



GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

2016 ANNUAL REPORT

Threshold Review Period 7/1/14 to 6/30/15

May 5, 2016

Approved by the Planning Commission (Resolution No. MPA15-0011) and
City Council (Resolution No. 2016-____) on May 5, 2016

GMOC Members

Armida Torres, Chair (Business)
Eric Mosolgo, Vice Chair (Environmental)
Javier Rosales (Northeast)
Gabriel Gutierrez (Planning Commission Representative)
Michael Lengyel (Development)
Raymundo Alatorre (Northwest)
Duaine Hooker (Education)
Gloria Juarez (Southwest)
Rodney Caudillo (Southeast)

City Staff

Kimberly Vander Bie – Growth Management Coordinator
Patricia Salvacion – Secretary
Scott Donaghe – Principal Planner

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 5, 2016

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

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

SUBJECT: Executive Summary - 2016 GMOC Annual Report

The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) is pleased to submit its 2016 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 the last two years. Threshold Standards for seven of the eleven quality-of-life topics were found to be compliant, including: Air Quality and Climate Protection, 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.

Libraries – For the twelfth consecutive year, Libraries is non-compliant. The GMOC continues to be impressed with the efforts of the Library Director as she explores creative approaches to provide library services to the citizens of the city and to go outside the box to find grant sources, as well as the efforts of Friends of the Library. The issue regarding prolonged deferred maintenance for existing facilities continues to be a concern. In light of the tremendous shortage of new library space, the maintenance of existing space is critical and must be a priority. Interesting information was shared with GMOC indicating an unacceptable budgeting concern. The statewide average annual materials expenditure is \$3.74 per capita. In Chula Vista, the budget is 15 cents per capita. We also discovered 75% of funding for supplies comes from sources outside of the General Fund.

Police – The GMOC was concerned and surprised to find that the Police response times were non-compliant with the current Threshold Standards, which were adopted last year with completion of the top-to-bottom update. The response times reported last year would have complied with the current Threshold Standard.

The Priority 2 Threshold Standard was non-compliant for the 18th year in a row. This is the third year of non-compliance for Priority 1 in four years.

Traffic – The northbound Heritage Road segment between Olympic Parkway and Telegraph Canyon Road failed to comply with the Threshold Standard, as did Otay Lakes Road, between East H Street and Telegraph Canyon Road, both north- and southbound.

Fire and Emergency Medical Services (EMS) – For the fifth consecutive year, response times failed to comply with the Threshold Standard. The Fire Department informed the GMOC that improvement in response times will not be noticed until completion of the fire station network improvements, and they listed five major factors necessary to achieve this:

1. Additional fire stations within the network
2. Additional improvement in call for service dispatch processes
3. Additional improvements in unit and station alerting
4. Improved management of response time performance to include interactive discussion with fire crews, use of mapping capabilities, and shared data with stakeholders
5. Replacement of old and failing fire apparatus within the fleet

The GMOC was disappointed with the tone of the Fire Department's resignation to continue in a state of non-compliance until build-out (defined in the 2014 Fire Facilities Master Plan). In addition, the GMOC noted that some responses in the Fire and EMS questionnaire were identical to responses in the previous year's questionnaire, indicating that there might have been little effort made by the Fire Department to follow through with last year's goals to improve response times. It is also important to note that response times on the west side of the city consistently comply with the Threshold Standard, while response times on the city's east side do not. The GMOC wonders if citizens in eastern Chula Vista would find it acceptable to wait until build-out for their emergency calls to be responded to by the Fire Department within the Growth Management Program's response time Threshold Standard.

Last September, the GMOC met with the City Manager to kick off this review period. The City Manager provided an update on all items that were referred to him during last year's Joint Workshop. We look forward to continuing these conversations with the City Manager on an annual basis to ensure there is follow-up to GMOC recommendations.

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, and Scott Donaghe 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.

City of Chula Vista

GMOC 2016 Annual Report

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 Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)	4-5
1.3 GMOC 2016 Annual Review Process	5
1.4 Annual Five-Year Residential Growth Forecast	5
2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY	6
3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE DISCUSSIONS	7-23
3.1 Libraries	7-9
3.1.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard	7-8
3.1.2 Status of Staff's Proposed Implementing Actions for GMOC's 2015 Annual Report Recommendations	8-9
3.2 Police	9-12
3.2.1 Non-Compliant Priority 1 Threshold Standard	9-11
3.2.2 Non-Compliant Priority 2 Threshold Standard	11-12
3.2.3 Status of Staff's Proposed Implementing Actions for GMOC's 2015 Annual Report Recommendations	12
3.3 Traffic	12-14
3.3.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard	13-14
3.3.2 Status of Staff's Proposed Implementing Actions for GMOC's 2015 Annual Report Recommendations	14
3.4 Fire and Emergency Medical Services	14-16
3.4.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard	14-16
3.4.2 Status of Staff's Proposed Implementing Actions for GMOC's 2015 Annual Report Recommendations	16
3.5 Parks and Recreation	16-18
3.5.1 Threshold Compliance	16-17
3.5.2 Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan	17-18
3.5.3 Status of Staff's Proposed Implementing Actions for GMOC's 2015 Annual Report Recommendations	18
3.6 Fiscal	18-19
3.6.1 Deferred Maintenance Costs	19
3.7 Drainage	19-20
3.7.1 Threshold Compliance	20
3.8 Schools	20-21
3.8.1 School Districts' Updates	20-21
3.9 Sewer	21-22
3.9.1 Long-Term Treatment Capacity	21
3.10 Air Quality and Climate Protection	22-22
3.10.1 Incomplete Questionnaire	22
3.11 Water	22-23
3.11.1 Threshold Compliance	23
4.0 APPENDICES	23
4.1 Appendix A – Growth Forecast	
4.2 Appendix B – Threshold Compliance Questionnaires	

