

Draft Rancho Bernardo Facilities Financing Plan

Comments for the City of San Diego

Page 3 - Rancho Bernardo Summary

1. The discussion of the division of planning in San Diego will be obsolete upon adoption of the General Plan Update. It does not seem appropriate to discuss issues that will be out of date before the final plan is even printed.
2. Rancho Bernardo is designated as Planned Urbanizing, not Urbanized. Is there any difference in the way impact fees are determined for Planning Urbanizing communities versus Urbanized communities?
3. Take out all references to the San Ysidro community.
4. Sentences are out of order in paragraph 2.
5. How was the total number of ADTs from the community generated? Does this figure include recent proposals to convert industrial land to multi-tenant office use? This is extremely important as this number is apparently used to determine the transportation component of the DIF.
6. The summary of uses within the community provided at the top of page 4 should include square footage of industrial uses as well.

Page 4 - Existing Public Facilities and Future Needs

1. Please provide the information regarding what percent of the transportation needs will be funded through the DIF and what percent will require the identification of other funding sources.
2. Last sentence on page 4 should read “New development *that is consistent with the current land use designations in the community plan* will not be required to contribute to the existing transportation system.
3. On page 5, there is a reference to the San Ysidro community. That statement should be deleted.
4. The percentages on page 6 need to be provided.

Page 8 - New Projects

1. Project 31-25 is no longer included as a proposed project.

2. The proposed library expansion (Project 31-10A) should be included as a new project.
3. The Escala Drive sidewalk project (west side of the road) should be added here as a new project (refer to our comments regarding the individual project sheets).

Page 14 - Distribution of Project Costs and Fee Determination

1. Please explain why an ADT of 7 is used for Rancho Bernardo, a planned urbanizing community. This seems low if single family units generate 10 ADTs and multiple family units generate 8 ADTs. The Mobility 2030 report indicates that a figure of 8.1 ADTs for each household should be used for determining traffic generation from residential units. Please explain why this figure is not being used here.
2. On page 15, there is a discussion of library needs; however, there is no justification provided for the \$560 cost per unit for library fees. Please include the information necessary to explain this fee.
3. Please explain why no fees will be collected for fire needs. Our fire station was built prior to 1969. The Rancho Bernardo Community Council is currently reviewing the need for major upgrades at this out-dated fire station. If we cannot use DIF funds for upgrading the fire station, how can these much needed upgrades be funded? Also, how would plan amendment proposals and increases related to City of Villages proposals impact existing fire service? Would future development that is inconsistent with the currently adopted plan be required to fund upgrades needed to the fire station to accommodate increased density?

Page A-1 – Appendix A

1. Is the pricing list for Mission Valley applicable to Rancho Bernardo? If so, a foot note should be provided that indicates this.

Page 17a (Table 1) - Facilities Summary

1. This table does not appear to adequately address future costs and identified funding sources. For instance, project 31-1 has a cost of \$6,780,000 with \$2,000,000 indicated as identified funding; however, Caltrans will actually be providing \$6,000,000. The unidentified funding needs for this project are therefore only \$780,000. Please explain how this difference affects the determination of how funds from the DIF are allocated. Also, does this project cost include all required traffic signals at this freeway interchange?
2. Why is the full cost of project 31-2 not included in the basis for the DIF?
3. Why is project 31-3, a completed project, included as the basis for the DIF? This completed project should be replaced with a new project that proposes the construction of a sidewalk on the west of Escala Drive.

4. Project 31-4 should be eliminated from the project list as this project will never be implemented and should be removed from the community plan.
5. We are concerned that project 31-6 could result in major visual impacts along Rancho Bernardo Road between 1-15 and Bernardo Center Drive. The center landscaped median was recently replanted in association with the interchange improvements completed by 4S Ranch. How can additional widening be accomplished in the existing right-of-way? If additional work is done along this segment of Rancho Bernardo Road, who would pay for the required changes to the center median? Would the olive trees still be accompanied under this proposal?
6. Why is project 31-5, a completed project, included as the basis for the DIF?
7. Why is project 31-6, a project to be funded by developer fees, included as the basis for the DIF?
8. Has project 31-7 been completed and why is it included if it is to be funded by developer fees for projects that have already been approved and are being constructed?
9. The project sheet for project 31-8 indicates a funding requirement of \$140,000 but Table 1 shows a cost of \$110,000. The cost of the project should be corrected to be consistent throughout the document.
10. Why is project 31-12, a completed project, included as the basis for the DIF?
11. Why is project 31-17, a completed project, included as the basis for the DIF?
12. Why is project 31-19, a project already funded with CMAQ funds, included as the basis for the DIF?
13. The cost of project 31-20 is indicated in the table as \$150,000 with no identified funding source, while the project sheet for 31-20 indicates a project cost of \$750,000 of which all would be funded with CMAQ funds. Please make the necessary corrections.
14. The table indicates that project 31-21 has no identified funding, yet according to the project sheet, this project is funded with CMAQ funds and has been completed. Please make the necessary corrections.
15. There is no project sheet for project 31-28. Please provide the backup information necessary to describe the need for \$358,800 to fund street and sidewalk improvements.
16. Why is project 31-9, a completed project, included as the basis for the DIF?
17. Why is project 31-10, a completed project, included as the basis for the DIF?

Project Sheets

1. Completed projects should be removed or placed at the back to avoid confusion.
2. We would like to recommend that Phase III of project 31-2 be divided into two sub-phases – a southbound and a northbound project. The southbound project may be funded by mitigation requirements of developers in the industrial park. This portion of the project should occur as soon as the developer is ready to implement the improvements or has provided the City with the funds necessary to complete this portion of Phase III.
3. Project 31-3 has been completed. We would like to see a new project added that proposes the construction of a sidewalk on the west side of Escala Drive through this same area.
4. Project 31-4 should be removed as a project, as it will never be constructed.
5. Has project 31-7 been completed?
6. The graphic provided for project 31-16 should be revised to indicate only that portion of Bernardo Center Drive that would be affected by this project.
7. Has project 31-20 been completed?
8. The information for project 31-28 is incorrect.