



**GROWTH MANAGEMENT
OVERSIGHT COMMISSION**

2014 ANNUAL REPORT

Threshold Review Period 7/1/12 to 6/30/13

May 1, 2014

Approved by the Planning Commission (Resolution No. PCM 13-11)

and

City Council (Resolution No. ___) on May 1, 2014

GMOC Members

Armida Torres, Chair (Business)
Carl Harry, Vice Chair (Development)
David Danciu (Southwest)
Eric Mosolgo (Environmental)
Javier Rosales (Northeast)
Leslie Bunker (Education)
Mark Liuag (Planning Commission Representative)
VACANT (Center City)
Zaneta Encarnacion (Southeast)

City Staff

Kimberly Vander Bie – Growth Management Coordinator
Patricia Salvacion – Management Assistant

City of Chula Vista
Development Services Department
276 Fourth Avenue
Chula Vista, CA 91910
(619) 691-5101

www.chulavistaca.gov

GMOC Chair Cover Memo

DATE: May 1, 2014

TO: The Honorable Mayor and City Council
Members of the Planning Commission
City of Chula Vista

FROM: Armida Torres, Chair
Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)

SUBJECT: Executive Summary - 2014 GMOC Annual Report

The GMOC appreciates the time and expertise given by the staff of various City departments, as well as the school districts, water districts, and the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) in helping us complete this year's annual report. The written and verbal reports presented to the GMOC demonstrate the commitment of these dedicated professionals to serving the citizens of Chula Vista. Special thanks to Kim Vander Bie and Patricia Salvacion who provided direct staff support to the Commission.

For the period under review, threshold standards for eight of the eleven quality of life topics were in compliance, including:

- 3.2 Police, Priority 1**
- 3.5 Parks and Recreation**
- 3.6 Fiscal**
- 3.7 Drainage**
- 3.8 Schools**
- 3.9 Sewer**
- 3.10 Air Quality**
- 3.11 Water**

In GMOC's 2013 Annual Report, we expressed concern that there was potential non-compliance with the **Parks and Recreation** threshold standard by the end of that year, based on population and development projections. We are pleased that the Parks and Recreation threshold standard was not out of compliance and that there are several parks in the pipeline to help keep it that way.

Threshold standards for the following four topics were out of compliance for this year's period under review:

- 3.1 Libraries**
- 3.2 Police, Priority 2**
- 3.3 Traffic**
- 3.4 Fire and Emergency Services**

The details of each of the above are outlined in the attached report, while summaries of the topics that were out of compliance are highlighted below:

Libraries – The Libraries threshold standard is non-compliant for the 10th successive year. The delivery of a library must remain a priority. The Millenia Development Agreement clearly requires a phasing plan for delivery of a library within one year of adopting an updated Libraries Master Plan and the GMOC urges the adoption of this Master Plan when it goes before City Council this spring.

Police - The Police Priority 2 threshold standard is non-compliant for the 16th year in a row. As mentioned in last year's report, both the GMOC and the Police Department agree that modifications to the Police threshold standards are necessary, and the Top-to-Bottom review of the Growth Management Program produced proposed changes that will be brought before Council for adoption. Once the Priority 2 threshold standard is changed, the GMOC believes that the Police Department will be able to comply with it.

Traffic – This year, one arterial segment was noncompliant with the threshold standard -- the chronically noncompliant Heritage Road between Olympic Parkway and Telegraph Canyon Road. The GMOC is concerned that this segment does not comply year after year and that the construction of Heritage Road to Main Street continues to be delayed. The Traffic Forum that the GMOC sponsored last fall was informative and beneficial to the public in providing insights on planning and expanding the circulation system, and ongoing Traffic threshold compliance conditions.

Fire – Response times failed to comply with the threshold standard for the third consecutive year. The Fire Department indicated that this is largely due to an increase in call volume but no change in staffing, resources and facilities.

Top-to-Bottom – The GMOC has an underlying concern about the status of the Growth Management Program's Top-to-Bottom review. Considerable strides had been made by this Commission towards bringing the review to completion. However, the project seems to have been sidetracked and we are concerned that all of our efforts may fade into the background. We believe it is important to adopt and incorporate the proposed changes as quickly as possible so that the Growth Management Program can function optimally.

Conclusion – The Commission recognizes its role in measuring the impact of growth on the quality of life in Chula Vista and believes that key components to a high quality of life are the economic development strategies and sustainability of the City in the face of continued growth. The GMOC appreciates the focus the City is showing towards attracting high quality jobs and companies to the City and urges continued emphasis in that endeavor. As the improving economy provides more resources to apply towards long-neglected city services, the GMOC looks forward to continued improvement in all non-compliant thresholds.

