



## **GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION**

# **ANNUAL REPORT for Fiscal Year 2018**

July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018

***May 2, 2019***

Approved by the Planning Commission (Resolution No. MPA18-0008) and  
City Council (Resolution No. \_\_\_\_\_) on August 1, 2019

## **GMOC Members**

Duaine Hooker, Chair - (Education)  
Raymundo Alatorre, Vice Chair - (Northwest)  
Michael Lengyel - (Development)  
Gloria Juarez - (Southwest)  
Rodney Caudillo - (Southeast)  
Andrew Strong - (Environmental)  
Max Zaker - (Planning Commission Representative)  
VACANT - (Business)  
VACANT - (Northeast)

## **City Staff**

Kimberly Vander Bie – Associate Planner, GMOC Staff Liaison  
Patricia Salvacion – Secretary  
Scott Barker – Transportation Engineer

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

[www.chulavistaca.gov](http://www.chulavistaca.gov)

# GMOC Chair Cover Memo

DATE: May 2, 2019

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

FROM: Duaine Hooker, Chair  
The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)

SUBJECT: Executive Summary - Fiscal Year 2018 GMOC Annual Report

---

The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) is pleased to submit its Fiscal Year 2018 annual report for your consideration and action.

In reviewing information for this year's report, it was discovered that threshold standards for eight of the eleven quality of life topics were compliant and three were non-compliant. Those found to be compliant were Air Quality and Climate Protection, Drainage, Fire and Emergency Medical Services, Fiscal, Parks and Recreation, Schools, Sewer, and Water.

Non-compliant were Libraries, Police (Priority 1 and Priority 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 fifteenth consecutive year, Libraries was non-compliant. The deficit in library space is expected to continue for several more years until a large library is built in Millenia. While the Rancho del Rey Library is included on the Public Facilities Development Impact Fees list of future public facilities, it has been, and will continue to be, pushed down the list due to the need for additional fire stations.

In addition to the shortage of library space, the GMOC is also concerned about inadequate budgeting for library materials. Chula Vista's expenditures for library materials (per capita) are 59% below the statewide average, and the Otay Ranch branch is the highest U.S. Passport processing center in the nation. To help increase expenditures for library materials, the GMOC highly recommends that any future surplus in the City's budget should be used to supplement the library materials budget, and the amount should be at least as much as the revenue generated by processing passports.

Police – The Priority 1 threshold standard was not met, and the Priority 2 threshold standard was non-compliant for the 22nd year in a row. Police reported they have the equipment necessary to deliver services, but adequate staffing continues to be an issue.

The Police Department is in the process of recruiting new officers to fill vacant positions. Currently, and throughout the next five years, additional officer positions, funded from Measure A, are being added. Population growth is projected to outpace staffing levels and the Police Department does NOT anticipate being able to accommodate citywide growth forecasted over the next 12 months or 5 years. The GMOC

recommends that the City Council and City managers continue to make adding more police officers a top priority, working toward the County median staffing levels per capita.

Traffic – Eastbound and westbound traffic conditions on Palomar Street, between Industrial Boulevard and Broadway, were found to be non-compliant, once again. The rail crossing at Palomar Street causes traffic to accumulate and has been a concern for some time. This rail crossing has been identified by SANDAG as the County's eminent rail crossing in need of repair. City engineers continue to work with SANDAG on plans to grade-separate the rail crossing from vehicular and pedestrian traffic, which should significantly improve the level of service.

On January 26, 2019, the GMOC, along with some members of the Measure P Citizens' Oversight Committee, went on its annual tour of new and proposed development throughout the City. We were pleased to witness some of the Measure P infrastructure projects that have been completed, thus far, and of new construction projects within the City. During the tour, we visited the Loma Verde Recreation Center and met employees there who showed us photos of the building during recent rainstorms, when garbage cans were needed to capture water gushing through the ceiling. The GMOC understands that City management has visited the site and is aware of the building's poor condition; however, the GMOC recommends that the City Council also visit the center and explore solutions to remediate the problems. The GMOC would like to thank the City staff from various departments who took time on that Saturday morning to join us for this important tour.

