



GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

2015 ANNUAL REPORT

Threshold Review Period 7/1/13 to 6/30/14

April 23, 2015

*Approved by the Planning Commission (Resolution No. PCM 14-11) and
City Council (Resolution No. 2014-___) on April 23, 2015*

GMOC Members

Armida Torres, Chair (Business)
Leslie Bunker, Vice Chair (Education)
David Danciu (Southwest)
Eric Mosolgo (Environmental)
Javier Rosales (Northeast)
Mark Liug (Planning Commission Representative)
Michael Lengyel (Development)
Raymundo Alatorre (Northwest)
VACANT (Southeast)

City Staff

Kimberly Vander Bie – Growth Management Coordinator
Patricia Salvacion – Secretary
Scott Donaghe – Principal Planner
Ed Batchelder – Planning Manager

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: April 23, 2015

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

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

SUBJECT: Executive Summary - 2015 GMOC Annual Report

The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) is pleased to submit its 2015 annual report for your consideration and action. In reviewing information for this year's report, it was discovered that the same four threshold standards were non-compliant as reported last year.

Threshold Standards for seven of the eleven quality-of-life topics were found to be compliant, including: Air Quality, Drainage, Fiscal, Parks and Recreation, Schools, Sewer and Water. Threshold standards found to be non-compliant were Fire and Emergency Medical Services, Libraries, Police Priority 1 and 2, and Traffic. While the details of each are outlined in the attached report, the GMOC would like to highlight a few items of special interest.

Fire and Emergency Medical Services – For the fourth consecutive year, response times failed to comply with the threshold standard, which the Fire Department attributed to the existing network of fire stations within the city. They stated that this issue will resolve itself at build-out, according to the 2014 Fire Facility Master Plan. The GMOC was alarmed to hear the fire response issue may not be resolved until that time.

The performance of 20% of the calls, primarily from stations 6, 7 and 8 in eastern Chula Vista, caused the threshold standard to be non-compliant. Narrowing down the specific problems and implementing remedies should not be that complicated, and the GMOC urges the Fire Department to address this. The Fire Chief stated that, historically, response time data has not been shared with the rank and file. However, the strategic plan that the department is working on will include goals involving individuals at all levels within the department to help improve response times. The GMOC believes this and other measures outlined in the report would be a good start.

The Fire Department also spoke about their use of the 911 First Watch dashboard program, which provides instant feedback on a call-by-call basis to each unit. It was discovered that this software had been disconnected and was not being utilized. At this time, the issues with the software are not reconcilable and, therefore, a potentially valuable tool in improving response times is not being utilized.

Libraries – For the eleventh consecutive year, Libraries is non-compliant. The Libraries Strategic Facilities Plan approved by City Council last April confirmed that a minimum of 500 square feet of library space per 1,000 residents is the standard that the City should be using, yet the City's library square footage continues to be grossly low, with a deficit of more than 30,000 square feet and growing. The GMOC supports the Library Director's determination to explore creative approaches to provide library services to the citizens of

the city and to go outside the box to find grant sources. However, the fact remains that the City is short one entire library, and that is not acceptable. In addition, there is concern regarding prolonged deferred maintenance for existing facilities. In light of the tremendous shortage of new library space, the maintenance of existing space is critical and must be a priority.

Police – Although the **Priority 1** threshold standard was found to be non-compliant for the second time in three years, response times are expected to improve as staffing models fall into place and the new threshold standard takes effect. The Police Department continues to improve upon the staffing issues identified in previous reports and the GMOC is pleased that a high standard of hiring the finest caliber is held in place as the Police Chief focuses on adding officers to fill vacancies, which was as high as 22 at one point, and is currently down to 13.

The **Priority 2** threshold standard was non-compliant for the 17th year in a row. However, it would have been compliant with the new threshold standard that will go into effect in the next review period.

Traffic – Once again, the northbound Heritage Road segment between Olympic Parkway and Telegraph Canyon Road failed to comply with the threshold standard. It has been consistently out of compliance for several years, in either the northbound or southbound direction. According to the City's traffic engineers, level of service improvements to this short segment are expected to occur when Heritage Road is extended south to Main Street.