Table of Contents

GMOC CHAIR COVER MEMO	1-2
TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
1.0 INTRODUCTION	4-5
1.1 Threshold Standards	4
1.2 The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)	4
1.3 GMOC 2014 Annual Review Process	5
1.4 Growth Forecast	5
2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY	6
3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE DISCUSSIONS	7-25
3.1 Libraries	7-8
3.1.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard	7-8
3.2 Police	8-11
3.2.1 Priority 1 Threshold Standard Compliance	9-10
3.2.2 Non-Compliant Priority 2 Threshold Standard	10-11
3.3 Traffic	11-13
3.3.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard	11-12
3.3.2 Construction of Heritage Road to Main Street	12
3.3.3 Grade Separation of Palomar Street/LRT Crossing	12-13
3.4 Fire and Emergency Services	13-14
3.4.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard	13-14
3.5 Parks and Recreation	14-15
3.5.1 Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan	14-15
3.5.2 Revenue Generating Capital Improvements	15
3.6 Fiscal	15
3.6.1 Threshold Compliance	15
3.7 Drainage	16
3.7.1 Maintenance of Existing Drainage Channels	16
3.8 Schools	17-18
3.8.1 School Districts Updates	17-18
3.9 Sewer	18-19
3.9.1 Long-Term Treatment Capacity	18-19
3.10 Air Quality	19-20
3.10.1 Threshold Compliance	19-20
3.11 Water	20-21
3.11.1 Meeting Water Demands	20-21
4.0 TRAFFIC FORUM	21
5.0 FIELD TRIP	21
6.0 APPENDICES	21
6.1 Appendix A – Growth Forecast	

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Threshold Standards

In November 1987, the Chula Vista City Council adopted the Threshold Standards Policy, establishing threshold standards, or “quality-of-life” indicators, for eleven public facility and service topics, including: Air Quality, Drainage, Fire and Emergency Services, Fiscal, Libraries, Parks and Recreation, Police, Schools, Sewer, Traffic and Water. The Policy addresses each indicator in terms of a goal, objective(s), threshold standard(s), and implementation measures. Adherence to the threshold standards is intended to preserve and enhance the quality of life and environment of Chula Vista residents, as growth occurs.

1.2 The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)

The 1987 Threshold Standards Policy also established the creation of the Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC), a body appointed by City Council to provide an independent, annual review of threshold standards compliance. The GMOC is composed of nine members who represent each of the city’s four major geographic areas; a cross-section of interests, including education, environment, business, and development; and a member of the Planning Commission. All of these citizens are volunteers and this report could not have been written without the time and effort that they have put into it.

The GMOC commissioners are: Leslie Bunker, Vice Chair (Education); David Danciu (Southwest); Zaneta Encarnacion (Southeast); Carl Harry (Development); Mark Liuag (Planning Commission); Eric Mosolgo (Environmental); Javier Rosales (Northeast); and Armida Torres, Chair (Business). The Northwest position, most recently held by Russ Hall, has been vacant during this review period.

The GMOC’s review is structured around three timeframes:

1. A Fiscal Year cycle to accommodate City Council review of GMOC recommendations that may have budget implications. The 2014 Annual Report focuses on Fiscal Year July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013;
2. The second half of 2013 and beginning of 2014 to identify and address pertinent issues identified during this timeframe, and to assure that the GMOC can and does respond to current events; and
3. A five-year forecast to assure that the GMOC has a future orientation. The period from January 2014 through December 2018 is assessed for potential threshold compliance concerns.

The GMOC annually distributes questionnaires to relevant city departments and public facility and service agencies to monitor the status of threshold standards compliance. When the questionnaires are completed, the GMOC reviews them and deliberates

issues of compliance. They also evaluate the appropriateness of the threshold standards, whether they should be amended, and whether any new threshold standards should be considered.

1.3 GMOC 2014 Annual Review Process

The GMOC held nine regular meetings, one traffic forum and one field trip between October 2013 and April 2014; all were open to the public. At the regular meetings, representatives from the city departments and public agencies associated with the threshold compliance questionnaires gave presentations to the Commission and discussed the completed questionnaires (attached in Appendix B) with them. Through this process, city staff and the GMOC identified issues and recommendations, which are discussed in this report.

The final GMOC annual report is required to be transmitted through the Planning Commission to the City Council at a joint meeting, which is scheduled for May 1, 2014.