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 and Patricia Salvacion 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

## GMOG Fiscal Year 2018

### Annual Report

#### Table of Contents

<b>GMOG CHAIR COVER MEMO</b>	<b>1-2</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>4-5</b>
1.1 Threshold Standards	4
1.2 Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOG)	4-5
1.3 GMOG Fiscal Year 2018 Annual Review Process	5
1.4 Annual Five-Year Residential Growth Forecast	5-6
<b>2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE DISCUSSIONS</b>	<b>8-24</b>
<b>3.1 Libraries</b>	<b>8-9</b>
3.1.1 Threshold Compliance	8-9
<b>3.2 Police</b>	<b>10-13</b>
3.2.1 Threshold Compliance	10-11
3.2.2 Threshold Compliance	12-13
<b>3.3 Traffic</b>	<b>13-15</b>
3.3.1 Threshold Compliance	13-15
<b>3.4 Fire and Emergency Medical Services</b>	<b>15-16</b>
3.4.1 Threshold Compliance	15-16
<b>3.5 Parks and Recreation</b>	<b>16-18</b>
3.5.1 Threshold Compliance	16-18
<b>3.6 Fiscal</b>	<b>18</b>
3.6.1 Threshold Compliance	18
<b>3.7 Drainage</b>	<b>19</b>
3.7.1 Threshold Compliance	19
<b>3.8 Schools</b>	<b>20-21</b>
3.8.1 Threshold Compliance	20-21
<b>3.9 Sewer</b>	<b>21</b>
3.9.1 Threshold Compliance	21
<b>3.10 Air Quality and Climate Protection</b>	<b>22</b>
3.10.1 Threshold Compliance	22
<b>3.11 Water</b>	<b>23-24</b>
3.11.1 Threshold Compliance	23-24
<b>4.0 APPENDICES</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>4.1 Appendix A – Growth Forecast</b>	
<b>4.2 Appendix B – Threshold Compliance Questionnaires</b>	

# 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, along with one or more goals, objectives, and implementation measures for each topic, are memorialized in the City's Growth Management ordinance (Chapter 19.09 of the Chula Vista Municipal Code), which was updated and approved by City Council in 2015 after a multi-year, comprehensive review of the Growth Management Program (i.e., a "top-to-bottom" review). The process involved members of the Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC), City staff, City Council, and various community stakeholders.

The eleven topics include eight within the City's control: Drainage, Fire and Emergency Medical Services, Fiscal, Libraries, Parks and Recreation Areas, Police, Sewer, and Traffic. Two topics, Schools and Water, are controlled by outside agencies, and one topic, Air Quality and Climate Protection, is controlled by both the City and an outside agency. 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

The GMOC (also referred to as "the Commission") was established by the City Council in 1987, and its purpose is to provide an independent, annual review for compliance with the threshold standards. The 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 of the City. The GMOC membership provides for representation from the City's four major geographic areas and from a cross-section of interests, including education, environment, business, and development, and from the City's Planning Commission. One commissioner also represents the GMOC on the Measure A Citizens' Oversight Committee (COC) and another serves on the Measure P COC (noted on the table below). During this review cycle, the following individuals served as commissioners on the GMOC:

COMMISSIONER	DISTRICTS OR INTERESTS
Duaine Hooker, Chair	Education
Raymundo Alatorre, Vice Chair	Northwest, and Measure A COC Representative
Gloria Juarez	Southwest
Rodney Caudillo	Southeast
Michael Lengyel	Development, and Measure P COC Representative
Andrew Strong	Environmental
Max Zaker	Planning Commission
VACANT	Business
VACANT	Northeast

The GMOC's review of the eleven quality of life topics is structured around three timeframes:

1. A Fiscal Year cycle to accommodate City Council review of GMOC recommendations that may have budget implications. The FY 2018 Annual Report focuses on Fiscal Year 2018 (July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018);
2. The second half of 2018 and beginning of 2019 to identify and address pertinent issues identified during this timeframe, and to assure that the GMOC responds to current events and conditions; and
3. A five-year forecast to assure that the GMOC has a future orientation. The period from January 2019 through December 2023 is assessed for potential threshold compliance concerns.

The GMOC annually distributes questionnaires to relevant City departments and public facility and service ("outside") agencies (i.e., school districts, water districts, and the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District) to monitor the status of compliance with the threshold standards. When the questionnaires are completed, the GMOC reviews the information for compliance with the identified threshold standards and considers issues of concern and possible recommendations. 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 Review Process for Fiscal Year 2018**

The GMOC held nine regular meetings and one city-wide development tour between September 2018 and April 2019, all of which were open to the public. At the first regular meeting, Assistant City Manager Maria Kachadoorian provided updates on expenditures for sales tax Measures A and P. At subsequent GMOC meetings, the commissioners reviewed the eleven quality of life topics and the associated questionnaire responses (attached as Appendix B). Representatives from the appropriate City departments and outside agencies were invited to attend and provide presentations to the Commission. Through this process, and as outlined in this report, City staff and the GMOC discussed each of the topics, recognized status of threshold compliance and efforts made, and identified concerns and recommendations.