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Threshold Standards

Threshold standards for eleven quality of life topics were established by the Chula Vista City Council in 1987. These standards are memorialized in the City's "Growth Management" ordinance (Chapter 19.09 of the Chula Vista Municipal Code), which was updated by Council in 2015 after a multi-year effort by the Growth Management Oversight Commission, City staff, City Council, and various community stakeholders to review the City's Growth Management Program from "top-to-bottom." The ordinance addresses each topic in terms of a goal, objective(s), threshold standard(s), and implementation measures.

The eleven topics include eight under the City's control: Drainage; Fire and Emergency Services; Fiscal; Libraries; Parks and Recreation; Police; Sewer; and Traffic. Two topics are controlled by outside agencies: Schools and Water. And one topic is a hybrid between City and outside agency control: Air Quality and Climate Protection. 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 Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)

The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) was established by City Council in 1987 to provide an independent, annual review of threshold standards compliance. The purpose and function of the Commission is outlined in Chapter 2.40 of the Chula Vista Municipal Code.

The GMOC is comprised of nine members who are residents in the community and 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. During this review cycle, only six of the seats were filled, including those held by: Armida Torres, Chair (Business); Eric Mosolgo, Vice Chair (Environmental); Javier Rosales (Northeast); Gabriel Gutierrez (Planning Commission); Michael Lengyel (Development); and Raymundo Alatorre (Northwest). The three vacant seats were recently filled by: Duaine Hooker (Education); Gloria Juarez (Southwest); and Rodney Caudillo (Southeast).

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 2016 Annual Report focuses on Fiscal Year July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015;
2. The second half of 2015 and beginning of 2016 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 2016 through December 2020 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 2016 Annual Review Process

The GMOC held ten regular meetings between September 2015 and April 2016; all were open to the public. At the first regular meeting, City Manager Gary Halbert provided status updates on “Staff Responses and Proposed Implementation Measures” that addressed issues and recommendations brought forth in the GMOC’s 2015 Annual Report. At a subsequent meeting, City staff provided updates on asset management and economic development. The other meetings were attended by representatives from the City departments and public agencies associated with the threshold compliance questionnaires, who gave presentations to the Commission and discussed responses they had provided earlier (attached in Appendix B). 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 5, 2016.

1.4 Annual Five-Year Residential Growth Forecast

The Development Services Department annually prepares a Five-Year Residential Growth Forecast, the latest of which was issued in August 2015. 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 departments and agencies determine if their respective public facilities/services would be able to accommodate the forecasted growth. The growth projections from August 2015 through December 2020 indicated an additional 7,457 residential units could be permitted for construction in the city over the next five years, (6,057 units in the east and 1,400 units in the west), for an annual average of 1,211 units in the east and 280 units in the west, or 1,491 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 2015 annual review cycle. Six thresholds were met, four were not met, and one was inconclusive, due to insufficient information.

2015 ANNUAL THRESHOLD STANDARD REVIEW SUMMARY				
Review Period 7/1/14 Through 6/30/15				
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	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 and Climate Protection	Inconclusive due to insufficient information			
11. Water	X			

3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE DISCUSSIONS

3.1 LIBRARIES – NON-COMPLIANT

Threshold Standard:

The city shall not fall below the citywide ratio of 500 gross square feet (GSF) of library space, adequately equipped and staffed, per 1,000 residents.

3.1.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard

Issue: For the past twelve years, the Libraries threshold standard has not been met.

LIBRARIES			
	Population	Total Gross Square Feet of Library Facilities	Gross Square Feet of Library Facilities Per 1,000 Residents
Threshold			500 Sq. Ft.
5-Year Projection (2020)	281,942	97,412 (a) 134,412 (b) 129,009 (c)	345 (a) 476 (b) 427 (c)
12-Month Projection (12/31/16)	261,187	97,412	373
FY 2014-15	257,362	97,412	379
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

*After closure of Eastlake library in 2011

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

- (a) Without Millenia Library completion
- (b) With Millenia Library completed, retaining Otay Ranch Branch
- (c) With Millenia Library completed, closing Otay Ranch Branch

Discussion: The GMOC is encouraged that there appears to be progress made in securing a library in Millenia within the next five years. However, at 30-35,000 square feet, the size of the facility would be barely enough to finally achieve Threshold Standard compliance. Either doubling the size of the Millenia library to 70,000 square feet or constructing two 35,000 square-foot libraries – one in Millenia and one on the Rancho del Rey library site – will be necessary to achieve compliance at build-out. Until then, however, focus should be on remodeling the space in the lower level of the Civic Center Library so that the area's usefulness can be maximized.