1.4 Growth Forecast

The Development Services Department annually prepares a Five-Year Growth Forecast, the latest of which was issued in September 2013. The Forecast provides departments and outside agencies with an estimate of the maximum amount of residential growth anticipated over the next five years. Copies of the Forecast were distributed with the GMOC questionnaires to help the departments and agencies determine if their respective public facilities/services would be able to accommodate the forecasted growth. The growth projections from September 2013 through December 2018 indicated an additional 10,115 residential units could be permitted for construction in the city over the next five years, (8,757 units in the east and 1,358 units in the west), for an annual average of 1,751 units in the east and 272 units in the west, or 2,023 housing units permitted per year on average, citywide.

2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

The following table indicates a summary of the GMOC's conclusions regarding threshold standards for the 2013 annual review cycle. Seven thresholds were met and four were not.

2013 ANNUAL THRESHOLD STANDARD REVIEW SUMMARY				
REVIEW PERIOD 7/1/12 THROUGH 6/30/13				
Threshold	Threshold Met	Threshold Not Met	Potential of Future Non-compliance	Adopt/Fund Tactics to Achieve Compliance
1. Libraries		X	X	X
2. Police				
Priority I	X			
Priority II		X	X	X
3. Traffic		X	X	X
4. Fire/EMS		X	X	X
5. Parks and Recreation				
<i>Land</i>	X		X	
<i>Facilities</i>	X		X	
6. Fiscal	X			
7. Drainage	X			
8. Schools				
CV Elementary School District	X			
Sweetwater Union High School District	X			
9. Sewer	X			
10. Air Quality	X			
11. Water	X			

3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE DISCUSSIONS

3.1 Libraries

Threshold Standard:

Population ratio: 500 square feet (gross) of adequately equipped and staffed library facility per 1,000 population. The city shall construct 60,000 gross square feet (GSF) of additional library space, over the June 30, 2000 GSF total, in the area east of Interstate 805 by build-out. The construction of said facilities shall be phased such that the city will not fall below the city-wide ratio of 500 GSF per 1,000 population. Library facilities are to be adequately equipped and staffed.

Threshold Finding: Non-Compliant

3.1.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard

LIBRARIES			
	Population	Total Gross Square Footage of Library Facilities	Gross Square Feet of Library Facilities Per 1000 Population
Threshold	X	X	500 Sq. Ft.
5-Year Projection (2018)	284,366	97,412 [†]	343
12-Month Projection (12/31/14)	258,664	97,412 ^{***}	377
FY 2012-13	251,613	95,412	379
FY 2011-12	249,382	92,000/95,412	369/383 ^{**}
FY 2010-11	246,496	102,000/92,000 [*]	414/387 [*]
FY 2009-10	233,692	102,000	436
FY 2008-09	233,108	102,000	437
FY 2007-08	231,305	102,000	441
FY 2006-07	227,723	102,000	448
FY 2005-06	223,423	102,000	457
FY 2004-05	220,000	102,000	464
FY 2003-04	211,800	102,000	482
FY 2002-03	203,000	102,000	502

*After closure of Eastlake Library in June 2011 [†]If the Millenia library is delivered this figure would be higher.

**After opening of Otay Ranch Town Center Branch Library in April 2012

***After addition of 2000 sf at Otay Ranch Town Center Branch Library in July 2014.

Issue: The Libraries threshold standard has not been met for the tenth consecutive year.

Discussion: As Chula Vista's population increases, so does the gap between the amount of library square footage required by the Libraries threshold standard and the actual amount of library square footage in Chula Vista. By the end of 2014, a deficit of 123 square feet per 1,000 population is projected – that is a total of approximately 32,000 square feet.

With the recent acquisition of 2,000 more square feet for the widely popular Otay Ranch Town Center Library, the projected deficit is just two square feet per 1,000 population higher than last year. The additional space is currently being converted into an area for story time, classes, community meetings and passport processing, and will have a rotating collection of books. It should be completed by summer.

As reported previously, construction of the 30,000 square foot Rancho del Rey library branch is several years away due to insufficient Public Facilities Development Impact Fees (PFDIF) funding. And the timeline for the 30,000 square-foot Millenia (EUC) library is uncertain. Per the Millenia Development Agreement, a phasing plan for delivery of the library is due within one year of adoption of an updated Libraries Master Plan, which was approved by City Council on April 8th. If neither of these future libraries is constructed within five years, the projected square footage deficit would be approximately 46,000 square feet.

In addition to shortfalls in square footage, Libraries reported that there will be insufficient staff to serve forecasted growth in the next 18 months and in five years. According to *California Library Statistics 2012*, published by the California State Library, Chula Vista's library staffing ratio per capita is in the bottom 15% of public libraries in California.

Recommendation: That City Council direct the City Manager to work with the developers of Millenia to establish a phasing plan that accelerates delivery of the Millenia library using creative financing.