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 2, 2019.

## **1.4 Annual Five-Year Residential Growth Forecast**

The Development Services Department annually prepares a Five-Year Residential Growth Forecast; the latest edition is dated September 21, 2018. Determining the projected number of residential building permits to be issued begins by soliciting projections from developers and builders who have completed or are undergoing the entitlement process for Sectional Planning Area (SPA) plans or design review, then determining status of compliance with environmental mitigation measures that must be met prior to issuance of grading and building permits. The projected numbers reflect consideration of the City's standard entitlement process and permitting time frames, and, as such, do not reflect market or other economic conditions outside the City's control.

The Forecast provides City 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 outside agencies determine if their respective public facilities/services would be able to accommodate the forecasted growth. The growth projections from September 2018 through December 2023 indicated an additional 7,760 residential units that could potentially be permitted for construction in the City over the next five years, (7,349 units in the east and 411 units in the west). This equates to an annual average of 1,455 housing units, with 1,378 units in the east and 77 units in the west.

## 2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

The following table is a summary of the GMOC's conclusions regarding threshold standards for the Fiscal Year 2018 review cycle. Eight thresholds were met, three were not met.

<b>FISCAL YEAR 2018 THRESHOLD STANDARD REVIEW SUMMARY</b> Review Period 7/1/17 Through 6/30/18				
Threshold Standard	Threshold Met	Threshold Not Met	Potential for Future Non-compliance	Adopt/Fund Tactics to Achieve Compliance
1. <b>Libraries</b>		X	X	X
2. <b>Police</b>				
<i>Priority 1-Emergency</i>		X	X	X
<i>Priority 2-Urgent</i>		X	X	X
3. <b>Traffic</b>		X	X	X
4. <b>Fire/EMS</b>	X			
5. <b>Parks and Recreation</b>	X			
6. <b>Fiscal</b>	X			
7. <b>Drainage</b>	X			
8. <b>Schools</b>	X			
9. <b>Sewer</b>	X			
10. <b>Air Quality and Climate Protection</b>	X			
11. <b>Water</b>	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 Threshold Compliance

**Issue:** The threshold standard was not met.

ADEQUACY OF LIBRARIES BASED ON THE THRESHOLD STANDARD			
	Population	Total Gross Square Footage of Library Facilities	Gross Square Feet of Library Facilities Per 1000 Residents (Threshold = 500 GSF/1000)
<b>5-Year Projection (2023)</b>	<b>293,663</b>	<b>134,412 (a) 129,000(b)</b>	<b>458 (a) 439(b)</b>
<b>FY 2018</b>	<b>275,158</b>	<b>97,412</b>	<b>354</b>
FY 2017	271,323	97,412	359
FY 2016	265,070	97,412	367
FY 2015	257,362	97,412	379
FY 2014	256,139	97,412***	380
FY 2013	251,613	95,412	379
FY 2012	249,382	92,000/95,412**	369/383**
FY 2011	246,496	102,000/92,000*	414/387*
FY 2010	233,692	102,000	436
FY 2009	233,108	102,000	437
FY 2008	231,305	102,000	441
FY 2007	227,723	102,000	448
FY 2006	223,423	102,000	457
FY 1990	135,163	57,329	425

Notes:

\*After closure of Eastlake library in 2011

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

\*\*\* After opening the Hub Annex

(a) includes projected Millenia Library at 37,000 square feet and retaining Otay Ranch branch

(b) includes projected Millenia Library, closing Otay Ranch Branch

Baseline per threshold standard adopted by Resolution No. 1987-13346. Threshold standard has not been amended.

**Discussion:** For the fifteenth consecutive year, the City's library facilities did not comply with the threshold standard to provide 500 GSF of library space per 1,000 residents. City library facilities total 97,412 GSF, which is about 29 percent or 40,000 square feet below the threshold standard requirement. Until Chula Vista increases library facilities by a minimum of 40,000 square feet, the libraries threshold standard will be out of compliance. As projected growth continues, the square footage deficit will continue to inflate.