Recommend: 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.

3.1.2 Status of Staff's Proposed Implementing Actions for GMOC's 2015 Annual Report Recommendations

The table below provides status on staff's proposed implementing actions in response to Libraries issues and recommendations brought forth in the GMOC's 2015 Annual Report.

Status of Implementing Actions for Issues Identified in the GMOC's 2015 Annual Report (7/1/14-6/30/15) Regarding Libraries			
<u>Issue</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Staff Responses and Proposed Implementing Actions</u>	<u>Status</u>
3.1.1 - The Libraries threshold standard has not been met for the eleventh consecutive year.	3.1.1 - 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.	3.1.1 - Talks are progressing for the library at Millenia.	<u>Otay Ranch Town Center Library Branch:</u> We'll try to extend the current win-win situation at the library, which attracts people to the center, for as long as possible. <u>Future Millenia Library:</u> A new, full-service library is expected to be completed, or nearly completed, within the next five years, although it is market dependent. This would bring the threshold closer to compliance. <u>Library Needs:</u> Several active library partnerships help the library accomplish its functions.
3.1.2 - The Civic Center Library needs to be renovated to maximize use of available space.	3.1.2 - 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.	3.1.2 - Civic Center space is being renovated as funds are found.	The City is collaborating with the CVESD and Qualcomm for a Thinkabit Lab to potentially open in the lower level of the Civic Center Library by July 2016.
3.1.3 - Opportunities to generate substantial revenue for libraries must	3.1.3 - That City Council direct the City Manager to continue seeking	3.1.3 - Opportunities for mixed use and revenue generating options are	Efforts are underway for a view deck at the Civic Center Library, which may be a source

Status of Implementing Actions for Issues Identified in the GMOC's 2015 Annual Report (7/1/14-6/30/15) Regarding Libraries			
<u>Issue</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Staff Responses and Proposed Implementing Actions</u>	<u>Status</u>
continue to be aggressively pursued.	opportunities within the library system for potential revenue generation, and support mixed use of parks and recreation and library facilities.	being explored.	of revenue in the future. The recently renovated auditorium and computer lab at that library, as well as the future Thinkabit Lab in the lower level, may also be future revenue sources when the City's Master Fee Schedule is revised.

3.2 **POLICE** – NON-COMPLIANT (Priority 1 and 2)

Threshold Standards:

1. Priority 1 – Emergency Calls¹. Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to at least 81% of Priority 1 calls within 7 minutes 30 seconds and shall maintain an average response time of 6 minutes or less for all Priority 1 calls (measured annually).

2. Priority 2 – Urgent Calls². Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to all Priority 2 calls within 12 minutes or less (measured annually).

¹Priority 1 – Emergency Calls are life-threatening calls; felony in progress; probability of injury (crime or accident); robbery or panic alarms; urgent cover calls from officers. Response: Immediate response by two officers from any source or assignment, immediate response by paramedics/fire if injuries are believed to have occurred.

²Priority 2 – Urgent Calls are misdemeanor in progress; possibility of injury; serious non-routine calls (domestic violence or other disturbances with potential for violence). Response: Immediate response by one or more officers from clear units or those on interruptible activities (traffic, field interviews, etc.)

Note: For growth management purposes, response time includes dispatch and travel time to the building or site address, otherwise referred to as "received to arrive."

3.2.1 Non-Compliant Priority 1 Threshold Standard

Issue: Despite implementation of a new Priority 1 Threshold Standard, the Threshold Standard was not met.

Priority 1 Response Times				
Fiscal Year	Call Volume	% of Call Responses within 7:30	Average Response Time (Old Methodology*)	Average Response Time (New Methodology)
Threshold Standard		81.0%	5:30	6:00
2014/2015	675 of 64,008	71.2%	5:17	6:49
		% of Call Responses within 7:00	Average Response Time (Old Methodology*)	Average Response Time
Threshold Standard		81.0%	5:30	6:00
2013/2014	711 of 65,645	79.3%	4:57	6:45
2012/2013	738 of 65,741	81.5%	4:57	6:42
2011/2012	726 of 64,386	78.4%	5:01	6:31
2010/2011	657 of 64,695	85.7%	4:40	6:03
2009/2010	673 of 68,145	85.1%	4:28	5:50
2008/2009	788 of 70,051	84.6%	4:26	5:58
2006/2007	976 of 74,277	84.5%	4:59	6:13
2007/2008	1,006 of 74,192	87.9%	4:19	5:52
2005/2006	1,068 of 73,075	82.3%	4:51	6:19
2004/2005	1,289 of 74,106	80.0%	5:11	6:37

**Old Methodology criteria: 1) Calculated from "route to arrive" rather than "received to arrive"; 2) Includes normalization calculation; and 3) Excludes false alarm calls for service.*

Discussion: This is the first GMOC annual report that implements the current Police Priority 1 and 2 Threshold Standards, which were revised and adopted in 2015. Because the old and new Threshold Standards cannot be compared, this report includes tables showing response times under both the old and the new Threshold Standards, using their respective methodologies, for informational purposes only.