Recommendation: That City Council direct the City Manager to initiate a campaign for library grants, endowments, partnerships and other funding mechanisms to support library needs.

3.2 Police

Threshold Standard:

Priority 1

Emergency Response: Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to 81% of the Priority 1 emergency calls throughout the city within seven minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority 1 calls of five minutes and thirty seconds (5.5 minutes) or less.

Priority 2

Urgent Response: Respond to 57% of the Priority 2 urgent calls throughout the city within seven minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority 2 calls of seven minutes and thirty seconds (7.5 minutes) or less.

Threshold Finding: Priority 1: Compliant
Priority 2: Non-Compliant

Threshold Standard	Percent	Time	Average Time
Emergency Response (Priority 1)	81.0%	7 minutes	5:30 min./sec.
Urgent Response (Priority 2)	57.0%	7 minutes	7:30 min./sec.
Actual	Percent	Time	Average Time
Emergency Response (Priority 1)	81.5%	7 minutes	4:57 min./sec.
Urgent Response (Priority 2)	42.7%	7 minutes	11:37 min./sec.

3.2.1 Priority 1 Threshold Standard Compliance

Priority 1 – Emergency Response Calls for Service			
	Call Volume	% of Call Responses Within 7 Minutes	Average Response Time
Threshold		81.0%	5:30
FY 2012-13	738 of 65,741	81.5%	4:57
FY 2011-12	726 of 64,386	78.4%	5:01
FY 2010-11	657 of 64,695	85.7%	4:40
FY 2009-10	673 of 68,145	85.1%	4:28
FY 2008-09	788 of 70,051	84.6%	4:26
FY 2007-08	1,006 of 74,192	87.9%	4:19
FY 2006-07	976 of 74,277	84.5%	4:59
FY 2005-06	1,068 of 73,075	82.3%	4:51
FY 2004-05	1,289 of 74,106	80.0%	5:11
FY 2003-04	1,322 of 71,000	82.1%	4:52
FY 2002-03	1,424 of 71,268	80.8%	4:55

Issue: None.

Discussion:

The GMOC is pleased that the Priority 1 threshold standard was met in Fiscal Year 2013 after being non-compliant in Fiscal Year 2012. Slightly ahead of the 81 percent threshold standard, the Priority 1 response time of 81.5 percent of calls within 7 minutes was an improvement of 2.6 percent from last year.

The “Average Response Time” component of the threshold standard has consistently been met and at 4 minutes and 57 seconds was a four-second improvement in Fiscal Year 2013.

Although the Police Department is in compliance with the Priority 1 threshold standard, they reported that “staffing levels are still a serious concern.” They have a proactive policing goal of 40%; the Patrol Division is currently at approximately 22%.

Recommendation: None.

3.2.2. Non-Compliant Priority 2 Threshold Standard

PRIORITY 2 – Urgent Response Calls for Service			
	Call Volume	% of Call Responses Within 7 Minutes	Average Response Time
Threshold		57.0%	7:30
FY 2012-13	18,505 of 65,741	42.7%	11:37
FY 2011-2012	22,121 of 64,386	41.9%	11:54
FY 2010-11	21,500 of 64,695	49.8%	10:06
FY 2009-10	22,240 of 68,145	49.8%	9:55
FY 2008-09	22,686 of 70,051	53.5%	9:16
FY 2007-08	23,955 of 74,192	53.1%	9:18
FY 2006-07	24,407 of 74,277	43.3%	11:18
FY 2005-06	24,876 of 73,075	40.0%	12:33
FY 2004-05	24,923 of 74,106	40.5%	11:40
FY 2003-04	24,741 of 71,000	48.4%	9:50
FY 2002-03	22,871 of 71,268	50.2%	9:24

These figures do not include responses to false alarms, beginning in FY 2002-03.

Issue:

The Police Priority 2 threshold standard has not been met for the 16th consecutive year.

Discussion:

There were 3,600 less Priority 2 calls in Fiscal Year 2013 than in Fiscal Year 2012; however, the threshold standard of responding to 57 percent of calls within 7 minutes was not met. At 42.7 percent, the percentage of calls improved by nearly one percent from the previous year, but is still 14.3 percent below the threshold standard.

The average response time of 11 minutes and 37 seconds was a 17-second improvement, but still 4 minutes and 7 seconds above the threshold standard of 7 minutes and 30 seconds.

During top-to-bottom review, the Police Department and the GMOC agreed that the 7-minute threshold standard is not the correct indicator for reporting response times and should be amended. Under the proposed changes, the Fiscal Year 2013 response time of 11 minutes and 37 seconds would comply with the proposed change of 12 minutes.