The City's library materials also did not comply with the threshold standard to provide adequately equipped library facilities. The statewide average annual materials expenditure for books, digital resources, magazines, etc. is \$3.18 per person and Chula Vista's baseline materials budget equals \$0.21 per person. Median state public library expenditure per capita for Fiscal Year (FY) 16/17 was \$33.75 compared to Chula Vista's expenditure of \$14.07.

Library staffing for Chula Vista's libraries did not comply with the threshold standard to provide adequately staffed library facilities. At 0.15 full time employees (FTE) per 1,000 residents, Chula Vista Library's FTE ratio per capita is at the bottom 5.4 percent of libraries statewide, relative to a statewide average of 0.43 FTE for public libraries. Despite low staffing per capita, Chula Vista Library continues to exceed the statewide average in many workload indicators, such as population served, reference questions per hour, and visits per open hour. The Otay Ranch Library is the busiest passport office in the country.

Grants and donations have helped the library sustain itself and implement new and innovative programs that educate and serve the community, such as VRex, a classroom style virtual reality experience, mental health first aid resources, and a Seed Library that gives seeds to community members who want to plant their own gardens.

Measure P funds have been used to complete deferred maintenance projects, including renovating one set of restrooms in the Civic Center Library and replacing the roofing there; a new HVAC system has been installed at the South Library.

A new, full-service library in the Millenia development is anticipated to be under construction within the next five years. The Growth Management Oversight Commission believes that, simultaneously, the Rancho del Rey library site should also be developed.

**Recommendation 1:** That the City Council direct the City Manager to prioritize Libraries, right below public safety, with the objective of increasing the amount of materials and staffing to meet the state average, based on the most recent data available.

**Recommendation 2:** That the City Council direct the City Manager to allocate a portion of any surplus from future budgets to supplement the library materials budget, on a one-time basis. It is further recommended that the supplemental funds should be equal to the fees collected in any given year for processing passport applications.

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

### Threshold Standards:

**1. Priority 1 – Emergency Calls<sup>1</sup>.** 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 Calls<sup>2</sup>.** Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to all Priority 2 calls within 12 minutes or less (measured annually).

<sup>1</sup>Priority 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.

<sup>2</sup>Priority 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 Threshold Compliance

**Issue:** The threshold standard was not met.

Priority 1 – Emergency Calls or Services				
Fiscal Year	Call Volume (Initial Priority Assigned) <sup>e</sup>	Timed Call Volume (Calls used in the calculation of response times <sup>g</sup> )	% of Call Responses Within 7 Minutes 30 Seconds (Threshold = 81%)	Average Response Time (Minutes) (Threshold = 6 Minutes)
FY 2018	675 of 65,581	507	71.8%	6:43 <sup>f</sup>
FY 2017	765 of 65,672	521	72.2%	6:47
FY 2016 <sup>a</sup>	742 of 67,048	520	71.0%	6:31
FY 2015	675 of 64,008	465	71.2%	6:49
FY 2014	711 of 65,645	534	73.6%	6:45
FY 2013	738 of 65,741	517	74.1%	6:42
FY 2012	726 of 64,386	529	72.8%	6:31
FY 2011	657 of 64,695	518	80.7%	6:03
FY 2002 <sup>b</sup>	1,539 of 71,859	--	80.0%	5:07
FY1992 <sup>c</sup>	--	--	81.2%	4:54
FY1990 <sup>d</sup>	--	--	87.6%	4:08
a. Threshold standard was amended by Ordinance No. 2015-3339 to current standard. b. Priority 1: 81% within 7 minutes, maximum average of 5:30; Priority 2: 57% within 7 minutes, maximum average of 7:30 (Reso. No. 2002-159). c. Priority 1: 85% within 7 minutes, maximum average of 4.5 minutes; Priority 2: 62% within 7 minutes, maximum average of 7 minutes (Ord. No. 1991-2448).				

