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December 15, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Technical Working Group on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Working Group. Speakers are limited to three minutes each.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>REPORTS FROM TWG MEMBERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members of the TWG may report on their activities or upcoming events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF NOVEMBER 10, 2005 TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The TWG should review and approve the November 10, 2005 meeting summary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REPORTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>RTP UPDATE: FORMATION OF AN AD HOC WORKING GROUP TO REVIEW TRANSPORTATION PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE 2007 RTP (Rachel Kennedy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff proposes forming an Ad Hoc Working Group to review and update the transportation project evaluation criteria for the 2007 RTP update. The TWG should appoint two members to the Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria Ad Hoc Working Group, joining transportation agency staff and volunteers from other transportation and planning advisory groups. The working group would meet monthly, beginning in January 2006. This item was on the November 10 TWG agenda; the appointments were postponed until today’s meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>STATUS REPORT ON DRAFT SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP (Carolina Gregor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attached is a report to the Regional Planning Committee on the Smart Growth Concept Map. Revisions to the Smart Growth Concept Map and tables will be available at the meeting for review by the TWG. The TWG will discuss the revised map and tables, as well as potential performance metrics related to the map. As a reminder, the City/County Management Association (CCMA) will discuss the Smart Growth Concept Map at its monthly meeting on Thursday, January 5, 2006, at the Del Mar Marriott at 11 a.m. Members of the CCMA will be inviting their planning directors to attend this meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. DRAFT BOARD POLICY: IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES FOR THE SANDAG BOARD’S FEBRUARY 25, 2005 REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT (RHNA) MEMORANDUM

The TWG should review and make a recommendation on guidelines drafted by an ad hoc working group of TWG members and local jurisdiction representatives regarding implementation of the RHNA memorandum authored by Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler, Mayor Steve Padilla, and Councilmember Jim Madaffer. The report will be forwarded to the Executive Committee, Regional Planning Committee, and SANDAG Board in January.

8. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING

The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, January 12, 2006, from 1:15 - 3:15 p.m.

+ next to an item indicates an attachment
SUMMARY OF NOVEMBER 10, 2005, TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING

Agenda Item #1: Welcome and Introductions
Gail Goldberg, City of San Diego, chaired the meeting. Self-introductions were conducted.

Agenda Item #2: Public Comments and Communications
Gail Goldberg announced that she attended a national Urban Land Institute Emerging Trends conference in Los Angeles. She reported that the San Diego region was named the best real estate investment market in the nation.

Ms. Goldberg announced that she also attended a workshop held by the San Diego Airport Authority, where technical issues regarding the airport land use compatibility plans were discussed. She encouraged members of the TWG affected by the airport land use plans to get involved in their stakeholders working group.

Bob Leiter, SANDAG staff, announced that Diane Eidam will replace Chief Deputy Executive Director Eric Pahlke, who is retiring in December. Currently, Ms. Eidam serves as the Executive Director of the California Transportation Commission. Her first official day at SANDAG is December 16, 2005.

Dave Witt, City of La Mesa, announced that he attended a meeting at the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). He reported that the RWQCB voted 4-3 to rescind the notice of violation against all the cities in the San Diego region and the County of San Diego.

CONSENT ITEMS (3-5)

Agenda Item #3: Summary of the October 20, 2005, Regional Planning Technical Working Group Meeting
A motion and second were made to approve the October 20, 2005, meeting summary. The motion passed unanimously.
Agenda Item #4: Workshops on the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS)
Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA)

Agenda Item #5: Draft 2006 Legislative Program

The TWG did not discuss Consent Items 4 and 5.

REPORTS (6-9)

Agenda Item #6: Smart Growth Concept Map: Update on Technical Issues and Draft Poster

Susan Baldwin, SANDAG staff, distributed a memorandum (Attachment 1) updating the TWG on the outstanding technical issues and the next steps to be taken regarding the Draft Smart Growth Concept Map. The remaining technical issues pertaining to Item 1 (boundaries and thresholds) included:

• flexibility on boundary modifications to reach intensity targets;
• flexibility on the width of transit corridors for special circumstances, such as topographical constraints or established single-family neighborhoods; and
• flexibility to shift the radius of community centers to capture additional intensities.

After an explanation of the issues, comments from the TWG group included:

Linda Niles, City of Del Mar, commented that the adjustments proposed were reasonable given the varying conditions that exist in each jurisdiction.

Ed Kleeman, City of Coronado, mentioned that a community center may have more than one transit stop and the stops may be on the edges of the community center. Mr. Kleeman added that with regard to the width of the transit corridor, enough flexibility is not being provided. More flexibility should be provided to include blocks on both sides of the street; i.e., wider as well as narrower widths.

Jerry Backoff, City of San Marcos, agreed with Mr. Kleeman regarding the need for flexibility in the width of transit corridors.

Stefan Marks, NCTD, commented that the 25 du/acre threshold set for transit corridors will be difficult for North County cities to meet and therefore compete for smart growth funds. He also noted that the quality of the pedestrian environment affects how far people are willing to walk to use transit.

Coleen Clementson, SANDAG staff, commented that SANDAG staff discussed some of these issues with the Independent Transit Planning Peer Review Panel, and that they agree that urban design is an important issue in identifying smart growth areas.

Dennis Turner, County of San Diego, stated that it would be helpful to reissue the Smart Growth Area Detail Report.

Susan Baldwin stated that the report will be reissued for the TWG December meeting after boundary and land use inputs have been received.

Melanie Kush, City of Santee, asked where the 25 du/acre for transit corridors came from.
Bob Leiter clarified that densities around transit stations is derived from standards that have been used for a long time by a variety of agencies, but that the literature isn't as clear with respect to density in a transit corridor. Further research will be conducted to determine the appropriate density for this place type, with the possibility of modifying the standards and amending the RCP, if appropriate.