The Police Department continues to make procedural, staff and equipment improvements wherever possible to improve efficiency and strive for threshold compliance. They reported that an updated Security Alarm Ordinance that took effect January 1, 2014 should reduce the number of responses to false alarms “by at least 50 to 80%”. They are hiring additional Community Service Officers (CSOs) to help free up officer time and are hoping to add a full-time IT manager, as well. The mobile data computers (MDCs) in the Patrol fleet are being updated and an Automated Vehicle Locating (AVL) system for the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system is being implemented. The AVL and the new MDCs should aid dispatchers in dispatching the nearest available unit to a call.

Recommendation: That City Council direct the City Manager to work with the Police Chief to continue to monitor procedures and programs to improve response times and achieve threshold compliance.

3.3 Traffic

Threshold Standard:

Citywide: Maintain Level of Service (LOS) “C” or better as measured by observed average travel speed on all signalized arterial segments, except that during peak hours a LOS “D” can occur for no more than two hours of the day.

West of I-805: Those intersections which do not meet the standard above, may continue to operate at their current (year 1991) LOS, but shall not worsen.

Threshold Finding: Non-Compliant

3.3.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard

Issue: One arterial segment was non-compliant with the threshold standard.

Discussion: Between Fiscal Years 2012 and 2013, there was no change in the status of northbound Heritage Road from Olympic Parkway to Telegraph Canyon Road, which was the one arterial segment that continued to be

noncompliant. It exceeded the Level of Service (LOS) threshold standard by four hours (three hours at LOS D and one hour at LOS E).

SEGMENT (Limits)	DIR	LOS 2012 (Hours)	LOS 2013 (Hours)	CHANGE
Heritage Road (Olympic Parkway to Telegraph Canyon Road)	NB	D(5) E(1) Non-Compliant	D(5) E(1) Non-Compliant	None

In an effort to combat the non-compliance issue, City traffic engineers coordinated and implemented a new signal timing plan last April. However, it was not enough, so a revised timing plan is being developed.

Recommendation: That City Council direct the City Manager to continue to support City engineers in their efforts to implement improvements that will result in threshold compliance, including funding to monitor corridor timing on a continual basis.

3.3.2 Construction of Heritage Road to Main Street

Issue: Heritage Road needs to be extended to Main Street.

Discussion: According to City engineers, regional traffic modeling confirms that when the City’s roadway network is completed in accordance with build-out plans, the system will operate within the growth management threshold standards. An important link in this ultimate plan is the extension of Heritage Road as a 6-lane arterial between Olympic Parkway and Main Street.

Two lanes of Heritage Road were recently opened between Olympic Parkway and Santa Victoria Road; however the road needs to be extended to Main Street to help relieve some of the delays that have been occurring to varying degrees on Olympic Parkway.

Recommendation: That City Council direct the City Manager to support City engineers in their efforts to ensure that a minimum of two lanes of Heritage Road be constructed from Santa Victoria Road to Main Street by the end of calendar year 2014.

3.3.3 Grade Separation of Palomar Street/LRT Crossing

Issue: Funding is needed to complete the Palomar Street/Light Rail Trolley grade separation improvements that will improve traffic flow.

Discussion: As reported in GMOC’s 2013 Annual Report, an August 2012 combined technical study report between the City and SANDAG identified the Palomar Street/Light Rail Trolley (LRT) Crossing as Priority 1 for improvements.

Palomar Street is a major east/west arterial where vehicular traffic is increasing and the current at-grade crossing requires traffic to stop each time a train passes the crossing. In December 2012, the SANDAG Transportation Committee and the Board of Directors approved a Memorandum of Understanding between SANDAG and the City of Chula Vista to commence work on the environmental document for grade separating the Palomar Street LRT crossing between Broadway and Interstate 5. Design and construction funding have not yet been identified.

Recommendation: That City Council and staff work with SANDAG on securing complete funding for the Palomar Street/Light Rail Trolley grade separation.

3.4 Fire and Emergency Medical Services

Threshold Standard:

Emergency response: Properly equipped and staffed fire and medical units shall respond to calls throughout the city within seven (7) minutes in 80% (current service to be verified) of the cases (measured annually).