- d. The 1990 GMOC Report stated threshold standard: Priority 1: 84% within 7 minutes, maximum average of 4.5 minutes; Priority 2: 62% within 7 minutes, maximum average of 7 minutes.
- e. Calls are assigned an initial priority, but the priority may be changed at the end of the call as the entire set of circumstances associated with the call are known. Call Volume figures are not used in any calculations.
- f. In FY 2018, the department modified the methodology used to calculate response times. Response times now include any call where the received-time and the arrival-time are the same (i.e. officer is "flagged-down" in the street). Additionally, incidents where the call has been holding for more than 1 hour are also included. These calls were excluded from previous year's reporting. The modified methodology produced more accurate data but resulted in a significant increase in reported response times for Priority 2 calls. Using the previous methodology, for example, Priority 2 response times for FY 2018 would have increased by 31 seconds (Average Response Time: 14:24). But, using the revised methodology, Priority 2 response times increased by 5:53 minutes (Average Response Time: 20:17). Priority 1 calls were not affected by the change since they are addressed immediately.
- g. In FY 2018, the department included the Time Call Volume column. Timed Call Volume represents the actual count of Priority 1 calls used in determining Average Response Time and % of Call Responses within 7:30. Timed Call Volume includes calls where the priority does not change as more information is known. Call Volume, on the other hand, includes the total number of calls received where the original priority is assigned based on the immediate information known, and where the priority changed after more information is available.

**Discussion:** Table 1, above, indicates that a total of 71.8 percent (column 4) of the Priority 1 calls were responded to within 7 minutes 30 seconds, nearly ten percent less than the threshold standard of 81 percent, and 0.4% less than in Fiscal Year 2017. The response time threshold standard of six minutes was also not met; however, the response time of 6:43 (column 5) was four seconds better than in Fiscal Year 2017.

Although the Police Department was properly equipped to deliver services at the levels necessary to comply with the threshold standards in Fiscal Year 2018, they reported that they were not properly staffed to do so. Effective patrol staffing was down by about five officers in Fiscal Year 2018, due to injuries and other staffing challenges. Specific units were properly staffed, but actual units per beat count (the territory and time that a police officer patrols) were below the necessary levels to meet the demands of the community. The Police Department is actively recruiting to fill the officer vacancies, and the GMOC encourages the City to explore non-traditional incentives for recruiting. One possible idea would be to provide temporary housing for officers with long commutes.

Measure A, a permanent half-cent sales tax initiative approved in June 2018, will help fund approximately 31 more sworn officers in the next five years; however, the City will remain among the lowest staffed law enforcement agencies in the County. Projected population growth through 2023 would necessitate hiring 148 officers to bring the ratio of officers per 1,000 residents in line with the County average of 1.29.

Chula Vista's crime rate is currently below the County average; however, the Police Department reported that current facilities, equipment and staff will not be able to accommodate forecasted growth in the next 12-18 months or five years.

**Recommendation 1:** That the City Council direct the City Manager to prioritize the City's annual budget so that staffing levels per capita will be consistent with the County's median staffing levels per capita.

**Recommendation 2:** That the City Council direct the City Manager to support the Police Department to aggressively expand a new officer recruitment campaign, providing it with the proper tools, technology and resources to aid in the process.

### 3.2.2. Threshold Compliance

**Issue:** The threshold standard was not met.

Table 2. Priority 2 – Urgent Calls for Service			
Fiscal Year	Call Volume (Initial Priority Assigned <sup>e</sup> )	Timed Call Volume (Calls used in the calculation of response times)	Average Response Time (Minutes) (Threshold = 12 Minutes)
<b>FY 2018</b>	<b>18,969 of 65,581</b>	<b>16,023</b>	<b>20:17<sup>f</sup></b>
FY 2017	19,309 of 65,672	14,829	13:53
FY 2016 <sup>a</sup>	19,288 of 67,048	14,729	13:50
FY 2015	17,976 of 64,008	13,694	13:50
FY 2014	17,817 of 65,645	13,681	13:36
FY 2013	18,505 of 65,741	14,258	13:44
FY 2012	22,121 of 64,386	17,185	14:20
FY 2011	21,500 of 64,695	17,054	12:52
FY 2002 <sup>b</sup>	22,199 of 71,859	--	10:04
FY1992 <sup>c</sup>	--	--	6:30
FY1990 <sup>d</sup>	--	--	6:15
<p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Threshold standard was amended by Ordinance No. 2015-3339 to current standard.</li> <li>b. Priority 1: 81% within 7 minutes, maximum average of 5:30; Priority 2: 57% within 7 minutes, maximum average of 7:30 (Reso. No. 2002-159).</li> <li>c. Priority 1: 85% within 7 minutes, maximum average of 4.5 minutes; Priority 2: 62% within 7 minutes, maximum average of 7 minutes (Ord. No. 1991-2448).</li> <li>d. The 1990 GMOC Report stated threshold standard: Priority 1: 84% within 7 minutes, maximum average of 4.5 minutes; Priority 2: 62% within 7 minutes, maximum average of 7 minutes.</li> <li>e. Calls are assigned an initial priority but the priority may be changed at the end of the call as the entire set of circumstances associated with the call are known. Call Volume figures are not used in any calculations.</li> <li>f. FY 2018, the department modified the methodology used to calculate response times. Response times now include any call where the received-time and the arrival-time are the same (i.e. officer is "flagged-down" in the street). Additionally, incidents where the call has been holding for more than 1 hour are also included. These calls were excluded from previous year's reporting. The modified methodology produced more accurate data but resulted in a significant increase in reported response times for Priority 2 calls. Using the previous methodology, for example, Priority 2 response times for FY 2018 would have increased by 31 seconds (Average Response Time: 14:24). But, using the revised methodology, Priority 2 response times increased by 5:53 minutes (Average Response Time: 20:17). Priority 1 calls were not affected by the change since they are addressed immediately.</li> </ul>			