Dennis Turner asked about how grant funding will be divided between capital and planning projects. He hopes that we will have this information for the City/County Managers Association Meeting.

Bob Leiter stated that further analysis needs to be conducted given the large numbers of smart growth areas on the map, and that this will be done as part of preparation of the 2007 RTP and during the development of the TransNet Smart Growth Improvement Program (SGIP).

Susan Baldwin added that during the preparation of the 2007 RTP, we also will be looking at the transit equivalency and transit propensity issues for areas that are close to meeting the residential and/or employment density targets. Further discussions with the Independent Transit Planning Review (ITPR) panel will assist in clarifying the density targets. Ms. Baldwin noted that the transit propensity issue was also discussed with the ITPR although no conclusive answers were reached.

Dennis Turner asked about the composition of the ITPR panel.

Bob Leiter answered that the members include Dr. Robert Cervero from University of California Berkeley, Richard Feder from Pittsburgh/Port of Allegheny County, Linda Cherrington from Texas Transportation Institute, John Bonsall from McCormick Rankin based in Ontario, David Mieger from Los Angeles MTA, and Phil Selinger from Portland Trimet.

Dennis Turner asked if we aren’t getting a consensus from the ITPR panel regarding transit equivalency/propensity how do we go about resolving these issues.

Bob Leiter indicated that Wilbur Smith & Associates, as a consultant, is working with the ITPR to resolve these issues. Also, the ITPR is hearing a series of presentations and plans from SANDAG groups to evaluate these issues.

Susan Baldwin discussed Item 2 of the memorandum (name of Transit Corridor place type). There were no comments or suggestions regarding this issue.

Susan Baldwin next discussed Item 3 of the memorandum (other issues) regarding the recommendation from the County of San Diego to fund the Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) evenly by place type.

Dennis Turner discussed the political ramifications of fair share funding for place types.

Ed Kleeman asked if the smart growth concept maps are just one of many drafts and if the maps used in January at the City/County Managers Association meeting will be different.

Coleen Clementson explained that the maps at that meeting will be somewhat different. A new draft of the Smart Growth Concept Map was presented to the TWG. Ms. Clementson explained that these maps are being updated to reflect the numerous inputs received from the jurisdictions and are intended to convey the overall strategy of the RCP.

The group discussed several issues regarding the Smart Growth Concept Map including: the need to be informed if a jurisdiction's designation changes, the use of different shapes instead of just colored circles, because some people are color-blind; the relative size of the dots and what they indicate; whether funds should be evenly distributed to all place types; the need to get the most
bang for the buck; and the desirability to have incentives to facilitate movement up the classification ladder.

**Agenda Item #7: Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) Monitoring Program**

Coleen Clementson provided an update on the RCP monitoring program. She stated that the first baseline monitoring report will be issued in March 2006, which will include establishing targets. The initial targets will relate to existing federal, state, or local mandates, or to locally adopted plans. She stated that a draft of the report will be available in mid-February.

Ed Kleeman asked if the monitoring program was for the region as a whole or for individual jurisdictions.

Coleen Clementson confirmed that the monitoring report will be regional in nature.

**Agenda Item #8: 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP): Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria AD Hoc Working Group**

Elisa Arias, SANDAG staff, provided background and overview on the RTP transportation project evaluation criteria as well as the formation of an Ad Hoc Working Group to lead the update of those criteria. Ms. Arias explained the proposed composition of the Ad Hoc Working Group, which is proposed to include two volunteers from TWG.

There were no questions regarding this agenda item.

Gail Goldberg asked for volunteers for the Ad Hoc Working Group. After a brief discussion, Ms. Goldberg stated that members to the group would be named at the December 8 TWG meeting.

Stefan Marks commented that he didn’t see a bicycle/pedestrian community representative proposed for inclusion on the Ad Hoc Working Group.

Elisa Arias responded that bicycle planning representatives are located in a different function. However, bicycle interests along with walkable community and multimodal interests will be represented by various members comprising the Ad Hoc Working Group.

**Agenda Item #9: Workforce Housing Reward Program: Housing Element Requirement**

Susan Baldwin reminded the TWG of the requirements of the Workforce Housing Reward Program. The main requirement for eligibility includes having an adopted Housing Element by the jurisdiction’s governing body and submitted to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) by December 31, 2005.

Jerry Backoff asked for clarification on the date in which the housing element is found in compliance with housing element law. The program guidelines are not clear whether the date is April 1, 2006, or December 31, 2005.

Susan Baldwin answered that she reviewed the program manual guidelines on HCD procedures and the guidelines state that the date is April 1, 2006. She indicated that she would email HCD to obtain clarification on this point.
Mark Stephens, City of Chula Vista, asked whether there might be some leeway in the submittal dates because of the rigorous and lengthy housing element process.

Susan Baldwin stated that deadlines are set by state law.

Several TWG members discussed the HCD review and submittal process of the housing element.

Dennis Turner noted that federal disaster relief funds administered by the State of California through block grants to local jurisdictions are available only to cities with a state certified housing element.

Group members discussed the issue of the increase in funding sources being tied to housing element compliance.

**Agenda Item #10: Adjournment and Next Meeting**

The next regular TWG Meeting will be held on Thursday, December 8, 2005, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m. in the 7th Floor Conference Room.
SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP:
UPDATE ON TECHNICAL ISSUES, REVIEW OF DRAFT POSTER, AND NEXT STEPS

Introduction

The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) calls for the preparation of a Smart Growth Concept Map illustrating the location of existing, planned, and potential smart growth areas. The Concept Map will be used in relation to two key SANDAG initiatives: the comprehensive 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update, and determining eligibility to participate in the long-term Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) funded by TransNet.