City staff reported that, during this review period, there were several arterial segments that were not measured because results would have been skewed due to construction. Despite the lack of data, the GMOC has an overall sense that traffic is becoming more congested throughout the City. We will continue to monitor traffic carefully and look forward to seeing a full report on all arterial segments.

The GMOC is pleased that the top-to-bottom process has been completed and would like to thank the City Council for their diligence in approving the proposed changes to the Growth Management Program, which included changes to the growth management ordinance and creation of the *Growth Management Implementation Manual*. The final products were the result of many hours of work from many dedicated individuals seeking to improve the Growth Management Program to best serve the residents of our City. The GMOC looks forward to working with the revised threshold standards for next year's report.

The GMOC appreciates the time and professional expertise provided by the staff of various city departments (as well as the school districts, the water districts, and the Air Pollution Control District) for their input on this year's annual report, specifically a big thank you to Kim Vander Bie, Patricia Salvacion, Scott Donaghe and Ed Batchelder for their continued support and guidance. The written and verbal reports presented to the GMOC demonstrate the commitment of these dedicated individuals to serve the citizens of the City of Chula Vista.

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 2015 Annual Review Process	5
1.4 Growth Forecast	5
2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY	6
3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE DISCUSSIONS	7-22
3.1 Libraries.....	7-9
3.1.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard	7-9
3.1.2 Renovation of Civic Center Library	9
3.1.3 Expanding Opportunities	
3.2 Police	10-12
3.2.1 Non-Compliant Priority 1 Threshold Standard	10-11
3.2.2 Non-Compliant Priority 2 Threshold Standard	12
3.3 Traffic	13
3.3.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard	13
3.4 Fire and Emergency Services.....	14-15
3.4.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard	14-15
3.5 Parks and Recreation.....	15-16
3.5.1 Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan	15-16
3.6 Fiscal	16
3.6.1 Threshold Compliance	16
3.7 Drainage	17
3.7.1 Threshold Compliance	17
3.8 Schools.....	17-18
3.8.1 School Districts' Updates	18
3.9 Sewer.....	19-20
3.9.1 Long-Term Treatment Capacity	19-20
3.10 Air Quality	20-21
3.10.1 Threshold Compliance	20-21
3.11 Water	21-22
3.11.1 Threshold Compliance	21-22
4.0 TOP-TO-BOTTOM: CHANGES TO THE CITY'S GROWTH MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	22
5.0 DEVELOPMENT TOUR	22
6.0 APPENDICES	22
6.1 Appendix A – Growth Forecast	
6.2 Appendix B – Threshold Compliance Questionnaires	

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 topic 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 comprised 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: Armida Torres, Chair (Business); Leslie Bunker, Vice Chair (Education); David Danciu (Southwest); Eric Mosolgo (Environmental); Javier Rosales (Northeast); Mark Liuag (Planning Commission); Michael Lengyel (Development); and Raymundo Alatorre (Northwest). The Northeast position 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 2015 Annual Report focuses on Fiscal Year July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014;
2. The second half of 2014 and beginning of 2015 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 2015 through December 2019 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 2015 Annual Review Process

The GMOC held nine regular meetings and one development tour field trip between October 2014 and April 2015; 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 April 23, 2015.

1.4 Growth Forecast

The Development Services Department annually prepares a Five-Year Growth Forecast, the latest of which was issued in September 2014. 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 2014 through December 2019 indicated an additional 10,827 residential units could be permitted for construction in the city over the next five years, (9,760 units in the east and 1,067 units in the west), for an annual average of 1,952 units in the east and 213 units in the west, or 2,165 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 2014 annual review cycle. Seven thresholds were met and four were not.