**Discussion:** The Police Department reported that they recently conducted an extensive review of methods used to calculate response times prior to Fiscal Year 2018 and determined that previous methods did not include data subsequently deemed pertinent. Using new methodology that includes previously omitted data (such as calls that are on hold for more

than one hour), the table above indicates that the Priority 2 average response time for Fiscal Year 2018 was above the 12-minute threshold standard by 6 minutes 24 seconds. (Priority 1 calls were not affected by the change because they are addressed immediately.) If the department had continued using the methodology used in previous years, the average response time would have increased by only 31 seconds.

The Police Department attributed the 31-second increase from the previous year to three primary reasons: 1) During Fiscal Year 2018, the Department's effective patrol staffing dropped below historical averages; 2) At the beginning of Fiscal Year 2018, the Department implemented a new CAD system, which required considerable time for personnel to adapt to; and 3) The average amount of time that officers spent on-scene investigating calls increased. For Priority 2, the call was completed in 57 minutes 30 seconds, which was 8 minutes 10 seconds longer than in Fiscal Year 2017.

As discussed above regarding Priority 1, current facilities, equipment and staff will not be able to accommodate forecasted growth in the next 12-18 months or five years. Therefore, the GMOC has the same recommendations for Priority 2 as for Priority 1.

**Recommendation 1:** That the City Council direct the City Manager to prioritize the City's annual budget so that staffing levels per capita will be consistent with the County's median staffing levels per capita.

**Recommendation 2:** That the City Council direct the City Manager to support the Police Department to aggressively expand a new officer recruitment campaign, providing it with the proper tools, technology and resources to aid in the process.

### **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 Threshold Compliance

**Issue:** The threshold standard was not met.

NON-COMPLIANT ROADWAY SEGMENTS		
Non-Urban Streets	Direction	Level of Service (LOS)
Otay Lakes Road* (Ridgeback Rd to Telegraph Canyon Rd)	SB*	D (3)   E (1)*
Palomar Street (Between Industrial Blvd & Broadway)	EB WB	D (2)   E (4) E (3)   F (3)
PAST PERFORMANCE (BASELINE)		
Number of Non-Compliant Segments FY2017 <sup>a</sup>	1 (Non-Urban)	
Number of Non-Compliant Intersections FY1992 <sup>b</sup>	0	
Number of Non-Compliant Intersections FY1989 <sup>c</sup>	8	
The LOS for 1989 was based on the 1990 GMOC Report dated June 1990.		
Notes: *Existing SCATS adaptive traffic signal system that improves traffic signal coordination was offline when data was collected. The modern replacement system will be online and fully functional before the end of FY19. a. Threshold standard was amended by Ord. No. 2015-3339 to be based on roadway segments instead of intersections. b. Threshold standard was amended by Ord. No. 1991-2448. c. Baseline as defined in the threshold standard approved in the City Council Policy adopted by Resolution No. 1987-13346.		

**Discussion:** Two non-urban street segments were non-compliant: southbound Otay Lakes Road from Ridgeback Road to Telegraph Canyon Road, and eastbound and westbound Palomar Street between Industrial Boulevard and Broadway.

Southbound Otay Lakes Road from Ridgeback Road to Telegraph Canyon Road fronts Southwestern College and Bonita Vista High School, where there are several signalized intersections and many pedestrian crossings that can cause vehicle delays. The intelligent, adaptive traffic signal system in this area (the Sydney Coordinated Adaptive Traffic Signal System, or SCATS) broke down, which is probably why this segment failed to comply with the applicable growth management threshold standard. A Capital Improvement Project replaced the offline SCATS System with a new and improved system at the end of calendar year 2018; this is expected to improve the LOS and bring the street back into compliance with the growth management threshold standard.

