National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board



Briefing on a Comprehensive Cost-Benefit Analysis Framework for Assessing Transit Investments, and Possible Implications for Transportation Planning in the Washington Region

June 18, 2008

HDR Decision Economics

Comprehensive Cost-Benefit Analysis

- Practices and procedures firmly in place for virtually all types of public infrastructure
- Transit the exception; assessment confined to ridership and related performance measures (transit user time savings)
- Ridership reflects mobility, but not other objectives and benefits of transit:
 - Congestion management
 - Environment
 - Safety
 - Economic development
 - Transit-oriented development

Why is Transit Treated Differently?

- Stems from FTA "New Starts Process"
- FTA process designed to rate applicant projects for pool of federal funds
- FTA process not designed to guide local infrastructure investment choices and trade-offs
- FTA process not designed to enable comparisons of value among infrastructure alternatives (highway options; congestion pricing options; technology options)

Risks in the Current Approach

- Failure to generate a level playing field for transportation alternatives
- Failure to recognize all sources of value in comparing local alternatives
- Risk of mistakenly rejecting good transit projects
- Failure to recognize all financing opportunities
- Not shaping projects to serve local objectives

Alternative Approach for Regional Investment Planning

- Cost-Benefit Analysis to recognize all sources of transit value
- Uses conventional tools
- Applicable both for analysis and as a deliberative public process

Comprehensive Recognition of Transit Benefits

- Mobility
- Congestion Management
- Community Economic Development

Mobility

- Time savings to transit users
- Cash savings to low income households for reallocation to housing, nutrition, child care ...
- Cross-sector benefits: reduced financial burden on social services

Congestion Management

- Reduced delay
- Improved reliability, predictability and productivity
- Reduced environmental emissions
- Lower vehicle operating costs
- Safety (lives, injuries, property)

Community Economic Development

Location Efficiency

- High density economic activity
- Less demand for motorized trips
- Reduced auto-ownership requirements, dependence
- Higher density life-style

Measurement

 Development benefits measured as increased economic land value

CASE: Light Rail (Austin, Texas)

Transit investment generates value in all three categories

Category of Benefits	Green Line	Orange Line
<u>Total Benefits (Million U.S. dollars)</u> Congestion Management	<u>\$1,369.9</u> \$ 852.5	<u>\$233.6</u> \$106.5
Mobility	\$ 224.0	\$ 32.5
Community Economic Development	\$ 293.5	\$ 94.6

CASE: Transit v. Highway Investment (Cincinnati, Ohio)

Transit investment can outperform highway alternatives

	BRT, Region- wide	Light Rail Region-wide	New Highway Capacity
Total Cost	\$522	\$6,218	\$1,209.1
Total Benefits	\$1,141	\$10,784	\$1,365.2
Net Benefits	\$619	\$4,566	\$156.1
Internal Rate of Return	27.1%	8.7%	4.9%

CASE: Streetcar Investment (Cincinnati, Ohio)

Focus on ridership benefits alone can miss financing opportunities and lead to the mistaken conclusion that a project is not economically worthwhile

	Millions of Constant Dollars (Present Value)
Congestion Management	\$16.4
Mobility	\$35.2
Economic Development	\$378.9
Total Costs	\$115.8

Conclusions

Cost-Benefit Analysis feasible and proven

- Enables quantitative understanding of significance of transit investment for economic well-being of region
- Facilitates understanding of development-based financing capacity of transit investment
- Facilitates community understanding, deliberation and consensus
- Allows comparative ranking of alternative scenarios for the region, including transit, highways, pricing and other policy options