


Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

VALUE CAPTURE ASSESSMENT STUDY

Executive Summary

July 2020



PREPARED BY: _____

Morgner Enterprise
Keyser Marston Associates
NBS Government Finance Group

D'Leon Consulting Engineers
Casamar Group, LLC



Executive Summary

Introduction and Goals

A study was conducted to identify potential opportunities for Metro and local communities to capitalize on value capture (VC) tools available today. The study, led by Morgner Enterprise and supported by Keyser Marston and NBS, first and foremost provides an initial assessment of the magnitude of potential additional funding that could be secured, in particular, through two of the more prevalent VC tools—i.e., (1) Existing tax based Tax Increment Financing (TIF) utilizing the Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) vehicle, and (2) Special tax based Special Financing Districts (SFD), in particular, the Community Facilities District (CFD) vehicle. Informed by the initial assessment, the study also recommends components of a longer term VC strategy, including implementation priorities and phasing, potential use of other effective and innovative VC tools, and new legislative needs to facilitate VC implementation.

Propelled by the capital funding gap issues that are becoming increasingly acute in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic, the future use of VC tools could prove essential and precedent-setting both for Metro and local communities to keep apace of the planned transit projects and public spending that could in turn support the timely economic recovery.

Initial Assessment— Understanding Potential Magnitude Of VC Funding

Effectiveness of TIF and EIFD Tools

VC tools are many and their uses involve many stakeholders—be they taxpayers, land and property owners, business owners and tenants, and developers—who are directly impacted both on the benefit and cost side of the VC equation. Among others,

one of the most prevalent VC tools used historically has been TIF based on the existing tax base without involving new assessments to stakeholders. California was the first to use the TIF tool and subsequently the first to overextend its use causing undesirable and lasting fiscal impacts. With the Great Recession, the State eliminated the TIF program and subsequently broadened the use of the existing infrastructure financing district (IFD) to create a better and improved version of TIF in the way of the EIFD. The EIFD is still in its infancy and its effectiveness is yet to be proven. However, a series of amendments since its initial legislation in 2015 (the most recent being the removal of voter approval for issuing EIFD bonds) are making the tool much more flexible and robust, empowering cities and counties with powerful means to raise much needed funding for critical infrastructure projects, including transit.

Over three dozen EIFD feasibility studies have been initiated by local and regional agencies since the 2015 EIFD legislation. To date, however, only a handful has been formally approved and, among those, only two (2) EIFDs identified below are of sufficient size with a detailed infrastructure financing plan (IFP) having substantive commitment of local tax increments that exceed \$1 billion in scale:

1. West Sacramento EIFD No. 1 to provide \$1.5 billion in infrastructure funding to help transition 4,100-acre waterfront properties from heavy industrial to mixed use
2. Otay Mesa EIFD to provide \$1.2 billion in infrastructure funding to support 9,300-acre Otay Mesa Community Plan Area (CPA) development envisioned by City of San Diego

There are others that are much smaller in scale, e.g., *City of La Verne EIFD* No. 1 for \$33 million in infrastructure funding to support the Old Town La Verne Specific Plan implementation. Although La Verne's Specific Plan hinges on transit-oriented developments

(TODs) around a future Gold Line station, its EIFD infrastructure financing plan does not include the Metro Station as part of its financing requirements. Of note in this regard, most of the EIFD feasibility studies to date—including the Redondo Beach EIFD in LA County currently under consideration to support a coastal community park and wetlands restoration—and a majority of TOD-driven local specific plans (many in LA County funded through Metro's TOD grants) are similar to La Verne in that they are small in scale where core transit facilities are excluded in their infrastructure financing requirements with the presumption that the transit will be paid for elsewhere. At minimum, the 3% local contribution for transit investments by local jurisdictions required by the Measure M sales tax should become a pre-established consideration in these studies and plans.

Notwithstanding West Sacramento and Otay Mesa EIFDs, it is clear that the EIFD tool is not applied currently in its full capacity for major infrastructure improvements. More specific to Metro, the recent West Hollywood EIFD feasibility assessment along the Crenshaw Northern Corridor demonstrates the tool's potential utility in addressing Metro's capital funding needs specifically. If done right, the EIFD feasibility studies for West Santa Ana Branch (WSAB) and Vermont Transit corridors currently under consideration by SCAG should also provide opportunities to set the course for how best the EIFD tool could be utilized specifically to help fund Metro's major transit projects. The initial assessment for this study thus focuses on the TIF and EIFD potential to help Metro gain a better grasp of the magnitude of additional funding that could be achieved through these tools.