2014 ANNUAL THRESHOLD STANDARD REVIEW SUMMARY				
REVIEW PERIOD 7/1/13 THROUGH 6/30/14				
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		X
Priority II		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 Feet of Library Facilities	Gross Square Feet of Library Facilities Per 1000 Population
Threshold	500 Sq. Ft.		
5-Year Projection (2019)	267,427	97,412	364
12-Month Projection (12/31/15)	257,362	97,412	378
FY 2013-14	256,139	97,412	380
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
FY 2001-02	195,000	102,000	523
FY 2000-01	187,444	102,000	544

*After closure of Eastlake Library in 2011

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

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

Discussion: Despite population growth in Chula Vista, the libraries square footage deficit remained steady during this review period due to a 2,000-square-foot expansion (dubbed “The Hub”) at the Otay Ranch Town Center Library Branch in the fall of 2014. However, the total square footage of libraries is still at least 30,000 square feet less than the threshold standard requires, and is on course to get worse over the next decade as Chula Vista’s population increases and funding for additional facilities remains uncertain. The lease for the Otay Ranch Library is scheduled to expire at the end of 2017, which would result in a loss of 5,412 square feet of library space.

The GMOC would like to see the Otay Ranch Library lease extended until the Millenia library is built. According to the 2009 Millenia Development Agreement, a timetable for delivery of the library would occur within one year of completion of the updated Libraries Master Plan. Council approved the Master Plan in April 2014 and City management is currently in discussions with the developer about extending the trigger. Granting an extension, however, would be contradictory to what the GMOC recommended in last year’s report when it recommended:

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.

And the City’s response was: *The Library and City Manager will work with the developers of Millenia to explore opportunities for accelerating delivery of a new library.*

In addition to insufficient square footage of facilities, the existing facilities were not being fully utilized during the review period because of inadequate equipment and staffing. In Fiscal Year 2014, the baseline budget provided by the city’s General Fund equaled 16 cents per capita for books, digital resources, magazines, etc. With help from Friends of the Library and additional grants and donations, the total amount rose to about 50 cents per capita, far below the statewide average annual materials expenditure of \$2.68 per capita.

In terms of staffing, Chula Vista’s library staffing ratio per capita is in the bottom 15% of public libraries in California, according to the most recent statistical data available (California Library Statistics 2013, published by the CA State Library). The statewide staffing average is 3,429 persons served by each library full-time employee. In Chula Vista, the ratio is 6,562 persons served by each library full-time employee.

Recommendation: That City Council direct the City Manager to negotiate extension of the Otay Ranch Town Center Library Branch until the library at Millenia is built, and actively campaign for library grants, endowments, partnerships and other funding mechanisms to support library needs.

3.1.2 Renovation of Civic Center Library

Issue: The Civic Center Library needs to be renovated to maximize use of available space.

Discussion: The Civic Center Branch is showing the effects of prolonged deferred maintenance (as is the South Branch), and is the oldest “main library” in any city in San Diego County without a major renovation completed or planned. The basement of the Civic Center Library is underutilized and, if renovated, could be a great community space or source of revenue from potential tenants. The GMOC strongly urges the City Council to take action and make the Civic Center Library a priority.

Recommendation: That City Council direct the City Manager to maximize use of available space by finding funding to renovate the Civic Center Library, focusing on the underutilized basement so that it could be accessible to the community, or serve as a revenue resource from potential tenants.

3.1.3 Expanding Opportunities

Issue: Opportunities to generate substantial revenue for libraries must continue to be aggressively pursued.

Discussion: The *Chula Vista Public Library Strategic Vision Plan* (February 2014) states that one of the themes that arose during the course of the development of the Strategic Vision Plan was “having tiers of service, even offering opportunities for revenue generation at enhanced levels.” The GMOC is supportive of enhanced levels of service and any other opportunities to generate revenue, including integrating leasable space into existing and/or future facilities to supplement ongoing operational expenses. The Library Director reported that the City has had discussions with various schools about leasing some existing library space and the GMOC supports that option, as well.

Also, as future parks are constructed, especially the 70-acre park in Otay Ranch, shared use of parks and recreation facilities and library facilities should be strongly considered. For example, a performing arts venue, community meeting rooms and WiFi centers or computer rooms could be incorporated into recreation facilities.