Over the past year, SANDAG has been working with the Technical Working Group (TWG), the Stakeholders Working Group (SWG), and the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) to develop the Smart Growth Concept Map and prepare a poster for use at upcoming public workshops and presentations to show the location of and describe the different types of smart growth areas in the San Diego region.

A number of issues have arisen during the preparation of the map. Many of them are related to the broader policy issue of how strongly we should adhere to the intensity targets included in the RCP Smart Growth Matrix, or alternatively, what degree of flexibility should be allowed in making final qualification determinations with respect to identifying smart growth areas – particularly the Existing/Planned areas. These and other issues are described below.

While staff had expected that the public workshops on the Concept Map would be held in January 2006, it is now anticipated that the workshops will be held sometime during the spring. Postponing the workshops will allow staff, the working groups, and the Regional Planning Committee time to address critical remaining issues; provide the opportunity to more fully engage the city managers and members of the SANDAG Board of Directors on the Concept Map before the workshops; and allow better integration of the Smart Growth Concept Map with the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Independent Transit Planning Review, and Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA). On this note, a joint briefing with local city managers and planning directors is anticipated to be held as part of the regularly-scheduled City/County Managers Association (CCMA) lunch meeting on Thursday, January 5, 2006 at the Marriott Hotel in Del Mar.

This report provides an overview of the remaining issues that need to be addressed, and presents next steps for the completion of the Concept Map. Additionally, a revised version of the layout of the smart growth poster will be circulated at the meeting for comments.
A. Remaining Issues

The purpose of this item is to discuss the outstanding Smart Growth Concept issues listed below.

1. Boundaries and Thresholds: The following issues related to boundaries and thresholds have been identified.

   It is the opinion of SANDAG staff that the following modifications are consistent with the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

   - **Boundary Modifications:** To what extent should we consider boundary modifications in an effort to reach the intensity targets? (Examples: Santee Town Center, Solana Beach Coaster Station, Vista Village Town Center)

   - **Width of Transit Corridors:** The current width of transit corridors is 600 feet (300 feet from the center of the street, on both sides, based on the width of an average block). Should the width of the corridors be reduced or allowed to vary in width in areas with special circumstances such as topographical constraints or established single family neighborhoods that are unlikely to redevelop? (Examples: University Avenue Transit Corridor, South Escondido Boulevard Transit Corridor, East Valley Parkway Transit Corridor)

   - **Location of Transit Stop within Community Centers:** Does the transit stop or station need to serve as the centerpoint for the ¼ mile radius of Community Centers, or should flexibility be considered by shifting the radius away from the transit station to capture additional intensities? (Example: NC Metro Sprinter Station)

   SANDAG staff recommends further analysis of the following issues in conjunction with the 2007 RTP update.

   - **Transit Equivalency Factor:** At the previous TWG meeting, it was suggested that some flexibility should be provided (1) to areas that are very close to meeting their density targets if they have high employment levels, and (2) to areas that are very close to meeting their employment levels if they have high residential densities. The TWG specified that the degree of flexibility should be quantifiable and tied to transit ridership. Staff discussed the idea with the Independent Transit Planning Peer Review Panel of allowing flexibility for areas within 10 percent of the intensity targets. Although the Peer Review Panel did not know of any existing studies that would help quantify this type of flexibility, they thought the idea had merit. They also suggested that urban design and parking standards may have more affect on ridership of bus lines than density. SANDAG staff is still looking into this issue and continuing to discuss potential ways to provide some flexibility.

   - **Transit Propensity:** Escondido and other jurisdictions have raised concerns about transit corridors that do not qualify from a density standpoint as Existing/Planned Transit Corridors but do have good ridership due to demographics (age and income levels) and other factors (lack of vehicles). They have asked that consideration be given to those corridors even if they do not meet the residential density (25 du/ac) specified in the RCP. Staff also discussed this issue with the Independent Transit Planning Peer Review Panel but did not get a conclusive answer on its merits.
2. **Name of Transit Corridor Place Type:** While the title of the Transit Corridor place type implies that a corridor would qualify if it has adequate transit service and high ridership, the original intent was to identify sections of corridors where high-density housing helps support the transit services. The TWG should discuss potential ideas for re-naming the Transit Corridor place type to more clearly reflect the emphasis on land use.

3. **Other Issues:** The County of San Diego has recommended that funding for the Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) be allocated evenly by place type to reflect the variety of smart growth patterns within the region, and that a substantial portion of the SGIP funds be allocated to planning rather than construction. Staff acknowledges these recommendations and will carry them forward once we begin discussions on the program details of the SGIP. This issue will be discussed at a later date during the development of the TransNet SGIP.

**B. Next Steps**

Based on the need to better integrate the Smart Growth Concept Map, 2007 RTP, and COA; to address the technical issues listed above; and to involve the city/county managers and SANDAG Board members more extensively in the planning process, the schedule for completing the Concept Map is being refined. The following general tasks and timeframes are anticipated in this process:

- Status report to Regional Planning Committee: December 2005
- Revised "numbers" and verifications with TWG: December 2005
- **Joint briefing with local city managers and planning directors: Thursday, January 5, 2006; Marriott Hotel in Del Mar, 11:30 a.m. (Please mark your calendars)**
  - Revised Concept Map poster with TWG and SWG: January 2006
  - Initial development of performance measures / metrics related to Concept Map: December 2005
  - Initial discussion with SANDAG Board members: Early February 2006
  - Presentations to local City Councils / Board of Supervisors and other groups: March / April 2006
  - Refinements to Concept Map based on public input: May / June 2006
  - Board action on Concept Map for use in RTP update: June / July 2006

Staff will keep the TWG involved in the development of the Concept Map, and will continue to seek input on the map's content and process.