Assessment Methodology Based on TOC Planning Principles and Guidelines

The initial assessment was guided by the established industry standards and planning principles pertaining to TODs. Several TOD guidelines at federal, state, and local levels were consulted. In particular, to characterize a VC opportunity area, the study applied: (1) TOD

amenability factor as recommended by the Center for Transit Oriented Development (CTOD) (mapped along the average vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per household and employment concentration dimensions) and (2) TOD density guidelines (dwelling units/acre and floor area ratio (FAR)), respectively, for residential and commercial land uses) recommended by Federal Transit Authority (FTA).

Given the sheer size of Metro's operational domain and time limitations, VC opportunity areas (OAs) had to be prioritized to include those with relatively higher VC potential. For the initial assessment, therefore, only the rail (not bus) transit facilities and only those rail corridors under construction or in planning stages (not existing) were included for initial quantitative analyses. Many station areas having already developed, the VC potential for existing transit stations were generally considered lower than those for future stations and, as discussed later, only a select few with significant development potential were considered as part of the initial assessment.

Excluding Crenshaw Northern (because EIFD assessments have been performed by West Hollywood and Arts District/6th St corridors (which is undertaking an independent VC assessment)), the remaining OAs were represented by 67 separate stations across 11 corridors along 8 major lines. Performing detailed analyses on all 67 stations was deemed virtually impossible given the time/budget constraints. As a result, with close coordination with Metro, a set of stations representative of key TOD categories (e.g., along urban vs. suburban groupings with varying densities) established by CTOD and FTA were selected for more detailed quantitative analyses. The results of these stations were then reviewed to gain insight into VC potential for each category and used as the basis for system-wide extrapolation. It should be recognized that the results of these initial assessments reflect at best a rough order-of-magnitude estimate of the VC tools' potential relative to Metro's larger overall portfolio.

Representative Stations and Their VC Characteristics and Potential

According to FTA guidelines, the TOD influence area for a light and heavy rail transit system is represented by 1/2-mile buffer zones around each station along its corridor. Detailed quantitative assessments were performed on eight (8) select representative stations spread across multiple corridors. For each 1/2-mile buffer zones, parcel level data characterizing each station were first obtained, including land use/zoning, dwelling units, lot and building size, current assessed valuations, and assigned tax rate areas (TRA) and County/City tax allocations. In addition, relevant demographic data (population, employment, household, business) were also collected for each 1/2 mile buffer zone as well as for a 2-mile radius surrounding each station for additional insights. Several data sources were used for this purpose, including those from Metro (station GIS), LA County Assessor and Auditor (assessed value and tax), SCAG (land use GIS), and ESRI (demographics).

Based on the existing demographics, each station was categorized according to the aforementioned CTOD/FTA typology defined largely in terms of TOD amenability and TOD density guidelines. To develop the TOD buildout scenario for each station, the existing densities for residential and commercial zones were increased to reach the higher recommended TOD density (specifically, recommended residential dwelling units/acre and commercial FAR) for that category. In general, where additional land is required to accommodate the new density, industrial zones (and vacant land, where available) were converted to residential and commercial uses. For each station, both general plans and specific plans for local jurisdictions were consulted for specific land use and zoning guidelines. With few exceptions, the TOD densities applied were within the maximum density allowed by the localities for a given land use and zoning specification.



Purple Line 2 Station Credit: Metro

In assessing the EIFD funding potential, the new assessed value (AV) for the TOD buildout Scenario for each station was estimated based on the increased density and higher unit pricing projected for the new properties. Commensurate with the EIFD financing terms, 45-year cash flow was then developed for the TOD buildout Scenario using the same assumptions on all stations for apples-to-apples comparisons. Using 2020 as the base year, these assumptions, generally consistent with other EIFD assessments, included 20-year TOD buildout starting 2025, 2% statutory appreciation of AV with additional consideration for turnovers, and 3% discount rate for the present value analysis.¹

Table ES-1 summarizes the results of the 8 representative stations. Collectively, the 8 stations are capable of securing over \$5 billion in additional funding (almost \$2 billion in present value) and 78% increase in total AV if the stations can reach their TOD buildout potential. In reviewing the results, not surprisingly, it was found that the magnitude of the current AV within each station buffer zone had significant bearing on the TOD buildout AV more than any other variables. As presented, the increase in AVs between the current and TOD buildout for individual stations is shown to range from 60% on the low end to not much more than 100% on the high end.