The Priority 1 Threshold Standard was changed from 7 minutes to 7 minutes 30 seconds, with an average response time changed from 5 minutes 30 seconds to 6 minutes. Implementation of the current Threshold Standard included changing the reporting methodology, as follows: 1) Starting the clock at "received to arrive" rather than "route to arrive"; 2) Eliminating a "normalization" calculation that was created due to higher reporting times in eastern versus western Chula Vista; and 3) Adding false alarms to the call volume.

The table above indicates that Priority 1 call volume was down slightly from the previous year; however, the percentage of calls responded to within 7 minutes 30 seconds was 9.8% below the 81% Threshold Standard. The "Average Response Time" component of the Threshold Standard fell 49 seconds short of the Threshold Standard.

The Police Chief attributed the shortfalls to "chronically low staffing in the Community Patrol Division." During the current review period, however, staffing has increased significantly (as of October 2015, there were 98 officers on patrol, just 5 short of the 103 that the Chief desired); several Community Service

Officers (CSOs have been added); and fleet mobile data computers (MDCs) were updated in the patrol fleet. Therefore, the GMOC would expect to see improved response times in the next report.

Recommend: That the City Council direct the City Manager to monitor the 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 Response Times			
Fiscal Year	Call Volume	Average Response Time (Old Methodology)	Average Response Time (New Methodology)
Threshold Standard		7:30	12:00
2014/2015	17,976 of 64,008	11:35	13:50
2013/2014	17,817 of 65,645	11:26	13:36
2012/2013	18,505 of 65,741	11:37	13:44
2011/2012	22,121 of 64,386	11:54	14:20
2010/2011	21,500 of 64,695	10:06	12:52
2009/2010	22,240 of 68,145	9:55	12:40
2008/2009	22,686 of 70,051	9:16	12:00
2007/2008	23,955 of 74,192	9:18	12:07
2006/2007	24,407 of 74,277	11:18	14:21
2005/2006	24,876 of 73,075	12:33	15:28
2004/2005	24,923 of 74,106	11:40	14:38

**Old Methodology criteria: 1) Calculated from "route to arrive" rather than "received to arrive";
2) Includes normalization calculation; and 3) Excludes false alarm calls for service.*

Issue: Despite implementation of a new Priority 2 Threshold Standard, the Threshold Standard was not met.

Discussion: As with the Priority 1 Threshold Standard, this is the first GMOC annual report that implements the revised Priority 2 Threshold Standard adopted in 2015. The Priority 2 "Average Response Time" was changed from 7 minutes 30 seconds to 12 minutes, and the "percentage of calls responded to within 7 minutes" portion of the Threshold Standard was eliminated. Implementation of the new Priority 2 Threshold Standard follows the same methodology used for the new Priority 1 Threshold Standard, including: 1) Starting the clock at "received to arrive" rather than "route to arrive"; 2) Eliminating a "normalization" calculation that was created due to higher reporting times in eastern versus western Chula Vista; and 3) Adding false alarms to the call volume.

The table above indicates that the Priority 2 Average Response Time came in 1:50 short of the new Threshold Standard. This is the 18th consecutive year that the Police Priority 2 Threshold Standard has not been met.

As with the Priority 1 Threshold Standard, the Police Chief attributed non-compliance of the Priority 2 Threshold Standard to low staffing, stating that it "must be significantly increased in the Community Patrol Division in order to

meet the Priority 2 response time goals. Without additional staff, improvements to the response time will most likely be limited.”

The GMOC is encouraged that, during the current review period, staffing has increased significantly, CSOs have been added and MDCs were updated in the patrol fleet. Therefore, as noted in Section 3.2.1 of this report, the GMOC would expect to see improved response times reported in the next review period.

Recommend: That the City Council direct the City Manager to monitor the recruitment programs and procedures for police officers so that the department will be properly staffed and response to Priority 2 calls can improve.

3.2.3 Status of Staff’s Proposed Implementing Actions for GMOC’s 2015 Annual Report Recommendations

The table below provides status on staff’s proposed implementing actions in response to Police issues and recommendations brought forth in the GMOC’s 2015 Annual Report.

Status of Implementing Actions for Issues Identified in the GMOC’s 2015 Annual Report Regarding Police			
<u>Issue</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Staff Responses and Proposed Implementing Actions</u>	<u>Status</u>
3.2.1 – The threshold standard [Priority 1] was not met.	3.2.1 - 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.	3.2.1 - The Police Department has recently added hourly staff to assist with processing police officer recruit backgrounds. With these additional resources, along with new mobile data computers, improvements should be seen in response times. The Police Department will continue to monitor and evaluate recruiting and retention programs.	As of October 2015: 1) there were 98 officers on patrol, just 5 short of the 103 that the Chief desired; 2) 12 officers were in field training; 3) 5 officers were in the Police Academy; 4) 5 CSOs were handling over 3,000 reports annually; 5) fleet mobile data computers (MDCs) were updated in the patrol fleet; 6) Automated Vehicle Locating (AVL) system for the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system is being implemented.

3.3 TRAFFIC – NON-COMPLIANT

Threshold Standards:

1. Arterial Level of Service (ALOS) for Non-Urban Streets: Those Traffic Monitoring Program (TMP) roadway segments classified as other than Urban Streets in the “Land Use and Transportation Element” of the city’s General Plan shall maintain LOS “C” or better as measured by observed average travel speed on those segments; except, that during peak hours, LOS “D” can occur for no more than two hours of the day.