Recommendation: That City Council direct the City Manager to continue seeking opportunities within the library system for potential revenue generation, and support mixed use of parks and recreation and library facilities.

3.2 Police

Threshold Standard:

Priority 1

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

Priority 2

Urgent Response: Respond to 57% of Priority 2 urgent calls within seven minutes and maintain an average response time to all Priority 2 calls of 7.5 minutes or less.

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

3.2.1 Non-Compliant Priority 1 Threshold Standard

Priority 1 – Emergency Response Calls or Services			
	Call Volume	% of Call Responses Within 7 Minutes	Average Response Time
Threshold Standard		81.0%	5:30
FY 2013-2014	711 of 65,645	79.3%	4:57
FY 2012-2013	738 of 65,741	81.5%	4:57
FY 2011-2012	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
FY 2001-02¹	1,539 of 71,859	80.0%	5:07
FY 2000-01	1,734 of 73,977	79.7%	5:13
FY 1999-00	1,750 of 76,738	75.9%	5:21
CY 1999²	1,890 of 74,405	70.9%	5:50

¹ All figures after FY 2000-2001 (as well as Priority 2 figures on the next page) reflect a change in citizen-initiated call reporting criteria. Prior to FY 01-02, citizen-initiated calls were determined according to call type; they are now determined according to received source.

² The FY98-99 GMOC report used calendar 1999 data due to the implementation of the new CAD system in mid-1998.

Issue: The threshold standard was not met.

Discussion: For the second time in three years, compliance with the “Percentage of Call Responses within 7 Minutes” portion of the Threshold Standard was not met. It fell 1.7% short of the 81% standard.

The “Average Response Time” component of the Threshold Standard has been met for several consecutive years, and at 4 minutes and 57 seconds was the same as in Fiscal Year 2013.

The Police Department attributed missing the Threshold Standard to chronically low staffing in the Community Patrol Division and indicated that they have invested in marketing, hired a full-time recruiter, and hired 35 new officers. They have reduced the training program for new recruits from 6 months to 4 months and have been striving to reduce the number of vacancies, which was as high as 22 at one point, but is now down to 13.

Recommendation: That the City Council direct the City Manager to monitor the retention and recruitment programs and procedures for police officers so that the department will be properly staffed and response to Priority 1 calls can improve.

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 Standard		57.0%	7:30
FY 2013-2014	17,817 of 65,645	42.7%	11:26
FY 2012-2013	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

Issue: The Police Priority 2 threshold standard has not been met for the 17th consecutive year.

Discussion: The number of Priority 2 calls went down by almost 700 from Fiscal Year 2013 to Fiscal Year 2014; however, the threshold standard of responding to 57 percent of calls within 7 minutes was still not met. At 42.7 percent, the percentage of calls responded to within 7 minutes was the same in Fiscal Year 2014 as it was in Fiscal Year 2013, which was 14.3 percent below the threshold standard.

The average response time of 11 minutes and 26 seconds was an 11-second improvement, but still 3 minutes and 56 seconds above the threshold standard of 7 minutes and 30 seconds. However, as a result of the top-to-bottom process, the Priority 2 threshold standard was changed to 12 minutes. The response times would comply with the new threshold standard, which is a more accurate barometer for the Priority 2 tasks.

Recommendation: Pending implementation of the new threshold standard that will be in effect for next year's report, the GMOC has no recommendation at this time.

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 2013 and 2014, 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 non-compliant. 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 2013 (Hours)	LOS 2014 (Hours)	CHANGE
Heritage Road (Olympic Parkway to Telegraph Canyon Road)	NB	D(5) E(1) Non-Compliant	D(5) E(1) Non-Compliant	None

According to the traffic engineers, this arterial segment is short (less than a mile) and, therefore, hypersensitive to the smallest changes in speed. Once Heritage Road is connected to Main Street, they expect this segment to improve.

Several traffic improvement construction projects were underway during this review period, creating abnormal traffic patterns. Therefore, City staff chose not to measure some arterial segments that are typically included in their analysis for the GMOC.

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 2016.

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% of the cases.