¹ Assumptions on turnovers reflect the findings from a recent UCLA study that indicates that LA County experienced a 16% increase in the number of gentrified neighborhoods (and resulting displacements) between 1990 and 2015.

TABLE ES-1: Potential VC for Representative Future Stations (in \$Million)

| Station | Current AV | TOD Buildout AV | % Increase in AV | 45-Year Tax Increment | Present Value |
|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Westwood/UCLA | \$6,284 | \$10,053 | 60% | \$2,304 | \$905 |
| Van Nuys/MOL | \$1,203 | \$2,069 | 72% | \$548 | \$215 |
| Westchester/Veteran | \$1,079 | \$2,088 | 94% | \$486 | \$191 |
| Lambert | \$992 | \$2,488 | 151% | \$524 | \$205 |
| Greenwood | \$738 | \$1,188 | 61% | \$274 | \$108 |
| Sylmar | \$722 | \$1,452 | 101% | \$361 | \$142 |
| Norwalk | \$676 | \$1,283 | 90% | \$203 | \$80 |
| Pomona | \$611 | \$1,237 | 102% | \$320 | \$126 |
| Total | \$12,305 | \$21,858 | 78% | \$5,020 | \$1,972 |

Systemwide EIFD VC Estimation through Extrapolation

The insights gained from the representative station results were applied to the remaining 59 stations for system-wide extrapolation. In particular, the TOD buildout scenario for each of the remaining stations was developed based on (1) potential increase in the current AV of the 1/2-mile buffer zones informed by its TOD-relevant demographics and (2) TRA and tax allocations specific to each station. In general, the current AV was increased by 60 to 100% to provide a reasonable range of TOD buildout AV potential for each station. This range was not applied to the 8 representative stations (where detailed analyses were undertaken) and several other stations that were considered to have less development potential due to (a) their connection with an already-developed existing station, (b) overlap of the market area between stations, and/or (c) the existence of large public land holdings that limit private development.

The same underlying assumptions as the 8 stations were used in developing the 45-year cash flow except, respectively, the EIFD base year and the start of the 20-year TOD buildout schedule were assumed to coincide with the expected groundbreaking and opening date of each corridor as shown in **Exhibit ES-1**.

Table ES-2 summarizes both the systemwide and corridor specific VC potential. Collectively, 67 future stations are capable of capturing additional funding that could range between \$46 to 56 billion (\$18 to 22 billion in present values) with as much as \$70 to \$100 billion in incremental total AV that could be attributable to these future stations. At the corridor level, the VC potential varies widely from as low as \$1.1 billion (\$0.4 billion in present value) for Sepulveda Westside-LAX Corridor to as high as \$17.7 billion (\$6.9 billion in present value) for Purple Line Extension Sections 1 and 2.

| EXHIBIT ES-1: VC Assessment Phasing Based on Expected Opening Date (2020-2080) | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Line | Opening Date (No. Stations) | 2020-2030 | 2030-2040 | 2040-2050 | 2050-2060 | 2060-2070 | 2070-2080 |
| Crenshaw/LAX | 2022 (9) | [Bar chart showing VC assessment phasing for Crenshaw/LAX from 2020 to 2060] | | | | | |
| Regional Connector | 2024 (4) | [Bar chart showing VC assessment phasing for Regional Connector from 2020 to 2060] | | | | | |
| Purple Line Extension | 2024-2026 (5) | [Bar chart showing VC assessment phasing for Purple Line Extension (2024-2026) from 2020 to 2060] | | | | | |
| | 2027 (2) | [Bar chart showing VC assessment phasing for Purple Line Extension (2027) from 2020 to 2060] | | | | | |
| Gold Line Extension | 2028 (4) | [Bar chart showing VC assessment phasing for Gold Line Extension (2028) from 2020 to 2060] | | | | | |
| | 2035 (6) | [Bar chart showing VC assessment phasing for Gold Line Extension (2035) from 2020 to 2080] | | | | | |
| East San Fernando Valley | 2027 (14) | [Bar chart showing VC assessment phasing for East San Fernando Valley from 2020 to 2060] | | | | | |
| Green Line to Torrance | 2030 (2) | [Bar chart showing VC assessment phasing for Green Line to Torrance from 2020 to 2080] | | | | | |
| West Santa Ana Branch | 2028 (11) | [Bar chart showing VC assessment phasing for West Santa Ana Branch from 2020 to 2060] | | | | | |
| Sepulveda Transit Corridor | 2033 (6) | [Bar chart showing VC assessment phasing for Sepulveda Transit Corridor (2033) from 2020 to 2080] | | | | | |
| | 2057 (4) | [Bar chart showing VC assessment phasing for Sepulveda Transit Corridor (2057) from 2020 to 2080] | | | | | |