2. Urban Street Level of Service (ULOS): Those TMP roadway segments classified as Urban Streets in the “Land Use and Transportation Element” of the city’s General Plan shall maintain

LOS “D” or better, as measured by observed or predicted average travel speed, except that during peak hours, LOS “E” can occur for no more than two hours per day.

Notes to Standards:

1. Arterial Segment: LOS measurements shall be for the average weekday peak hours, excluding seasonal and special circumstance variations.
2. The LOS measurement of arterial segments at freeway ramps shall be a growth management consideration in situations where proposed developments have a significant impact at interchanges.
3. Circulation improvements should be implemented prior to the anticipated deterioration of LOS below established standards.
4. The criteria for calculating arterial LOS and defining arterial lengths and classifications shall follow the procedures detailed in the most recent Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) and shall be confirmed by the city’s traffic engineer.
5. Level of service values for arterial segments shall be based on the HCM.

3.3.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard

Issue: Two arterial segments were non-compliant with the Threshold Standard.

NON-COMPLIANT ROADWAY SEGMENTS		
NON-URBAN STREETS	Direction	LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) (Threshold allows maximum of 2 hours at LOS D during peak hours)
Otay Lakes Road (East H St./Telegraph Canyon Rd.)	NB	D(4 hours)
	SB	D(4 hours) E(1 hour)
Heritage Road (Telegraph Canyon Rd./Olympic Parkway)	NB	D(6 hours)
	SB	D(5 hours)
URBAN STREETS	Direction	Level of Service (LOS) (Threshold allows maximum of 2 hours at LOS E during peak hours)
None	-	-

Discussion: All Urban Street Level of Service (ULOS) streets complied with the current Traffic Threshold Standard, updated in 2015. However, two Arterial Level of Service (ALOS) non-urban streets did not comply. Heritage Road between Telegraph Canyon Road and Olympic Parkway has been chronically non-compliant in either or both directions for several years, and was non-compliant by two hours northbound and three hours southbound during this review period. Also, despite recent improvements to Otay Lakes Road between Telegraph Canyon Road and East H Street, Otay Lakes Road was non-compliant in both directions during the review period. City engineers have indicated that, in order to comply with the Threshold Standards as projected growth occurs over the next five years, connection of both Heritage Road and La Media Road to Main Street is essential, and funding will be covered by developer impact fees.

The GMOC is concerned that completion of the Heritage Road connection has been further delayed due to resolution of environmental issues, but appreciates the efforts by City staff to comply with the environmental regulations so that progress on the road can continue.

Recommend: 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.

3.3.2 Status of Staff's Proposed Implementing Actions for GMOC's 2015 Annual Report Recommendations

The table below provides status on staff's proposed implementing actions in response to Traffic issues and recommendations brought forth in the GMOC's 2015 Annual Report.

Status of Implementing Actions for Issues Identified in the GMOC's 2015 Annual Report Regarding Traffic			
Issue	Recommendation	Staff Responses and Proposed Implementing Actions	Status
3.3.1 - One arterial segment was non-compliant with the Threshold Standard.	3.3.1 - 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.	3.3.1 - The Public Works Department concurs with the GMOC recommendation; recommendation is accepted. The environmental document has been completed as part of the Village Three EIR. This section of Heritage Road has been fully bonded for. The developer is endeavoring to complete the connection by December 2016.	Obtaining the 404 permit from the Army Corps of Engineers is still in process and completion of the Heritage Road connection is expected to be delayed until approximately February 2017.

3.4 FIRE and EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES – NON-COMPLIANT

Threshold Standard:

Emergency Response: Properly equipped and staffed fire and medical units shall respond to calls throughout the city within 7 minutes in at least 80% of the cases (measured annually).

3.4.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard

FIRE and EMS Response Times						
Review Period	Call Volume	% of All Calls Responded to Within 7 Minutes (Threshold = 80%)	Average Response Time for all Calls ²	Average Travel Time	Average Dispatch Time	Average Turn-out Time
FY 2015	12,561	78.3	6:14	3:51	1:12	1:10
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		

Review Period	Call Volume	% of All Calls Responded to Within 7 Minutes (Threshold = 80%)	Average Response Time for all Calls ²	Average Travel Time	Average Dispatch Time	Average Turn-out Time
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 Threshold Standard was non-compliant for the fifth consecutive year.