Threshold Finding: Non-Compliant

3.4.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard

FIRE and EMS Response Times						
Review Period	Call Volume	% of All Calls Responded to Within 7 Minutes	Average Response Time for all Calls ²	Average Travel Time	Average Dispatch Time	Average Turn-out Time
Threshold Standard:		80.0%				
FY 2013	12,316	75.7%	6:02	3:48	1:05	1:08
FY 2012	11,132	76.4%	5:59	3:43		
FY 2011	9,916	78.1%	6:46	3:41		
FY 2010	10,296	85.0%	5:09	3:40		
FY 2009	9,363	84.0%	4:46	3:33		
FY 2008	9,883	86.9%	6:31	3:17		
FY 2007	10,020	88.1%	6:24	3:30		
CY 2006	10,390	85.2%	6:43	3:36		
CY 2005	9,907	81.6%	7:05	3:31		
FY 2003-04	8,420	72.9%	7:38	3:32		
FY 2002-03 ¹	8,088	75.5%	7:35	3:43		
FY 2001-02 ¹	7,626	69.7%	7:53	3:39		
FY 2000-01	7,128	80.8%	7:02	3:18		
FY 1999-00	6,654	79.7%		3:29		

Note 1: Reporting period for FY 2001-02 and 2002-03 is for October 1, 2002 to September 30, 2003. The difference in 2004 performance when compared to 2003 is within the 2.5% range of expected yearly variation and not statistically significant.

Note 2: Through FY 2012, the data was for "Average Response Time for 80% of Calls."

Issue: The Fire threshold standard has not been met for the third consecutive year.

Discussion: The percentage of calls responded to within 7 minutes dropped less than one percent between Fiscal Year 2012 (76.4%) and Fiscal Year 2013 (75.7%). However, that is down a total of 9.3% in the past three years, and 4.3% below the threshold standard of 80%. The Fire Department attributed the decline to an increase in call volume (1,184 more).

Between Fiscal Year 2012 and Fiscal Year 2013, the number of fire calls decreased by 2.4% for a total of 4.8%, and the number of medical calls decreased by .9% for a total of 83.7%. The number of calls categorized as “Other” increased by 3.28% for a total of 11.5%.

The Fire Department has been monitoring and addressing response times with the companies that are not meeting the standard. In addition, they purchased the FirstWatch real time data and notification program to help address concerns related to dispatch and turnout.

Recommendation: That City Council direct the City Manager to continue to direct the Fire Department to implement effective measures that will ensure that the threshold standard will be met.

3.5 Parks and Recreation

Threshold Standard:

Population Ratio: Three acres of neighborhood and community park land with appropriate facilities per 1,000 residents east of I-805.

Threshold Finding: Compliant

3.5.1 Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan

Issue: A council-approved Parks and Recreation Master Plan update continues to be delayed.

Discussion: City staff had anticipated bringing the draft Parks and Recreation Master Plan (PRMP) update to City Council in 2013. Since that did not occur, they are aiming for the end of 2014, but it is subject to completing park planning efforts within the Otay Ranch’s future University Villages that are still being processed for entitlement approvals. Those villages (3, 8 East, 9 and 10) anticipate new park acreages and park locations beyond what was envisioned in the former draft PRMP from December 2010.

Since unforeseen delays in the entitlement processes could continue to postpone adoption of an updated Master Plan, the GMOC would prefer

that the most recent draft of the updated plan be approved, and additional updates be made as necessary.

Recommendation: That City Council approve the updated Parks and Recreation Master Plan by the end of 2014 and make additional updates as necessary.

3.5.2 Revenue Generating Capital Improvements

Issue: The City needs to continue maximizing opportunities to generate revenue for parks and expansion of recreation services.

Discussion: The GMOC is pleased that reservations for gazebos and picnic shelters continue to increase and that the City leases recreation facilities on Sundays to increase revenue. However, we would like the Recreation Department to continue to explore programs and/or capital improvements that would help generate recurring revenue.

Recommendation: That City Council direct the City Manager to seek opportunities for potential capital improvements that will provide new services and recreation to the community while generating revenue to offset recurring costs for new and existing parks.

3.6 Fiscal

Threshold Standards:

1. The GMOC shall be provided with an annual fiscal impact report which provides an evaluation of the impacts of growth on the City, both in terms of operations and capital improvements. This report should evaluate actual growth over the previous 12-month period, as well as projected growth over the next 12- to 18-month period, and 5- to 7-year period.
2. The GMOC shall be provided with an annual Development Impact Fee (DIF) Report, which provides an analysis of development impact fees collected and expended over the previous 12-month period.

Threshold Finding: Compliant

3.6.1 Threshold Compliance

Issue: None.

Discussion: In last year's GMOC report, the Commission recommended that City Council adopt a debt service payment policy, and we are pleased that this recommendation was fulfilled last January.