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 2014	11,721	76.5%	6:02	3:34	1:07	1:21
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 and Emergency Medical Services Threshold Standard has not been met for the fourth consecutive year.

Discussion: The percentage of calls responded to within 7 minutes improved from 75.7% in FY 2013 to 76.5% in FY 2014; however, the Threshold Standard of 80% was missed by 3.5%. The Fire Department reported that the geographical layout of the fire stations on the east side of the City and the number of stations available to serve the community contribute to response times that do not comply with the Threshold Standard. Response times from fire stations 6, 7 and 8, in particular, have not been meeting the Threshold Standard, and the GMOC would like the Fire Department to focus on these stations to improve their response times.

According to the Fire Department, three system improvements could significantly impact compliance, including:

1. Additional fire stations within the network;
2. Additional improvements in call for service dispatch processes; and
3. Improved management of response time performance to include interactive discussion with fire crews, use of mapping capabilities, and shared data with stakeholders.

To help effectuate change and improve response times, the Fire Department is doing the following:

- Forming a group to help generate ideas on how to improve turnout and travel times.
- Creating a method for identifying and marking times to signify actual en route start and end times.
- Gathering and sharing data at individual crew levels to solicit discussion and awareness of crew response time effectiveness.
- Establishing a method to determine what to do with anomaly data that affect the data set being analyzed.
- Working on solutions to problems with the FirstWatch software that was purchased to help the Fire Department address dispatch and turnout problems by using real time data notification.

Recommendation: That City Council direct the City Manager to collaborate with the Fire Chief in implementing effective measures that improve response times and result in threshold compliance.

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 at 2.96 acres per 1,000

3.5.1 Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan

Issue: An update to the Parks and Recreation Master Plan has still not gone to Council for approval.

Discussion: A draft of the updated Parks and Recreation Master Plan (PRMP) has been completed and is being reviewed by department directors. It will then be reviewed by the Parks and Recreation Commission. After that, it

will move on to Council for their consideration. City staff is projecting that the PRMP will be approved by the end of June 2015.

Recommendation: That City Council approve the updated Parks and Recreation Master Plan by the end of June 2015 and make additional updates, as necessary.

3.5.2 Mixing Uses

Issue: Combining the use of parks and recreation and libraries should be considered.

Discussion: As noted in the Libraries discussion, when future parks are constructed, especially the 70-acre park in Otay Ranch, shared use of parks and recreation facilities and library facilities should be explored. For example, a performing arts venue, community meeting rooms or WiFi and computer centers could be established in parks or recreation facilities.

Recommendation: That City Council direct the City Manager to support mixed use of parks and recreation and library facilities.

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: Although the Threshold Standard is technically compliant for this review period, the new Threshold Standard, which will be in effect during the next review period, will provide a better barometer for measuring compliance.

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 Threshold Compliance

Issue: None.

Discussion: According to the City's engineers, increased growth will not directly impact current channel operation over the next five years because developers in eastern Chula Vista will be required to provide all necessary facilities and their respective share of maintenance costs of facilities they may impact. In western Chula Vista, where the parcels are redeveloped at a higher density, developers may need to construct additional facilities or reconstruct existing facilities in order to accommodate new development.

The Regional Water Quality Control Board's Order No. R9-2013-0001 (NPDES Municipal Permit) has additional requirements for pollutant control and hydromodification management on development projects and developers will be required to construct facilities that comply with new regulations going into effect in December 2015.

Recommendation: None.

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: None.

Discussion: The Chula Vista Elementary School District is still waiting to be reimbursed by the state for partial construction costs of Camarena Elementary School in Village 11, which opened in 2013. This has made it more challenging for the school district to secure funding for additional schools. However, both the Chula Vista Elementary School District (CVESD) and the Sweetwater Union High School District (SUHSD) reported that, within the next five years, they should be able to provide the facilities necessary to accommodate additional students in eastern Chula Vista.

Chula Vista Elementary School District

Construction of an elementary school in Otay Ranch Village 2 is scheduled to begin in 2016 and open in 2017. The District is still working on securing a second school site in Village 2, which will be necessary when triggers are reached due to projected growth actually occurring.

