pp. 1973 – 1987.
- Leinberger, Christopher. 2009. The Option of Urbanism: Investing in a New American Dream. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
- Levine, Jonathan. 2006, Zoned Out: Regulation, Markets, and Choices in Transportation and Metropolitan Land-Use, Washington, D.C.: Resources for the Future.

Listokin, David, Barbara Listokin, and Michael Lahr. 1998. The contributions of historic preservation to housing and economic development. *Housing Policy Debate*, pp. 431-478.

Smart Growth America. 2013. *Federal Involvement in Real Estate: A Call for Examination*. Washington, D.C.: Smart Growth America. Accessible at:  
<http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/federal-real-estate>

Urban Land Institute (ULI). 2013. *America in 2013: A ULI Survey of Views on Housing, Transportation, and Community*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Land Institute. Accessible at:  
<http://www.uli.org/report/america-in-2013-a-uli-survey-of-views-on-housing-transportation-and-community/>