3.7 Drainage

Threshold Standards:

1. Storm water flows and volumes shall not exceed city engineering standards as set forth in the subdivision manual adopted by city council Resolution No. 11175 on February 23, 1983, as may be amended from time to time.
2. The GMOC shall annually review the performance of the city's storm drain system to determine its ability to meet the goals and objectives above.

Threshold Finding: Compliant

3.7.1 Maintenance of Existing Drainage Channels

Issue: Adequate funding for channel maintenance continues to be a problem.

Discussion: Increased maintenance of the City's storm water conveyance system would provide a higher level of service. However, additional funding is necessary.

In June 2013, new Regional Water Quality Control Board regulations (Permit No. R9-2013-0001) became effective and the City began a two-year transition period to identify the best strategies to meet the new requirements, which may necessitate increased storm drain maintenance activities; baseline water quality levels are being monitored to determine the extent.

Additional funds and resources will be necessary for the City to implement the new regulations within 18 months of the reissued permit.

Recommendation: That City Council direct the City Manager to support engineering staff to closely monitor the status of the storm water conveyance system to ensure sufficient operation and continued threshold standard compliance.

Recommendation: That City Council identify funding to 1) implement locally mandated storm water flow regulations designed to avoid potential flooding and/or health issues; and 2) to stay in compliance with Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements.

3.8 Schools

Threshold Standard:

The city shall annually provide the two local school districts with a 12- to 18-month development forecast and request an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecast and continuing growth. The districts' replies should address the following:

1. Amount of current capacity now used or committed;
2. Ability to absorb forecasted growth in affected facilities;
3. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities;
4. Other relevant information the district(s) desire(s) to communicate to the city and the Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC).

The growth forecast and school district response letters shall be provided to the GMOC for inclusion in its review.

Threshold Finding: CVESD – Compliant
SUHSD – Compliant

3.8.1 **School Districts Updates**

Issue: New schools will be needed in the next 2-3 years to accommodate projected growth.

Discussion: Chula Vista Elementary School District and Sweetwater Union High School District are starting to feel some growing pains in eastern Chula Vista, and both districts reported that new schools will be needed by 2016 or 2017. Summaries of the schools are below.

Chula Vista Elementary School District

Based on current growth projections, a K-6 school in Otay Ranch Village 2 will be necessary by the 2016/17 school year. However, the school district indicated that the cost of the school site is more expensive than they had planned and they are continuing to negotiate with the developer so that they can acquire the necessary land for the school.

Sweetwater Union High School District

For the first time in five years, enrollment has increased in the Sweetwater Union High School District. And, based on the amount of growth projected over the next five years, construction of Middle School No. 12 and High School No. 14 at Hunte Parkway and Eastlake Parkway will be necessary by 2017. Plans are already complete for this proposed joint facility on school sites that have already been acquired. However,

since the plans are five years old, they need to be updated to accommodate common core curriculum changes and building code amendments.

Recommendation: That City Council encourage the school districts to continue being proactive in identifying funding and school sites so that schools will be constructed before the need becomes more critical.

3.9 Sewer

Threshold Standards:

1. Sewage flows and volumes shall not exceed City Engineering Standards as set forth in the subdivision manual adopted by city council Resolution No. 11175 on February 12, 1983, as may be amended from time to time.
2. The city shall annually provide the San Diego Metropolitan Sewer Authority with a 12- to 18-month development forecast and request confirmation that the projection is within the city's purchased capacity rights and an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecast and continuing growth, or the city engineering department staff shall gather the necessary data. The information provided to the GMOC shall include the following:
 - a. Amount of current capacity now used or committed;
 - b. Ability of affected facilities to absorb forecasted growth;
 - c. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities;
 - d. Other relevant information.

The growth forecast and authority response letters shall be provided to the GMOC for inclusion in its review.

Threshold Finding: Compliant

3.9.1 Long-Term Treatment Capacity

Sewage Flow and Treatment Capacity					
Million Gallons per Day (MGD)	FY 11/12	FY 12/13	18-month Projection	5-year Projection	"Build-out" Projection*
Average Flow	15.935	15.734	16.870**	18.583**	26.2*
Capacity	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864

*Buildout Projection based on 2005 Chula Vista Wastewater Master Plan

**Growth rate per the "Residential Growth Forecast Years 2013 through 2018"

Issue: None.

Discussion: Once again, Sewer is in compliance with the threshold standard and is projected to remain in compliance for the next ten years. As the city begins to approach build-out projections, however, additional treatment capacity will need to be obtained. Staff is working on updating the 2005 Master Plan in order to verify the build-out treatment capacity needs of the City. Two “cost per gallon” options for acquiring additional treatment capacity are being considered: 1) Constructing a sewer treatment facility in Chula Vista; or 2) Purchasing additional treatment capacity rights from other agencies within the San Diego Metropolitan System.