Discussion: The percentage of "Calls Responded to Within 7 Minutes" fell just 1.7% short of the 80% Threshold Standard, which was a 1.8% improvement from the previous review period. The average response time for all calls was 12 seconds slower, however. The slowest times were reported from stations 6, 7 and 8, at 21.6% below the Threshold Standard, as shown in the table below:

FIRE and EMS Response Times (By Geography)																		
Review Period	Call Volume			% of All Calls Responded to Within 7 Minutes (Threshold = 80%)			Average Response Time for all Calls ²			Average Travel Time			Average Dispatch Time			Average Turn-out Time		
	E	W	E/W	E	W	E/W	E	W	E/W	E	W	E/W	E	W	E/W	E	W	E/W
FY 2015	2,014	6,970	3,577	58.4	92.5	73.3	7:48	5:40	6:27	4:53	3:21	4:15	1:36	1:13	0:58	1:19	1:06	1:14
FY 2014	1,890	6,198	3,633	52.7	86.7	71.9	7:15	5:29	6:22	4:33	3:04	3:55	1:08	1:08	1:04	1:34	1:16	1:22
FY 2013	1,976	6,670	3,670	54.3	85.9	68.7	7:06	5:29	6:27	4:48	3:16	4:15	1:08	1:05	1:04	1:12	1:06	1:09

Note: "East" = Calls responded to east of I-805 (Fire Stations 6, 7 and 8).

"West" = Calls responded to west of I-805 (Fire Stations 1 and 5).

"E/W" = Calls responded to citywide (Fire Stations 2, 3, 4 and 9).

The slow response times concern the GMOC and we believe that focusing on the areas where the response times are the slowest should be a priority until additional fire stations are built and response times can comply with the Threshold Standard. Accurate data collection is paramount so that weaknesses can be verified and addressed.

The Chula Vista Fire Department (CVFD) reported that, while response times collected are accurate, it is challenging to collect accurate travel and turn-out times with the current system, FirstWatch, which is operated by the San Diego Fire Department, on a contractual basis. Although turn-out and travel times are captured via a GPS system, the AVL (automated vehicle location system) does not pick up the data until the apparatus moves out of the bay; therefore, the CVFD is seeking new technology that will report actual turnout time.

Recommend: That City Council direct the City Manager to collaborate with the Fire Chief in conducting a statistical analysis to provide more detailed information regarding specific station response times and the percentage of calls where there is cross-coverage, and to focus on improving the response times by fire stations 6, 7 & 8.

3.4.2 Status of Staff's Proposed Implementing Actions for GMOC's 2015 Annual Report Recommendations

The table below provides status on staff's proposed implementing actions in response to Fire and EMS issues and recommendations brought forth in the GMOC's 2015 Annual Report.

Status of Implementing Actions for Issues Identified in the GMOC's 2015 Annual Report Regarding Fire & EMS			
<u>Issue</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Staff Responses and Proposed Implementing Actions</u>	<u>Status</u>
3.4.1 - The Fire and Emergency Medical Services Threshold Standard has not been met for the fourth consecutive year.	3.4.1 - 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.	3.4.1 - Response times will become an objective to the goal of improving service delivery in the Fire Department's 5-year strategic plan. It is agreed to discuss with the City Manager all strategic measures that must be implemented to reach the objective.	Response times are improving and when more fire stations are added they should improve even more. Fire response times continue to be better in western Chula Vista than in eastern Chula Vista. However, overall fire response times are better than AMR (ambulance) response times. We are pushing to become a technologically "Smart City" so that we can be as efficient as possible. A Google route finder device only works if we have fiber optics throughout the city. Many firefighters have a phone app that calls them before bells go off in the fire stations. Implementation of a 5-year strategic plan would bring in new equipment and more stations.

3.5 PARKS AND RECREATION – COMPLIANT at 2.94 acres/1,000

Threshold Standard:

Population Ratio: Three (3) acres of neighborhood and community parkland with appropriate facilities shall be provided per 1,000 residents east of I-805.

3.5.1 Threshold Compliance

Issue: None.

Discussion: Rounded up to 3 acres, the Threshold Standard is compliant at 2.94 acres per 1,000 people in eastern Chula Vista, as indicated on the table below. Forecasts for 18 months and five years, however, indicate that the margin will be broadening if adequate park land is not dedicated in a timely manner.

CITY-OWNED PARK ACREAGE Threshold, Forecast, and Comparisons							
Threshold Standard	Area of City	Current (6/30/15)	Forecasts		Prior Year Comparisons		
			18-Month (12.31.16)	5-Year (2020)	June 2012	June 2013	June 2014
3 acres per 1,000 population East of I-805	East I-805 AC/1,000 persons	2.94	2.91	2.82	3.1	3.05	2.96
	West I-805 AC/1,000 persons	1.2	1.22	1.19	1.2	1.20	1.2
	Citywide AC/1,000 persons	2.16	2.16	2.13	2.2	2.21	2.17
Acres of parkland	East I-805	418.44	420.41⁺	456.92[*]	418.01	418.44	418.44
	West I-805	138.76	142.68 ⁺	142.68	138.76	138.76	138.76
	Citywide	557.2	563.09 ⁺	599.60 [*]	556.77	557.20	557.20
Population	East I-805	142,547	144,577	161,773	135,205	137,313	141,436
	West I-805	115,801	116,610	120,169	115,130	115,300	115,788
	Citywide	258,348	261,187	281,942	250,335	252,643	257,224
Acreage shortfall or excess	East I-805	(9.2)	(13.32)	(28.40)	12.4	6.5	(5.87)
	West I-805	(208.64)	207.15	217.83	(206.6)	(207.23)	(208.61)
	Citywide	(217.84)	220.47	246.23	(194.24)	(200.73)	(214.46)

⁺ Assumes completion of Orange park **3.9 acres** and Millenia, Stylus Park **1.97 acres**.