| TABLE ES-2: Systemwide EIFD VC Potential for Future Transit Corridors (in \$Billion) | | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Rail Corridor | Project Status | Current AV | TOD Buildout AV | 45-Year Tax Increment | Present Value |
| Crenshaw/LAX | Construction | \$9.6 | \$14.8~\$17.1 | \$3.3~\$4.2 | \$1.3~\$1.7 |
| Regional Connector | Construction | \$47.4 | \$55.8 | \$9.8 | \$3.9 |
| Purple Line Ext. (Sect 1/2) | Construction | \$32.6 | \$52.2~\$65.2 | \$12.5~\$17.7 | \$4.9~\$6.9 |
| Purple Line Ext. (Sect. 3) | Construction | \$8.2 | \$12.5 | \$2.9 | \$1.1 |
| Gold Line Foothill-Claremont | Construction | \$2.9 | \$5.0~\$5.9 | \$1.0~\$1.3 | \$0.4~\$0.5 |
| Gold Line Eastside Phase 2 | Planning | \$5.0 | \$8.7~\$9.7 | \$1.7~\$2.1 | \$0.7~\$0.8 |
| Green Line to Torrance | Planning | \$2.9 | \$4.6~\$5.7 | \$1.2~\$1.7 | \$0.5~\$0.6 |
| East San Fernando Valley | Planning | \$12.9 | \$21.2~\$25.6 | \$5.1~\$6.6 | \$2.0~\$2.6 |
| West Santa Ana Branch | Planning | \$18.6 | \$26.6~\$30.5 | \$4.8~\$6.0 | \$1.9~\$2.3 |
| Sepulveda Valley-Westside | Planning | \$12.5 | \$16.6 | \$3.0 | \$1.1 |
| Sepulveda Westside-LAX | Planning | \$8.0 | \$12.3~\$14.3 | \$1.1~\$1.3 | \$0.4~\$0.5 |
| Total | | \$160.7 | \$230.1~\$258.9 | \$46.3~\$56.4 | \$18.1~\$22.1 |

Use of Special Financing District Tool

In addition to TIF and EIFD, potential VC opportunity for the second prevalent tool, i.e., special taxes using special financing districts, in particular, CFD, was examined. CFDs are more prevalent than EIFD with many currently existing in Metro’s service territory. At a very conceptual level, an initial assessment of CFD VC potential was

performed for the 67 stations based on the same TOD buildout scenarios assumed under the EIFD analyses. **Table ES-3** shows, in present value, both the system-wide and corridor specific CFD VC potential if the TOD buildout were to materialize and if the effective tax rate were to be raised to the industry standard maximum of 2% allowable for each station.

TABLE ES-3: Systemwide CFD VC Potential for Future Transit Corridors (in \$Billion)

| Rail Corridor | Current AV | TOD Buildout AV | CFD VC in Present Value | |
|------------------------------|----------------|------------------------|--|---|
| | | | EIFD Assumption (45-Year @ 3% discount rate) | CFD Financing Term (30-Year @ 5% interest rate) |
| Crenshaw/LAX | \$9.6 | \$14.8~\$17.1 | \$1.0~\$1.5 | \$0.6~\$0.9 |
| Regional Connector | \$47.4 | \$55.8 | \$1.6 | \$1.0 |
| Purple Line Ext. (Sect 1/2) | \$32.6 | \$52.2~\$65.2 | \$3.8~\$6.4 | \$2.4~\$4.0 |
| Purple Line Ext. (Sect. 3) | \$8.2 | \$12.5 | \$0.9 | \$0.5 |
| Gold Line Foothill-Claremont | \$2.9 | \$5.0~\$5.9 | \$0.4~\$0.6 | \$0.2~\$0.4 |
| Gold Line Eastside Phase 2 | \$5.0 | \$8.7~\$9.7 | \$0.7~\$0.9 | \$0.5~\$0.6 |
| Green Line to Torrance | \$2.9 | \$4.6~\$5.7 | \$0.3~\$0.6 | \$0.2~\$0.4 |
| East San Fernando Valley | \$12.9 | \$21.2~\$25.6 | \$1.6~\$2.5 | \$1.0~\$1.5 |
| West Santa Ana Branch | \$18.6 | \$26.6~\$30.5 | \$1.6~\$2.3 | \$1.0~\$1.5 |
| Sepulveda Valley-Westside | \$12.5 | \$16.6 | \$0.8 | \$0.5 |
| Sepulveda Westside-LAX | \$8.0 | \$12.3~\$14.3 | \$0.8~\$1.2 | \$0.5~\$0.8 |
| Total | \$160.7 | \$230.1~\$258.9 | \$13.6~\$19.2 | \$8.5~\$12.1 |