Recommendation: None.

3.10 Air Quality

Threshold Standard:

The GMOC shall be provided with an Annual Report which:

1. Provides an overview and evaluation of local development projects approved during the prior year to determine to what extent they implemented measures designed to foster air quality improvement pursuant to relevant regional and local air quality improvement strategies.
2. Identifies whether the city’s development regulations, policies, and procedures relate to, and/are consistent with current, applicable federal, state, and regional air quality regulations and programs.
3. Identifies non-development related activities being undertaken by the city toward compliance with relevant federal, state, and local regulations regarding air quality, and whether the city has achieved compliance.
The city shall provide a copy of said report to the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) for review and comment. In addition, the APCD shall report on overall regional and local air quality conditions, the status of regional air quality improvement implementation efforts under the Regional Air Quality Strategy and related federal and state programs, and the effect of those efforts/programs on the city of Chula Vista and local planning and development activities.

Threshold Finding: Compliant

3.10.1 Threshold Compliance

Issue: Additional air monitoring is desired.

Discussion: During the period under review, Chula Vista’s development standards continued to meet or exceed regional, state, and federal air quality regulations.

In December 2012, the Environmental Protection Agency tightened the annual standard for fine particles PM2.5 (the smallest inhalable particles) from 15 to 12 micrograms per cubic meter and this stricter standard has been met throughout San Diego County.

The San Diego Air Pollution Control District (APCD) operates nine real-time, ambient air quality monitoring stations throughout the region, including one station in Chula Vista. However, the GMOC would like more monitoring stations in the Chula Vista area to obtain more data.

Recommendation: That the City advocate for at least one more air monitoring station in Chula Vista.

3.11 Water

Threshold Standards:

1. Developer will request and deliver to the city a service availability letter from the water district for each project.
2. The city shall annually provide the San Diego County Water Authority, the Sweetwater Authority, and the Otay Municipal Water District with a 12- to 18-month development forecast and request evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecast and continuing growth. The districts' replies should address the following:
 - a. Water availability to the city and planning area, considering both short- and long-term perspectives;
 - b. Amount of current capacity, including storage capacity, now used or committed;
 - c. Ability of affected facilities to absorb forecast growth;
 - d. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities;
 - e. Other relevant information the district(s) desire to communicate to the city and GMOC.

Threshold Finding: Compliant

3.11.1 Meeting Water Demands

Issue: None.

Discussion: Otay Water District and Sweetwater Authority serve the City of Chula Vista, and both reported that they will be able to meet the water demands of anticipated growth over the next five years. Specific data is available in the Otay Water District and Sweetwater Authority questionnaires, located in Appendix B of this report.

Otay Water District

The Otay Water District (OWD) provided a list of the maintenance, replacement, and/or upgrade projects within the Fiscal Year 2014 six-year

Otay Water District capital improvement program (CIP) that are planned and anticipated to be needed to serve the City of Chula Vista. They have effectively anticipated growth, managed the addition of new facilities, and documented water supply needs.

Additional water supply sources are continually under investigation by OWD, with the most significant potential source being the Rosarito, Mexico desalination facility. Projected to ultimately produce 100 MGD of potable water, there is the potential for up to 50 MGD to be purchased by Otay Water District. Significant regulatory and permitting issues need to be resolved before this project can be deemed viable, but the current outlook is promising. The Presidential permit process is underway as well as discussions with the State of California regarding treatment requirements.

Sweetwater Authority

The majority of Sweetwater Authority's planned improvements to pipelines, valves and other facilities are listed in the 2010 Water Distribution System Master Plan. This includes the Desalination Facility Expansion project that has been designed and is ready for construction to begin in early 2015. In addition, Sweetwater plans to replace approximately three miles of 36-inch water transmission pipeline through Bonita Valley, which is critical for continued long-term water supply to the City of Chula Vista.

Recommendation: None.

4.0 TRAFFIC FORUM

On October 24, 2013, the GMOC sponsored a traffic forum for the citizens of Chula Vista to update them on threshold standard compliance and road improvements that are currently underway or planned in the short-term (18 months) and long-term (five years). Several members of the public attended and viewed presentations given by City staff and representatives from Caltrans and SANDAG.

5.0 FIELD TRIP

On January 11, 2014, City staff and Mayor Cox took the GMOC and a few members of the public on a field trip that covered every corner of the City. The itinerary included sites of future development, projects currently being developed, and projects that have been completed.

6.0 APPENDICES

6.1 Appendix A – Growth Forecast

6.2 Appendix B – Threshold Compliance Questionnaires