Eastbound and westbound Palomar Street between Industrial Boulevard to Broadway has been non-compliant since Fiscal Year 2016. The poor LOS at this location is attributed to the at-grade transit crossing that regularly interrupts vehicular flow throughout the day. City staff continues to work with SANDAG on plans for a grade separation at that location; the project is likely to be completed in five years.

Due to lack of funding, urban street segments were not studied during this fiscal year. As of August 2018, the Traffic Engineering Division is fully staffed so the Fiscal Year 2019 questionnaire will provide substantially more data. More automated traffic monitoring devices are being installed, and the City has an agreement with Waze, the

roadway navigation and traffic reporting application, to share data, which will support aggregation and assessment of LOS on City roadways.

**Statement of Concern:** The GMOC is concerned that continued growth and development will worsen existing traffic congestion on Palomar Street in future years, given that the planned grade separation improvements will likely take five years to complete.

### 3.4 **FIRE and EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES (EMS) – 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).

Note: For growth management purposes, response time includes dispatch, turnout and travel time to the building or site address.

#### 3.4.1 **Threshold Compliance**

**Issue:** None.

FIRE and EMS Response Times FY 2018						
Fiscal Year	All Calls For Service	% of All Calls Responded to Within 7 Minutes (Threshold = 80%)	Average Response Time For All Calls	Average Travel Time	Average Dispatch Time	Average Turn-out Time
2018	13,986	81.4	5:45	4:06	0:50	0:49
2017	13,665	80.6	5:50	4:07	0:53	0:50
2016	13,481	74.8	6:15	4:25	0:55	0:56
2015	12,561	78.3	6:14	3:51	1:12	1:10
2014	11,721	76.5	6:02	3:34	1:07	1:21
2013	12,316	75.7	6:02	3:48	1:05	1:08

**Discussion:** For the second consecutive year, Fire and Emergency Medical Services (EMS) complied with the growth management threshold standard of responding to calls within 7 minutes 80 percent of the time. They responded within 7 minutes 81.4 percent of the time, nearly one percentage better than the previous year, even with 4.3 percent more calls. While the threshold standard was met on a citywide basis, it was not met by certain individual fire stations in eastern Chula Vista, despite improved response times. This pattern has been observed in previous years as well.

Fire calls accounted for 2.1 percent of all calls, EMS calls accounted for 68.9 percent, and all other calls accounted for 29.1 percent.

FY 2018 FIRE and EMS Response Times - By Fire Station						
Fire Station # And Location	All Calls For Service	% of All Calls Responded to Within 7 Minutes (Threshold = 80%)	Average Response Time For All Calls	Average Travel Time	Average Dispatch Time	Average Turn-out Time
1 -447 F St.	4424	90.7	04:54	03:19	00:53	00:42
2 -80 East J. St	964	78.3	05:58	04:23	00:45	00:51
3 -1410 Brandywine	836	79	06:11	04:44	00:46	00:42
4 -850 Paseo Ranchero	868	76.9	06:12	04:32	00:47	00:53
5 -391 Oxford	3275	85.5	05:37	03:55	00:51	00:51
6 -605 Mt. Miguel	607	75.7	06:14	04:24	00:50	01:01
7 -1640 Santa Venetia	1152	56.8	07:04	05:13	00:53	00:58
8 -1180 Woods Dr.	841	62.7	07:04	05:19	00:48	00:56
9 -266 E. Oneida	1019	82.6	06:00	04:23	00:45	00:52

The fire and EMS units were properly equipped and staffed to meet the threshold standard, and current facilities, equipment and staff should be able to accommodate citywide projected growth and meet the threshold standard during the next 12-18 months. However, current facilities, equipment and staff will not be able to accommodate citywide projected growth and meet the threshold standard during the next five years.

Updates to the Fire Facilities Master Plan were approved by City Council in August 2018. Changes include: implementation of 4-0 staffing, implementation of squads, relocation of stations 5 and 9, and Retention Policy for apparatus and equipment. A fire station under construction in Millenia will serve that community, and a fire station will be part of the Bayfront development, as well. Funding from the Measure A one-half cent sales tax will provide staffing improvements, and the Measure P temporary one-half cent sales tax will provide infrastructure improvements, such as relocating fire stations 5 and 9 and purchasing fire apparatus and equipment. These enhancements are expected to help improve response times.