^{*} Assumes completion of: V2, P-3 (Ph1) **3.9 acres**. V2, P-2 **7.10 acres**. Millenia, Strata Park **1.51 acres**. Village 3, P-1 **6.7 acres**. Village 8 West, P-1 **7.5 acres**. Village 8 West Town Square **3 acres**. V8 East, Neighborhood Park **6.8 acres**.

Recommend: None.

3.5.2 Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan

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

Discussion: The Parks and Recreation Master Plan (PRMP) was further delayed because a Parks Needs Assessment identifying recreational needs had to be completed,

and a Cost Recovery, Resource Allocation and Revenue Enhancement Study needed to be finalized. In addition, Public Works decided to add a chapter on Operations and Maintenance. City staff is planning to take the draft document to stakeholders by June, to the general public by July, and to City Council by fall 2016.

Recommend: That City Council approve the updated Parks and Recreation Master Plan by fall 2016, and resolve any outstanding issues through future amendments to the document.

3.5.3 Status of Staff's Proposed Implementing Actions for GMOC's 2015 Annual Report Recommendations

The table below provides status on staff's proposed implementing actions in response to Parks and Recreation issues and recommendations brought forth in the GMOC's 2015 Annual Report.

Status of Implementing Actions for Issues Identified in the GMOC's 2015 Annual Report Regarding Parks and Recreation			
<u>Issue</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Staff Responses and Proposed Implementing Actions</u>	<u>Status</u>
3.5.1 - An update to the Parks and Recreation Master Plan has still not gone to Council for approval.	3.5.1 - That City Council approve the updated Parks and Recreation Master Plan by the end of June 2015 and make additional updates, as necessary.	3.5.1 - Staff is preparing the Parks and Recreation Master Plan for presentation before the Parks and Recreation Commission for early Summer 2015 and a presentation before City Council in Summer/Fall 2015.	The Master Plan is expected to go to Council in September or October 2016. Public Works is adding a chapter on operations and maintenance, and Recreation is adding a section on Cost Recovery, Resource Allocation and Revenue Enhancement.
3.5.2 - Combining the use of parks and recreation and libraries should be considered.	3.5.2 - That City Council direct the City Manager to support mixed use of parks and recreation and library facilities.	3.5.2 - Opportunities for mixed use and revenue generating options are being explored.	Recreation is maximizing opportunities to lease facilities when they are not being used for City services; for instance several rec centers lease to churches, and long-term facility rentals have increased programming offerings. The second floor of the Norman Park Center has become a one-stop shop for social services, such as Meals on Wheels, Home Start, and Southern Caregivers Resource Center.

3.6 FISCAL - COMPLIANT

Threshold Standards:

1. Fiscal Impact Analyses and Public Facilities Financing Plans, at the time they are adopted, shall ensure that new development generates sufficient revenue to offset the cost of providing municipal services and facilities to that development.

2. The city shall establish and maintain, at sufficient levels to ensure the timely delivery of infrastructure and services needed to support growth, consistent with the threshold standards, a Development Impact Fee, capital improvement funding, and other necessary funding programs or mechanisms.

3.6.1 Deferred Maintenance Costs

Issue: Funding is needed for deferred maintenance.

Discussion: The City has been undertaking an asset management program/study to identify Citywide infrastructure needs and develop a financing plan. During the recession, the City deferred equipment replacement and building maintenance costs, which are now catching up. Therefore, the City's Five-Year Financial Forecast includes several major expenditures, but it does not include funding recommendations from the asset management studies.

City staff reported that the City's financial outlook is more stable than it has been in recent years, due to positive revenue growth, implementation of efficiency measures, cooperation of City labor groups, and strong Council leadership; and they do not anticipate fiscal issues resulting from new development. However, the cost for deferred maintenance is so great that supplemental funds will be necessary. Therefore, they are considering bringing forth two different bond measures: a sales tax increase and/or a bond/property tax measure. The GMOC would support this proposal.

Recommend 1: That City Council direct the City Manager to strongly consider ballot measures to increase property and/or sales taxes.

Recommend 2: That City Council direct the City Manager to work with the Director of Economic Development to explore economic development through tax incentives.

3.7 DRAINAGE - COMPLIANT

Threshold Standards:

1. Storm water flows and volumes shall not exceed city engineering standards and shall comply with current local, state and federal regulations, as may be amended from time to time.

2. The GMOC shall annually review the performance of the city's storm drain system, with respect to the impacts of new development, to determine its ability to meet the goal and objective for drainage.

3.7.1 Threshold Compliance

Issue: None.

Discussion: According to the City's engineers, storm water flows or volumes did not exceed City Engineering Standards during the review period, and no new facilities will be needed to accommodate projected growth in the next 12-18 months or the next five years.

They did stress, however, that storm water reuse and pollution prevention are important factors in smart growth, and help to minimize the impact of development on water quality. Implementation of low-impact development best management practices (BMPs), re-use of storm water, and treatment systems to reduce the pollution and runoff coming from new development are essential.

Recommend: None.