**Key Staff Contact:** Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989, cgr@sandag.org
STATUS REPORT ON DRAFT SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP

Introduction

The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) contains policy objectives and actions aimed at improving transportation and land use coordination. A key recommendation is to identify smart growth opportunity areas and place a higher priority on directing transportation facility improvements and other infrastructure resources toward those areas.

The Urban Form chapter of the RCP defines seven categories of smart growth “place types,” ranging from “metropolitan center” to “rural village.” In addition, the RCP recommends that smart growth development be planned near existing and future transit stations, as well as other appropriate locations such as rural community village cores, which can provide a focal point for commercial and civic uses that serve surrounding rural areas.

One of the RCP’s key actions is the development of a Smart Growth Concept Map illustrating the location of existing, planned, and potential smart growth areas. The Concept Map will be used in relation to two key SANDAG initiatives:

1. Updating the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), where it will help in the prioritization of transportation infrastructure investments and deployment of transit services to support smart growth development, and

2. Determining eligibility to participate in the long-term Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) funded by TransNet.

Last July, the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) reviewed a preliminary draft Smart Growth Concept Map and a series of accompanying subregional maps. Since then, SANDAG staff and the local planning directors, through the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), have continued to work on refining the smart growth areas and addressing a number of issues that have arisen from the mapping process.

In addition, the TWG and the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) have provided input on an “illustrative” version of the Concept Map that could be used during the public input process. The illustrative map is more conceptual than the preliminary map reviewed by the RPC last July. While the illustrative map still needs additional work, it will be circulated at the RPC meeting for review and comment.
The Regional Planning Committee is asked to comment on the key issues described in this report and provide input on the sample illustrative map to be circulated at the meeting.

Discussion

Uses of the Map

The Smart Growth Concept Map will be used in relation to two key SANDAG initiatives: updating the comprehensive 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and determining eligibility for the long-term TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP). The map will be used to develop the land use scenarios for the RTP, including the Regional Growth Forecast (Existing Plans and Policies) and an Enhanced Smart Growth scenario. These scenarios will be used in the environmental analysis of the RTP. The map also will be used in the update of the transportation project evaluation criteria that will occur as part of the RTP work program. These criteria are used to determine priorities for transportation funding.

In addition to the RTP, the map also will be used to determine eligibility to compete for future funding from the long-term TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program. The intent of the program is to provide incentives to plan and provide for the infrastructure to support smart growth development in our communities.

The map will be updated periodically to reflect ongoing general plan amendments and updates. Regular updates to the map will ensure accurate land use inputs into future growth forecasts and RTP updates and will allow active participation by local jurisdictions in the future SGIP.

Mapping Effort

The seven smart growth place types identified in the RCP fall into two distinct categories – “Existing and Planned Smart Growth Areas” and “Potential Smart Growth Areas.” The RCP includes recommended land use characteristics, intensity targets, and transportation system and public transit service characteristics for each of the seven place types.

Existing and planned smart growth areas are places where existing development and/or planned land uses are consistent with the recommended residential and employment land use intensities and characteristics described in the RCP’s Smart Growth Matrix, and are (or will be) served by appropriate levels of public transit. Potential smart growth areas are places where there are opportunities for smart growth development, if local land use plans and/or regional plans for transportation and transit service are changed.

The designation of smart growth areas as either Existing/Planned or Potential is important because it will affect the kind of funding that areas will be eligible to compete for in the long-term SGIP. As previously discussed with the Regional Planning Committee, Existing/Planned smart growth areas will be eligible for both planning and infrastructure grants while Potential smart growth areas will be eligible for planning grants only.

The TWG has been serving as the lead advisory group in preparing the Concept Map. Last spring, city and county planning staffs identified areas within their jurisdictions that they believed could be
classified as either Existing/Planned or Potential smart growth areas. These areas were shown on the preliminary draft map reviewed by the RPC last July.

During the summer, SANDAG staff evaluated the areas for consistency with the land use intensity thresholds and transit service levels included in the RCP Smart Growth Matrix, using SANDAG’s land use database. This verification process, as discussed in Attachment 1, has resulted in a number of questions related to the broader policy issue of what degree of flexibility should be allowed in making final determinations with respect to identifying the Existing/Planned smart growth areas, and in the recognition that the development of the Concept Map needs to be more closely related to the 2007 RTP update, the Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) currently underway by the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and the work of the Independent Transit Planning Peer Review Panel.

**Process to Refine the Concept Map**

While the TWG and the SWG have been the most actively involved advisory groups in the preparation of the Concept Map, staff has also met with the Independent Transit Planning Peer Review Panel to discuss the Concept Map on two occasions. The meetings with the Peer Review Panel have been very helpful and have led to the recognition that the various land use and transit planning efforts currently underway need stronger coordination. For example, while the current draft Concept Map relies on the transit networks included in the adopted RTP, the final Concept Map should reflect revised transit service concepts that are being recommended in the COA, the Independent Transit Planning Review, and other input into the updated Regional Transportation Plan.

In addition, various members of the Peer Review Panel have suggested that the Concept Map be less inclusive and instead focus on areas planned for significant land use intensity where major regional transit investments have already been made. This approach would maximize the region's use of existing investments in its transit system and provide additional incentives for increased development around existing and planned transit stations before expanding the transit system to areas that may generate less transit ridership.

As a result of these discussions, and in coordination with the 2007 RTP update, staff believes that it would be useful to develop several alternative “enhanced smart growth” land use / transportation scenarios based on variations of the Concept Map and transit service concepts, and to test the transportation, housing, land consumption, and environmental effects of those alternatives through the development of the 2007 RTP update.

