

**RDCS COMPETITION CRITERIA TEST RESULTS
SUMMARY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDED CHANGES**

Findings assume test projects maximize score with the maximum possible contribution of funds or construction of off-site improvements.

A. General Findings

1. Total Points

- Only 1 of 15 projects achieved the minimum score of 160 points (Khanna, large multi-family rental at 162 points)
- Average score: 151 points
- Highest score: 162 points (Khanna, large multi-family rental)
- Lowest score: 131 points (Vo-Apple Tree, micro single-family)

2. Cost Per Unit – Funds Contributed and Value of Improvements

- Average cost per unit, including both funds contributed and the value of off-site improvements: \$67,149
- Highest cost per unit: \$136,970 (San Sebastian, detached SFD)
- Lowest cost per unit: \$43,000 (UHC Monterey, affordable MF)

3. Cost Per Unit – Funds Contributed Only

- Average cost per unit, funds contributed only: \$45,035
- Highest cost per unit: \$104,970 (San Sebastian, detached SFD)
- Lowest cost per unit: \$14,000 (UHC Monterey, affordable MF)

4. Cost Per Unit – Measure C Comparison

- Average cost of funds contributed and the value of improvements per unit for sample of projects last competition: \$31,452. This is \$35,000 less than the average cost of test projects.
- Lowest cost of funds contributed and value of improvements per unit from sample of projects from last competition: \$13,050.
- Lowest cost of funds contributed and value of improvements per unit from sample of projects from last competition: \$51,413.

5. Points for Monetary Contributions and Off-Site Community Improvements

- Average percentage of points awarded for monetary contributions: 28%
- Average percentage of points awarded for off-site community improvements: 32%
- Average percentage of points awarded for monetary contributions and off-site community improvements: 60%

6. Project Type Variation

- Total scores of the Monterey Corridor projects (143 and 144) are below the average score for all projects (151).

- The Downtown project score (154) is slightly above the average score for all projects (151)
- The average score of projects that are not open market (147) is slightly below the average score for all projects (151)
- The average score for single-family attached and multi-family projects (149) is slightly below average score for all projects (151)

B. General Recommended Changes

- **Point Costs.** Decrease the cost per point for funds contributed and off-site improvements. If cost is reduced uniformly from \$1,000 to \$500 per unit, total costs would be similar to historic costs under Measure C. Alternatively, costs could be reduced for certain points and not for others.
- **Non-Purchase Points.** Increase the points awarded for criteria that do not require contribution of funds or construction of off-site improvements. Points could be increased for location, recreational amenities, environmental protection, and project quality criteria. Increasing points for existing non-purchase criteria will enable more projects to achieve minimum score without increasing costs.
- **Non-Purchase Criteria.** Add new criteria that allow projects to obtain additional points not requiring contribution of funds or construction of off-site improvements. Objectives with limited non-purchase points are schools, affordable housing, parks and open space, transportation, and municipal services. Adding non-purchase criteria within these objectives will enable more projects to achieve the minimum score without increasing costs.
- **Smaller Infill Projects.** Modify criteria within the housing diversity, parks and open space, and project quality objectives to increase scoring opportunities for smaller infill projects. This issue is discussed further in the objective-specific findings and recommendations below.

C. Objective-Specific Findings and Recommendations

1. Schools

Findings

- High average score (16.8 of 17)
- 13 of 15 projects achieved maximum available points
- Two projects did not achieve maximum points due to distance from schools
- All projects can score high as 15 of 17 points are available for contributing funds and/or construction of improvements

Recommended Changes

- Add point opportunities that do not require contribution of funds and/or construction of improvements

2. Location

Findings

- Average score of 15 of 22 points

- All projects, regardless of location, received at least 9 of 22 points
- Downtown project achieved maximum available points
- One Monterey corridor project received only an average score (15 of 22 points)

Recommended Changes

- Increase point for location criteria, particularly for Monterey Corridor

3. Affordable Housing

Findings

- All projects achieved minimum required score (18 of 24 points)
- Average cost of baseline affordable housing fund contribution: \$25,010 per unit (\$1,389 per point).
- Range of baseline affordable housing fund contribution: \$12,455 to \$54,264 per unit
- If project contributes baseline funds (18 points), there is no 6-point construction option to get to 24 points

Recommended Changes

- Add 6-point construction option to Criteria 3-B

4. Housing Diversity

Findings

- Relatively low average score (8 of 22 points)
- Attached, multi-family, and micro projects scored particularly low
- Infill and projects close to central core scored particularly low
- Attached and multi-family projects with only one housing type that increase citywide housing diversity scored no points

Recommended Changes

- Add new criteria tailored to smaller infill projects that are not detached single-family
- Revise Criteria 4-D (Small Units) to award points to other housing types (attached, multi-family)
- Increase non-purchase points

5. Parks and Open Space

Findings

- Relatively high average score (27 of 30 points)
- All projects able to score at least 21 points due to high points awarded for fund contributions
- Projects receive most points from fund contributions
- Smaller infill projects scored relatively low

Recommended Changes

- Increase points available for on-site recreational amenities
- Add criteria with additional point opportunities that do not require contribution of funds
- Add criteria that enable smaller infill projects to receive points. Example: proximity to park, enhancement to public park, special common open space amenities (roof garden)

6. Environmental Protection

Findings

- Relatively low average score (10 of 22 points)
- Projects could not receive Build It Green points (8 of 22) because green building features awarded points under Criteria 6-A through 6-D cannot be double counted for 6-E.

Recommended Changes

- Revise Criteria 6-E to address double counting problem

7. Transportation

Findings

- All projects received maximum score (15 of 15) for contributing funds or providing off-site improvements

Recommendation

- Add criteria with additional point opportunities that do not require contribution of funds or providing off-site improvements

8. Municipal Services

Findings

- All projects received maximum score (15 of 15) for contributing funds or providing off-site improvements

Recommendation

- Add criteria with additional point opportunities that do not require contribution of funds or providing off-site improvements

9. Project Quality

Findings

- Relatively low average score (21 of 33)
- Difficult for small infill projects not building new roads to receive points under Criteria 9-A and 9-B

Recommended Changes

- For Criteria 9-A, award points for small infill projects that enhance connectivity.
- For 9-B, provide opportunities for small infill projects to obtain points

D. Other Developer Comments

1. **Schools.** Measure proximity from project entrance point nearest to school.
2. **Monterey Corridor Boundary.** Extend to northern City limits.
3. **Adjacent Development.** Establish rule for conflicting City General Plan and County zoning when defining “existing development.”

4. **Diversity of Housing Type.** Allow housing types that constitute 10 percent or more to be eligible for points.
5. **Variation in Housing Size.** Allow housing size categories that constitute 10 percent or more to be eligible for points
6. **Small Units.** No developer would build a 1,700 sq. ft. single-family home. Points will go unused.
7. **Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements (7-A).** Consider points awarded for distance of bike paths, not value of improvement.
8. **TDM (Criteria 7-E).** Award a point for each TDM measure, up to 3 points.
9. **Gridding Infrastructure.** Award points for project gridding to infrastructure.
10. **Environmental Protection Points.** Award points for these specific environmental protection features:
 - a. EV charging
 - b. PV above guest parking
 - c. Minimized grading.
 - d. Moving trees
11. **EV Charging.** Award points specifically for EV charging stations.
12. **Design Fees.** Consider including design fees in cost of improvements.
13. **Design Points.** Award points for these specific project design features:
 - a. Variation in front setbacks
 - b. Increased rear yards
 - c. Garage door orientation and design
 - d. Curvilinear streets
 - e. Covered guest parking