Sweetwater Union High School District

A combined high school/middle school had been planned for the District's site on the northeast corner of Eastlake Parkway and Hunte Parkway. However, because of an increase in SANDAG's 2030 housing projections, the District decided to include the middle school in Otay Ranch Village 8 West and leave the Hunte Parkway site for a high school only. Splitting the two schools would result in a capacity increase of 1,000 students. Construction of both schools is currently scheduled to begin in 2016 and both are planned to open in 2018.

Recommendation: None.

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	FY 13/14	18-month Projection	5-year Projection	"Build-out" Projection*
Average Flow	15.935	15.734	15.466	16.67	18.34	29.89
Capacity	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864

Issue: None.

Discussion: In July 2014, the City adopted an update to the 2004 Wastewater Master Plan, documenting that the demand for sewer treatment capacity at build-out has increased from 26.20 Million Gallons per Day (MGD) to 29.89 MGD. The increase of 3.69 MGD is due to planned densification in the undeveloped portions of the City and it includes projected water savings due to conservation efforts.

At current growth projections, the City has enough capacity for the next 10 years. Staff will continue to monitor flow rates in order to secure treatment capacity before it is needed.

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: None.

Discussion: Since 2010, smog trends in Chula Vista have not exceeded the one-hour per day state standard; and since 2008, they have not exceeded the 1997 8-hour federal standard. The City meets all current air quality standards and ranks amongst the best air quality in San Diego County, according to the Air Pollution Control District (APCD). Air pollution in the entire region continues to improve due to effective emission control strategies and programs.

The City's green building and enhanced energy efficiency standards require levels of efficiency 15-20% higher than state codes. During the review period, approximately 732 new/remodeled building units were permitted, which complied with these standards.

In Chula Vista, nine development projects underwent formal CEQA review for their contribution to local criteria air pollutants and greenhouse gases. A Statement of Overriding Considerations was issued for four of those projects (Otay Ranch Villages 2, 8, 9 and 10) because the projects' air quality emissions were significant and unmitigable. This was due to their construction and operation emissions not meeting City thresholds and/or the regional air quality basin already being designated a nonattainment area under the Clean Air Act.

Most development projects were found to have air quality impacts below a level of significance and/or were required to incorporate mitigation measures into their construction and operation.

As of July 1, 2014, new buildings and major renovations must be approximately 25% more energy efficient than previous standards, due to the 2013 Title-24 (Section 6) code requirements. Section 11 of the 2013 Title-24 code also updated statewide green building standards for indoor air quality, effective on January 1, 2014. The City has hosted monthly trainings for staff and local developers on the new code.

Recommendation: None.

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 Threshold Compliance

Issue: None.

Discussion: Both the Otay Water District and Sweetwater Authority reported that water demand has not grown in recent years because customers are conserving. Sweetwater indicated that the State Department of Water Resources may decide to cut the water supply to its customers, however, due to the drought in the state of California.

Over the next five years, both water companies stated that they will be able to meet the water demands anticipated with projected growth. Specific data is available in the Otay Water District and Sweetwater Authority questionnaires, located in Appendix B of this report.

Recommendation: None.

4.0 TOP-TO-BOTTOM – CHANGES TO THE CITY’S GROWTH MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

On October 22, 2014, the GMOC reviewed staff’s final edits to the City’s Growth Management Program’s documents, including the “Growth Management” ordinance (Chapter 19.09 of the Chula Vista Municipal Code) and the *Growth Management Program Implementation Manual*. Upon review, the GMOC voted to approve the documents and forward them to the Planning Commission.

On November 12, 2014, the Planning Commission recommended that the City Council approve the Growth Management Program documents, which were forwarded to Council and subsequently approved on April 14, 2015, as recommended. Next year’s GMOC report will abide by the amended documents.

5.0 DEVELOPMENT TOUR

On January 17, 2015, City staff and Mayor Casillas Salas took the GMOC and a few members of the public on a development tour throughout the City that 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