The current Smart Growth Concept Map includes all Existing/Planned or Potential smart growth areas identified by local jurisdictions. Understanding that the region will lack sufficient funding to complete transportation improvements or provide smart growth incentive funds to all of those areas by the year 2030, the Regional Planning Committee could provide policy direction on these alternatives, which could range from the existing, all-inclusive map, to a map that focuses exclusively on areas along existing/planned red and yellow car transit service, to a map that includes areas only along the yellow transit service lines, to a combination of these. Staff could develop performance measures to test which of the alternatives best implements the RCP policy objectives associated with housing, transportation, urban form, and the environment, such as affordable housing, mode share, transit ridership, air quality, land consumption, and others.
SANDAG could also use the upcoming public workshops to obtain input on these alternative land use/transportation scenarios related to different combinations of smart growth and transit in the draft RTP and also obtain public input on the transportation networks connecting the smart growth areas.

Because of the additional coordination necessary between SANDAG, the local planning staffs, MTS, North County Transit District (NCTD), and the Independent Transit Planning Peer Review Panel, it is anticipated that the workshops will be held sometime this spring. Holding the workshops this spring will allow staff, the Regional Planning Committee, and the working groups time to address remaining issues; provide the opportunity to more fully engage the city/county managers and members of the SANDAG Board of Directors in discussions on the Concept Map before the workshops; and allow better integration of the Smart Growth Concept Map with the various efforts described above.

**Next Steps**

Based on the approach to public outreach and integration with other planning programs as outlined above, the following are the proposed next steps:

- Joint briefing with local city managers and planning directors: January 2006
- Revised illustrative map to TWG and SWG: January 2006
- Initial discussion with SANDAG Board members at Board retreat: Early February 2006
- Presentations to local City Councils / Board of Supervisors and other groups: February / March 2006
- Refinements to Concept Map and alternatives based on public input: April / May 2006
- Board action on draft Concept Map and alternatives for use in RTP update: June / July 2006

BOB LEITER  
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Overview of Process Used to Develop the Draft Smart Growth Concept Map

Key Staff Contact: Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989, cgr@sandag.org
Overview of Process Used to Develop the Draft Smart Growth Concept Map

Over the past year, staff has been working with the local planning directors in the region to identify the initial list of smart growth areas for inclusion on the Smart Growth Concept Map. The planning directors were asked to identify areas in their jurisdictions that exemplified the characteristics of the smart growth place types contained in the RCP and listed below. The planning directors also were asked to estimate whether the areas should be classified as "Existing/Planned" smart growth areas or "Potential" smart growth areas based on whether they meet the residential and employment targets contained in the table below, and whether they meet certain transit service characteristics contained in the RCP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smart Growth Place Type</th>
<th>Minimum Residential Target based on RCP</th>
<th>Minimum Employment Target based on RCP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Center</td>
<td>75 du/ac</td>
<td>80 emp/ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Center</td>
<td>40 du/ac</td>
<td>50 emp/ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>20 du/ac</td>
<td>30 emp/ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>20 du/ac</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Village</td>
<td>10.9 du/ac</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Center</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>45 emp/ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Corridor</td>
<td>25 du/ac</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the planning directors identified the areas and estimated their status (Existing/Planned or Potential), staff initiated a "verification" process to determine whether the areas met the residential and employment targets, and the associated transit service levels. (The verification process did not include analysis of urban design characteristics at this stage.)

The verification process is based on data included in SANDAG's geographic information system (GIS) databases. The information in our GIS databases is updated on a periodic basis as part of the regional growth forecast update. SANDAG is in the process of updating the regional growth forecast, and has been working with local jurisdictions to obtain local land use inputs based on their most recently updated local general plans and policies. The criteria for verifying the smart growth areas is based on:

- Projected net residential densities in 2030,
- Projected net employment densities in 2030, and
- Existing/planned transit service levels included in the existing RTP, MOBILITY 2030.

Over the summer, SANDAG staff "ran the numbers" for the smart growth areas. Initial results indicated that approximately one-fifth of the areas identified by the planning directors qualified as "Existing/Planned" smart growth areas based on the criteria listed above.

SANDAG held subregional working sessions with local planning staff members to discuss their areas; consider the addition, deletion, or modification of any areas; verify their data; and identify remaining policy and technical issues. SANDAG currently is in the process of resolving remaining issues.
DRAFT BOARD POLICY: IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES FOR THE SANDAG BOARD’S FEBRUARY 25, 2005 REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT (RHNA) MEMORANDUM

Introduction

On February 25, 2005 the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the Final Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the San Diego region for the 2005-2010 housing element cycle. In conjunction with the approval of the Final RHNA the Board approved a memorandum signed by Escondido Mayor Lori Pfeiler, Chula Vista Mayor Steve Padilla, and San Diego Councilmember Jim Madaffer (Attachment 1). This memorandum was proposed as an incentive-based compromise on the issue of the allocation of the RHNA numbers by income category. The general intent of the memorandum was to tie decisions about the allocation of discretionary local agency transportation funding to housing element compliance and housing production.

As stated in the memorandum, “Simply put...cities that are willing and able to accommodate additional housing...should be compensated through incentives that would help improve existing as well as future infrastructure.” In exchange for agreeing to Modified Alternative 1 (the RHNA income allocation that was ultimately approved by the Board), the three signatories to the memorandum proposed several incentives for jurisdictions that are providing a greater share of affordable housing now, and are willing to accommodate additional housing in the future.