3.8 SCHOOLS - COMPLIANT

Threshold Standard:

The city shall annually provide the Chula Vista Elementary School District (CVESD) and the Sweetwater Union High School District (SUHSD) with the city's annual 5-year residential growth forecast and request an evaluation of their ability to accommodate forecasted growth, both citywide and by subarea. Replies from the school districts should address the following:

1. Amount of current classroom and "essential facility" (as defined in the Facility Master Plan) capacity now used or committed;
2. Ability to absorb forecasted growth in affected facilities and identification of what facilities need to be upgraded or added over the next five years;
3. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities identified; and
4. Other relevant information the school district(s) desire(s) to communicate to the city and the Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC).

3.8.1 School Districts' Updates

Issue: None.

Discussion: 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 a new 800-student school (#46) in Otay Ranch Village 2 will begin in April 2016 and is projected to open in July 2017, providing relief to Wolf Canyon Elementary, which is nearing capacity. A second school in Village 2, which will accommodate 600 students, will come later. New schools will also be added in Village 3 and the Eastern Urban Center (Millenia). The school district is limiting and eventually discontinuing zone transfers (from the west side to the east side) so that students that live in the new communities can attend their home school.

Prop E funds are being used to update older schools and address deferred maintenance.

Sweetwater Union High School District

The school district is working on updating its Long-Range Facilities Master Plan and has met with the City to discuss potential high school and middle school sites. Current plans are to begin construction of high school #14 on the northeast corner of Eastlake Parkway and Hunte Parkway, and middle school #12 in Otay Ranch Village 8 West in 2017 and open in July 2019. The district will need to acquire another 25-50-acre site to accommodate future growth.

Recommend: None.

3.9 SEWER - COMPLIANT

Threshold Standards:

1. Existing and projected facility sewage flows and volumes shall not exceed city engineering standards for the current system and for budgeted improvements, as set forth in the Subdivision Manual.
2. The city shall annually ensure adequate contracted capacity in the San Diego Metropolitan Sewer Authority or other means sufficient to meet the projected needs of development.

3.9.1 Long-Term Treatment Capacity

SEWAGE - Flow and Treatment Capacity						
Million Gallons per Day (MGD)	Fiscal Year 2012-13	Fiscal Year 2013-14	Fiscal Year 2014-15	18-month Projection	5-year Projection	"Buildout" Projection
Average Flow	15.734	15.466	15.729	16.59	18.60	29.89
Capacity	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864

Issue: None.

Discussion: The City's permit with the San Diego Metropolitan Sewer Authority is on a five-year cycle and it was submitted in early 2015 with the expectation that it would

be renewed for another five years. With renewal of the permit, the City is well within capacity until at least 2027. Staff will continue to monitor flow rates in order to secure treatment capacity before it is needed.

Recommend: None.

3.10 AIR QUALITY and CLIMATE PROTECTION - INCONCLUSIVE

Threshold Standard:

The city shall pursue a greenhouse gas emissions reduction target consistent with appropriate city climate change and energy efficiency regulations in effect at the time of project application for SPA plans or for the following, subject to the discretion of the Development Services Director:

- a. Residential projects of 50 or more residential dwelling units;
- b. Commercial projects of 12 or more acres (or equivalent square footage);
- c. Industrial projects of 24 or more acres (or equivalent square footage); or
- d. Mixed use projects of 50 equivalent dwelling units or greater.

3.10.1 Incomplete Questionnaire

Issue: A full report was not provided by City staff.

Discussion: Only one of nine questions was responded to by City staff. The explanation provided to the GMOC was that there have been staff changes, as well as changes in software, making it challenging to obtain the necessary information to complete the report.

A report completed by the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) indicated that Chula Vista continues to comply with smog standards 365 days per year.

Recommend: Correct data accessibility software issues so that a full report can be provided next year.

3.11 WATER - COMPLIANT

Threshold Standards:

1. Adequate water supply must be available to serve new development. Therefore, developers shall provide the city with a service availability letter from the appropriate 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 the city's annual 5-year residential growth

forecast and request that they provide an evaluation of their ability to accommodate forecasted growth. Replies should address the following:

- a. Water availability to the city, considering both short- and long-term perspectives.
- b. Identify current and projected demand, and the amount of current capacity, including storage capacity, now used or committed.
- c. Ability of current and projected facilities to absorb forecasted 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 the Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC).

3.11.1 Threshold Compliance

Issue: None.

Discussion: Both the Otay Water District and Sweetwater Authority reported that, despite the State of California's water conservation mandates between June 1, 2015 and February 13, 2016, Chula Vista's water supply is in good shape because customers have been exceeding water conservation goals for several years, in preparation for the drought. (Note: Water Conservation Plans required by Chula Vista's "Growth Management" ordinance for all SPA Plans, Tentative Maps, and major development projects have also had a positive effect on water conservation in the City.)

With ample water in storage, the Otay Water District's water supply is very high—well over what is currently demanded. They continue to pursue a future desalination plant in Rosarito, Mexico as another source of water, however, saying that doing so may provide price stability.

The Sweetwater Authority has several reliable sources of water, including the Richard Reynolds Groundwater Desalination Facility, which is adding five new wells that will result in double the amount of drinking water when complete.

Recommend: None.

4.0 APPENDICES

4.1 Appendix A – Residential Growth Forecast

4.2 Appendix B – Threshold Compliance Questionnaires