As shown, under the same conceptual present value assumptions used for EIFD (i.e., 45-year term at 3% discount rate), the maximum CFD VC potential could range between \$13.6 to \$19.2 billion for the 67 stations. Under the financing terms that are more typical of CFD (i.e., 30-year term at 5% interest rate), CFD VC upfront potential could range between \$8.5 to \$12.1 billion. It is important to recognize that there may be significant challenges in using the CFD for VC purposes. CFDs require a 2/3 voter approval from either property owners or registered voters depending on the number of registered voters within the proposed CFD. Further, CFDs are typically smaller in scale created on an individual development project basis with each issuance requiring the 2/3 voter approval (from property owners or registered voters, as the case may be). For each station with a 1/2-mile TOD buffer zone, numerous districts, each burdened with the voter approval requirement, may be necessary before the VC potential shown can be achieved. Nevertheless, a CFD was successfully implemented for the planned Historic Downtown Streetcar project, and a CFD is being considered for a potential Arts District Red Line station.

VC Potential for Existing Stations

As mentioned earlier, with the help from Metro, a select few existing stations having significant development potential were identified, including Willowbrook/Rosa Parks (Blue Line), Vermont/Beverly and Westlake/MacArthur Park (Red Line), and El Segundo (Green Line). Among these, the El Segundo station was considered as being relatively less developed with higher VC potential and thus selected for more detailed analysis of the level similar to the eight representative stations described earlier. Near the El Segundo station is a large parcel developed as industrial formerly owned by Raytheon (recently merged with United Technologies). The TOD buildout scenario entailed redeveloping the low density industrial parcel to high density, high value commercial developments. The analysis showed that, through the TOD buildout, this station can achieve close to a 45% increase in AV (from \$3.0 billion to \$4.4 billion) with a VC potential of \$826 million (\$325 million in present value) over the 45-year period.

More qualitatively, the study team also reviewed the current development activity near Metro stations provided in Metro's CY2019 Development Review. The Review identifies 22 proposed or under development projects near existing station sites which would require some level of Metro involvement. Many of these sites could be "TOD-amenable" with substantive VC potential, especially where large parcel sizes are available and where the existing density is low (e.g., FAR under 1.0). A very preliminary review indicates that these projects could generate between 1,400 and 1,600 new residential units and between 700,000 and 1,000,000 square feet of new commercial or industrial space. The incremental AV of these new developments could range between \$900 million to \$1.2 billion. If a tax increment VC program were in place and if, for example, the share of tax revenues devoted to Metro infrastructure was 15%, then these projects could mean additional VC potential of between \$1.4 and \$1.8 million annually.

Over and beyond the direct monetization, at minimum, these sites could also serve as potential candidates for affordable housing where grants and subsidies (e.g., affordable housing sustainable communities grants) could be sought to further Metro's policy priorities. In short, with better information about future station-adjacent development plans, further and more detailed assessment of the overall VC potential for existing stations, inclusive of the availability of relevant grants and subsidies, could be beneficial.

Short and Long Term Value Capture Strategy

An effective VC strategy is ultimately about starting **early** when there is a general recognition of TOD's potential value and **before** it is given away without proper assessment of its monetization potential based

on benefits and costs to each major stakeholder involved. For each major corridor, a long term value capture strategy should be integrated, phased, and risk-adjusted across multiple stakeholders and planned well in advance alongside the capital project planning process and long before the opening date.