Discussion

In May 2005 an ad hoc group of Regional Planning Technical Working Group members and others involved in the RHNA process began meeting to review and make recommendations on the implementation of the memorandum, and on lessons learned during the 2005-2010 RHNA process. Attached to this report are recommendations regarding the implementation of the RHNA memorandum (Attachment 1). A separate report is being written about the lessons learned during the 2005 – 2010 RHNA process that should be considered for the 2010 – 2015 RHNA process (which will need to be started in mid-2007/early 2008 based on current state law).

Members of the ad hoc working group included: Barbara Redlitz and Lisa Smith (City of Escondido); Dennis Turner and Mike Grim (City of Carlsbad); Mark Stephens and Leilani Hines (City of Chula Vista); Jerry Backoff and Karen Brindley (City of San Marcos); Bill Levin (City of San Diego); and Dixie Switzer (County of San Diego). Several additional individuals participated during the meeting in
which the group discussed the lessons learned during the RHNA process including: Tom Scott, San Diego Housing Federation; Scott Molloy, Building Industry Association; Catherine Rodman, San Diego Affordable Housing Advocates; Michael Nagy, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce; and Jim Yerdon, City of El Cajon.

The RHNA memorandum implementation guidelines will be adopted by the SANDAG Board as a Board Policy. The draft Board Policy will be presented to the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG); the Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG) (for information); the Regional Planning Committee (RPC); the Executive Committee and the SANDAG Board.

Key issues that the Technical Working Group should discuss include:

1. Proposed list of funding programs subject to or not subject to the provisions of the RHNA memorandum (Item 2.)

   The TWG should discuss the draft lists of funding programs that are proposed to be subject to or excluded from the provisions of the RHNA memorandum (Attachments 2 and 3). One funding program that has been the subject of discussion is the Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP). The EMP funds are proposed to be excluded from the RHNA memorandum provisions because these funds (for the first year) will be allocated to Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group (EMPWG) members not solely local jurisdictions.

2. Housing element screening criteria for eligibility for funding programs subject to the RHNA memorandum (Item 2.a.)

   The TWG should discuss the draft RHNA memorandum guidelines related to Item 2.a. that require housing element compliance. The draft guidelines propose that grant applications due between July 1, 2005 and December 31, 2006 shall be required to have submitted a draft housing element to the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) or have self-certified its housing element in compliance with state law. For grant applications due between January 1, 2007 and December 31, 2010 jurisdictions shall have adopted their housing element (and have been found in compliance with state law by HCD or self-certified) and, if applicable, demonstrate that they are making progress toward implementing the rezoning program in conformance with the schedule contained in their housing element.

3. Incentive points for jurisdictions in which lower income housing units are being produced in accordance with the RHNA Alternative 3 (Attachment 4) (Item 2.b.)

   The TWG should review the proposed methodology and Example Allocation of Incentive Points (Attachment 5) for giving incentive points based on the production of lower income housing. These incentive points will be allocated to projects whose applications for funding are due on or after January 1, 2007. The proposed incentive point methodology would calculate the total number of lower (total very low and low combined) income units produced each year on a cumulative basis. Also, only units that have received a certificate of occupancy or final inspection shall be counted, and lower income units that have been acquired and rehabilitated may only be counted when they were used to meet a jurisdiction’s site identification requirements associated with the RHNA numbers.
4. Annual submission of a report to SANDAG required for eligibility to apply for the discretionary funds subject to the RHNA memorandum (Item 2.c.)

The TWG should review the draft guidelines associated with the annual report as discussed below. Eligibility for discretionary funds subject to the RHNA memorandum will require jurisdictions to submit information to SANDAG that is typically included in the annual general plan/housing element report required by state law by Government Code Section 65400 on October 1 of each year. Because state law requires each jurisdiction to prepare and submit a similar report annually to HCD on that date, the preparation of this report would not require additional work for jurisdictions that prepare the state report. The draft guidelines propose that the report to SANDAG only would need to include: (1) the units produced from July 30 to June 30 for each year by income category (very low, low, moderate, and above moderate), and (2) progress toward implementing the rezoning program in the housing element needed to identify adequate sites. If this information has not been submitted to SANDAG by October 1, jurisdictions will be ineligible for funding during the following calendar year.

The first call for projects affected by the RHNA memorandum will be for the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 - Non-motorized Program/TransNet Bicycle Program, which is scheduled to occur on February 1, 2006. To qualify for this (and any other) discretionary funding for which grant applications are due before January 1, 2007, each jurisdiction will need to have submitted a draft of its housing element to HCD or have self-certified its element in compliance with state law by the project submittal deadline (March 3, 2006 in the case of the TDA Article 3 funding).
The purpose of this policy is to provide guidelines on the implementation of the memorandum adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors on February 25, 2005, prepared by Escondido Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler, Chula Vista Mayor Steve Padilla, and San Diego Councilmember Jim Madaffer in association with the adoption of the 2005 – 2010 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) (Attachment 1). The RHNA memorandum laid out specific provisions regarding SANDAG’s allocation of discretionary funding to local agency projects in relation to local jurisdiction housing element compliance and lower income housing production.

The implementation guidelines restate each provision of the RHNA memorandum and define how they will be implemented. The numbered italicized wording is taken verbatim from the memorandum; the implementation guidelines are contained in the text that follows. The implementation guidelines should be reviewed and evaluated annually for the first two years, and then on an as needed basis, to determine whether changes to the guidelines are needed.

**Pilot Smart Growth Implementation Program**

1. Jurisdictions whose 1999 lower income households as a percentage of total households is estimated to be greater than the regional average shall receive 15 bonus points (out of 100 possible) for projects requesting funding through the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. (This would include National City, El Cajon, Imperial Beach, Lemon Grove, La Mesa, Escondido, Vista, Chula Vista, San Diego, and San Marcos.)

   The provisions in Item 1 have been implemented. The Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) criteria, which were approved by the SANDAG Board on April 22, 2005, included the required bonus points for the cities noted above (22 points out of 147 points – 15 percent of the total points awarded).

**Future Discretionary Funding Allocated to Local Agency Projects**

2. In addition to the current Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program, for all future discretionary funding allocated to local agency projects by SANDAG (following the adoption by jurisdictions of housing elements for 2005-2010), the following criteria shall apply:
For the purpose of implementing Items 2.a. - 2.c. in the RHNA memorandum, "discretionary funding allocated to local agency projects by SANDAG" shall be defined as: funds allocated by SANDAG to local jurisdictions (the cities or County) through a competitive process. These funds are listed in Attachment 2 and include the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program, Transportation Development Act (TDA) Non-motorized Program, and TransNet Bicycle Program, among others.

The following types of funding shall not be subject to the provisions of the memorandum:

- Formula funds allocated by population or number of miles, because they are not allocated on a competitive basis.
- Discretionary funds allocated to Caltrans, the two transit agencies, and SANDAG, because they are not local agencies.
- Funds allocated directly by Caltrans to local jurisdictions, because SANDAG is not involved in their allocation.
- Funds allocated to local jurisdictions and other entities.

Attachment 3 provides a more detailed list of funding sources/programs that shall not be subject to the RHNA memorandum.

a. In order to qualify for such funding, a jurisdiction will be required to demonstrate that they are in compliance with provisions of their adopted housing element which set forth their commitment to providing adequate multi-family zoned land or other actions necessary to accommodate their share of lower income housing under the adopted RHNA.

To be eligible to apply for future discretionary funding allocated by SANDAG to local agency projects, local jurisdictions shall meet the following screening criteria:

1. During the first year of the housing element cycle (July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006), a jurisdiction shall have submitted a draft of its housing element to HCD or have self-certified its housing element in compliance with state law by the due date for the grant application. This screening criteria shall apply for any discretionary funding programs subject to the RHNA memorandum whose application due date is between July 1, 2005 and December 31, 2006.

2. Starting January 1, 2007, jurisdictions shall have adopted their housing elements (and have been found in compliance with state law by HCD or self-certified). Also, those jurisdictions that were not able to identify adequate sites to meet their RHNA goals and were required to include a program in their housing elements to identify additional sites by rezoning must be able to demonstrate that they are making progress toward implementing the rezoning program in conformance with the schedule contained in their housing elements.

b. Incentive points (a minimum of 25 points out of 100 possible) will be given to projects in jurisdictions in which lower income housing units are being produced in accordance with the housing unit figures contained in Alternative 3.
Item 2.b. ties the allocation of funding to the production of lower income housing through the award of incentive points based on the number of lower income housing units produced in accordance with RHNA Alternative 3 (Attachment 4) (RHNA Alternative 3 was one of several income allocation alternatives considered but not adopted during the RHNA process.)

Production of lower income housing units will be evaluated and points awarded for each application for discretionary funds based on the percentage of lower (total very low and low combined) income units that were produced in the jurisdiction. The number of lower income units will be calculated for each fiscal year (July 1 to June 30) on a cumulative basis, and compared to annualized RHNA Alternative 3 numbers. An example of the methodology to calculate the incentive points is shown in Attachment 5. Units shall be counted based on certificates of occupancy or final inspection. Lower income units that were acquired and rehabilitated may only count toward the RHNA Alternative 3 goals when this type of unit was used to meet the site identification requirements for the RHNA numbers as permitted in state law.

c. In order to verify compliance with these provisions, each jurisdiction shall annually submit a report to SANDAG indicating their progress in complying with requirements of their housing element, as well as actual production of housing units within their jurisdiction by income category, during the preceding year.

Jurisdictions shall submit a report covering the July 1 to June 30 time period to SANDAG by October 1 of each year. This report will be used for eligibility for funding programs for the following January 1 through December 31 time period. If the report has not been submitted to SANDAG by October 1, jurisdictions will be ineligible for funding during the following calendar year.

The annual report shall provide information regarding the actual production of housing units by all four income categories (very low, low, moderate, and above moderate). If the report is submitted for the first time in years two, three, four, or five of the housing element cycle, it shall include the total number of units produced by income category during each year (July 1 to June 30) of the cycle. The report also shall indicate (if relevant) progress toward complying with any rezoning programs contained in the housing element that are required to meet the adequate site identification requirements of state law.

The typical schedule for the process for the allocation of discretionary funds would be:

October 1   Annual reports due to HCD and SANDAG
November/December   SANDAG staff reviews and prepares a summary of the reports
December/January   Report to Regional Planning Technical Working Group, Regional Housing Working Group, Regional Planning Committee, and Board of Directors on results of process
December/January   SANDAG announces grant funding opportunity and call for projects
January/February   Grant applications due
March/April   Funds awarded
The first annual reports shall be due on October 1, 2006, and will cover the first year of the 2005 - 2010 housing element cycle (July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2006). SANDAG staff will review the information in the annual reports and prepare a report to the working groups and committees as shown above.

Attachments:
1. February 25, 2005 RHNA Memorandum to the SANDAG Board of Directors
2. Discretionary Funding Programs Subject to Board RHNA Memorandum
3. Funding Programs Not Subject to Board RHNA Memorandum
4. Regional Housing Needs Assessment Alternative 3
5. Example of Allocation of Incentive Points
February 25, 2005

TO: SANDAG Board of Directors
FROM: Mayor Lori Pheiler, Mayor Steve Padilla, and Councilmember Jim Madaffer
SUBJECT: Agenda Item No. 12 – Final Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

Our regional housing needs are significant – both now and in the future. Addressing these needs is often a complex process when dealing with the varied interests of the cities in our region. We are committed to doing everything we can to address our regional housing needs. Recognizing the differences between the cities, we are proposing an incentive-based compromise to the RHNA Modified Alternative 1. Simply put, for those cities that are willing and able to accommodate additional housing, those cities should be compensated through incentives that would help improve existing as well as future infrastructure.