In general, various VC tools presented in this study can be used on a case-by-case basis. At a strategic level over a longer term, the basic approach should be to start with those tools that have the least new impact on stakeholders (real or perceived) and proceed with new charges in a manner that is risk-adjusted so that the stakeholders can better bear the VC financial burden. The following two broad risk-adjusted VC implementation layers are thus recommended:

1. Given that it can be multi-jurisdictional and non-contiguous, the use of EIFD/TIF tool is recommended at an entire corridor level², tapping on organic increase in tax revenues from TODs linked to all new stations along a new corridor without imposing new taxes. Not all affected local jurisdictions along a given corridor may be interested in participating initially but, over the long run, with the appropriate value proposition and emphasis on the "but-for" factor³, the EIFD/TIF tool has a potential to trigger a ripple effect and help maximize local contributions.
2. The use of CFD is recommended at an individual station level because it is likely triggered by developers and property owners based on their individual development projects around each station. As CFD involves new taxes and requires voter approval, its applications may be easier where the project does not involve multiple and diverse voter communities. At the station level, as called for by the funding needs, it may also be desirable to combine CFD (new owners) with SFD (existing owners) and various forms of developer exactions (e.g., impact fees) that are implemented in phases

² The recent West Hollywood EIFD feasibility was a corridor-level assessment for the Crenshaw Northern Corridor. Likewise, the WSAB and Vermont Transit Corridor EIFD feasibility studies under consideration by SCAG should be at corridor-level to maximize the tool's benefits.

³ The "but-for" factor refers to the recognition from the outset that the TOC VC opportunities and the resulting increase in local revenues would not be possible without the transit facilities.



7th Street Metro Train Station Rendering. Credit Metro

such that developers' contributions kick-in later in the development phase when their risks are lower and their willingness to pay is higher.

The two implementation layers should be explored in parallel to determine the best and most practical path forward. More importantly, regardless of the path chosen in the end, the overall VC implementation framework for how various VC tools are to be used should be laid out well in advance as an integral part of the overall VC strategy for each corridor for purposes of providing full transparency from the outset for local jurisdictions, property owners, and developer community.

A broad stakeholder engagement both at the municipal and state levels would also be an essential element of a VC strategy. Close coordination with municipal partners is needed, for example, to prioritize VC generated funds amongst competing demands and to implement a new taxing district. As the best path forward is identified and select VC tools are pursued, the VC strategy may also entail legislative recommendations to amend existing tools or create new tools, requiring close coordination at

the state level. It is recommended that an internal inter-departmental VC task force within Metro be established to facilitate not only the stakeholder engagement efforts but also overall implementation of the VC strategy both in the short- and long-term.

Finally, as practical, other innovative VC tools gleaned from global best practices should also be explored in developing the long term VC strategy, particularly when new sources of funding can be identified to further spread the VC financial burden. Of particular interest in this regard is CEPAC bonds from Sao Paulo, Brazil, where the effective use of innovative VC tools has been prevalent and long standing. By leveraging less than 0.1% of their developable land and directly adding the larger investor community to the VC stakeholder equation, the City has been able to convert TOD-driven incremental density into tradable securities sold through public auctions. The CEPAC proceeds alone helped the City to raise as much as 15% of its overall capital spending needs, including much needed affordable housing provisions to help mitigate the larger gentrification issues facing the City.

Glossary

| | |
|-------|---|
| AV | Assessed Value |
| BRT | Bus Rapid Transit |
| CBA | Community Benefits Agreement |
| CEPAC | Certificate for Potential Additional Construction |
| CFD | Community Facilities District |
| CID | Community Improvement District |
| CTOD | Center for Transit Oriented Development |
| DA | Development Agreement |
| EIFD | Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District |
| ESFV | East San Fernando Valley |
| ESRI | Environmental Systems Research Institute |
| FAR | Floor Area Ratio |
| FTA | Federal Transit Authority |
| IFD | Infrastructure Financing District |
| IFP | Infrastructure Financing Plan |
| JD | Joint Development |
| JPA | Joint Powers Authority |
| LMD | Landscape Maintenance District |
| MOL | Metro Orange Line |
| ROW | Right of Way |
| SCAG | Southern California Association of Governments |
| SFD | Special Financing District |
| TFAR | Transfer of Floor Area Rights |
| TIF | Tax Increment Financing |
| TOC | Transit Oriented Community |
| TOD | Transit Oriented Development |
| TRA | Tax Rate Area |
| VC | Value Capture |
| VMT | Vehicle Mile Traveled |
| VNY | Van Nuys |
| WeHo | West Hollywood |
| WSAB | West Santa Ana Branch |