We recommend the Board approve Modified Alternative 1, with the following provisions:

1. Jurisdictions whose 1999 lower income households as a percentage of total households is estimated to be greater than the regional average (Attachment 2, Column 1) shall receive 15 bonus points (out of 100 possible) for projects requesting funding through the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. (This would include National City, El Cajon, Imperial Beach, Lemon Grove, La Mesa, Escondido, Vista, Chula Vista, San Diego, and San Marcos.)

2. In addition to the current Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program, for all future discretionary funding allocated to local agency projects by SANDAG (following the adoption by jurisdictions of housing elements for 2005-2010), the following criteria shall apply:

   a. In order to qualify for such funding, a jurisdiction will be required to demonstrate that they are in compliance with provisions of their adopted housing element which set forth their commitment to providing adequate multi-family zoned land or other actions necessary to accommodate their share of lower income housing under the adopted RHNA.

   b. Incentive points (a minimum of 25 points out of 100 possible) will be given to projects in jurisdictions in which lower income housing units are being produced in accordance with the housing unit figures contained in Alternative 3 (Attachment 2, Column 13).

   c. In order to verify compliance with these provisions, each jurisdiction shall annually submit a report to SANDAG indicating their progress in complying with requirements of their housing element, as well as actual production of housing units within their jurisdiction by income category, during the preceding year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Program</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Timeframe Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation Enhancements (TE) Program - Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program</td>
<td>$19.1 M</td>
<td>FY 2006 to FY 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 - Non-motorized Program</td>
<td>$2.4 M (FY 2006 allocation)</td>
<td>Annual apportionments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Bicycle Program</td>
<td>$3 M</td>
<td>$1 M annually from 2006 to 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To be determined (TBD)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Bicycle, Pedestrian and Neighborhood Safety Program</td>
<td>$280 M*</td>
<td>2009 to 2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program</td>
<td>$285 M*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Senior Transportation Mini-grant Program</td>
<td>$73 M*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Rail Grade Separation Program (Funding source TBD)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• $100 M in Revenue Constrained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• $200 M in MOBILITY 2030 Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In 2002 dollars

\(^1\) In prior funding cycles, the SANDAG Board of Directors has allocated funding to local jurisdictions through a competitive process for Regional Arterial System, Traffic Signal Optimization, Highway Noise Barrier, Regional Bikeway, and Transportation Enhancements programs. To the extent that such competitive funding programs are made available in the future, they would be subject to the Board RHNA memorandum.
### Current Funding Programs

#### Federal
- Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)³
- Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ)³
- Transportation Enhancement (TE) Program³
- Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Urbanized Area Formula Program (Section 5307)
- FTA Fixed Guideway Modernization Program (Section 5309 Rail Mod)
- FTA Section 5310 Elderly & Disabled Program

#### State
- State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) – Regional Improvement Program (RIP)³
- STIP – Interregional Improvement Program (IIP)
- State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP)
- TDA Article 4 – General Public Transit Services (Fixed Transit Route Services)
- TDA Article 4.5 – Community Transit Service (Accessible Service for the Disabled)
- TDA Article 8 – Special Provisions (Express Bus and Ferry Services)
- TDA Planning and Administration
- State Transit Assistance (STA)

#### Local
- TransNet Highway Program
- TransNet Transit Program
- TransNet Local Streets & Roads Program

### Future Funding Programs

#### Federal
- same as current programs above

#### State
- same as current programs above

#### Local
1. TransNet Congestion Relief Program – Major Transportation Corridor Improvements
   a. Highway & transit capital projects
   b. Operating support for bus rapid transit (BRT) & rail transit capital improvements
2. Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP)
3. TransNet Congestion Relief Program – Transit System Services Improvements & Related Programs
4. TransNet Congestion Relief Program – Local System Improvements & Related Programs
   a. Local Street & Road Program
5. Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP)³
6. TransNet Administration and Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOIC)

---

² There are a variety of federal and state discretionary funding programs allocated directly by Caltrans that provide funding to local jurisdictions (e.g., Highway Bridge Repair & Replacement [HBRR], Safe Routes to School, etc.). Because SANDAG does not have decision-making authority over these funding programs, they would not be subject to the Board RHNA memorandum.

³ These funds would be subject to the Board RHNA memorandum, if allocated by SANDAG Board of Directors to local jurisdictions through a competitive process for local projects.
**Example**

**Allocation of Incentive Points**

December 15, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Alt.3 – Low/V.Low Income Units*</th>
<th>Annual Number Year 1</th>
<th>Number Produced Year 1</th>
<th>Percentage of Alt. 3 Year 1</th>
<th>Incentive Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>4,322</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>6,322</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>17,739</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated County</td>
<td>4,758</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Alt.3 – Low/V.Low Income Units</th>
<th>Cum. Annual Number Year 2</th>
<th>Cum. Number Produced Year 2</th>
<th>Percentage of Alt. 3 Cum. Year 2</th>
<th>Incentive Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>4,322</td>
<td>1,728</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>6,322</td>
<td>2,528</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>275%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>17,739</td>
<td>7,096</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated County</td>
<td>4,758</td>
<td>1,904</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 7.5 year number in RHNA Alternative 3 may be modified based on 5-year number included in local housing elements.