The Fire Department's proposal to discontinue responding to Level 3 calls for service has not been implemented. It was not agreeable through contract negotiations with American Medical Response. The City is preparing a Request for Proposal seeking qualified transport providers, a process that may take up to two years to complete.

## 3.5 PARKS AND RECREATION – COMPLIANT

### 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.

<b>PARK ACREAGE</b> <b>Threshold, Forecast, and Comparisons</b> <b>Baseline 1989<sup>a</sup> – Population: 131,603 Parkland Acreage: 299.15 Parkland/1000 Residents: 2.27</b>								
Threshold Standard	Area of City	City-Owned 6/30/18	Current Available <sup>b</sup> 12/31/18	Forecasts <sup>c</sup>		Prior Year Comparisons		
				18-Month (12/31/19)	5-Year (2023)	June 2015	June 2016	June 2017
<b>3 acres per 1,000 population East of I-805</b>	<b>East I-805</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>3.66</b>	<b>2.94</b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>3.99</b>
	West I-805	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.3	1.20	1.21	1.19
	Citywide	2.61	2.62	2.58	2.69	2.16	2.11	2.77
<b>Acres of parkland</b>	<b>East I-805</b>	<b>578.98</b>	<b>582.88</b>	<b>582.88</b>	<b>632.94</b>	<b>418.44</b>	<b>421.00</b>	<b>604.25</b>
	West I-805	138.95	138.95	138.95	157.11	138.76	142.66	138.95
	Citywide	717.93	721.83	721.83	790.05	557.20	563.07	743.30
<b>Population</b>	<b>East I-805</b>	<b>155461</b>	<b>155461</b>	<b>159,693</b>	<b>173,005</b>	<b>142,547</b>	<b>148,714</b>	<b>151,266</b>
	West I-805	119697	119697	120,081	120,658	115,801	118,275	116,651
	Citywide	275,158	275,158	279,774	293,663	58,348	266,969	267,917
<b>Acreage shortfall or excess</b>	<b>East I-805</b>	<b>(112.6)</b>	<b>(116.5)</b>	<b>(103.8)</b>	<b>(113.93)</b>	<b>9.20</b>	<b>25.67</b>	<b>(150.45)</b>
	West I-805	220.14	220.14	221.39	204.86	208.64	212.17	211.00
	Citywide	107.54	103.64	117.49	90.94	217.84	237.84	60.55

Notes:

- Baseline per threshold standard adopted by Resolution No. 1987-13346. Threshold standard has not been amended.
- Current available park acreage includes:
  - Publicly owned and maintained parks and recreation facilities (including existing Bayfront parks),
  - Acreages of extra credit allocated to parks with additional amenities,
  - Acres within HOA parks allocated park credit,
  - Chula Vista municipal golf course,
  - City open spaces that function as parks and special purpose parks, for example, Pedestrian Park and Circle Park. (Park acreage does not include undeveloped park areas either owned or offered to the City for dedication.)

Since the 2017/2018 questionnaire was completed, park acreages were refined during the City-wide Parks and Recreation Master Plan finalization process. During the final inventory of the City's Parks, prior to the adoption of the Chula Vista Parks and Recreation Master Plan, 25 acres of MSCP areas and open space land adjacent to parks were deducted from the total. This was because they are not available for active park use. The deduction made a significant revision to the total park acreage currently available.

Added to the figure this year are the 3.9 acres of new park opened at Montecito Park Phase 1.

- Forecast data includes addition of parkland anticipated to be opened within the identified time horizon.

Please also note that there is some acreage expected to be created as a result of the expansion of the existing Bayside Park (aka future Harbor Park), however, the limits of work for this expansion have yet to be determined. Therefore, the acreage has not yet been included in the 2023 total.

**Discussion:** The City currently has 3.75 park acres available per 1,000 residents in eastern Chula Vista, exceeding the threshold standard requiring 3 acres per 1,000 residents; it is forecasted to have 3.65 acres per 1,000 residents by 2020, and 3.66 acres per 1,000 by 2023 in eastern Chula Vista.

Citywide, there are currently 2.62 acres per 1,000 residents; 2.58 are forecasted by 2020 and 2.69 per 1,000 residents are forecasted by 2023. The Citywide Parks and Recreation Master Plan was adopted by the City Council on August 7, 2018.

On April 1, 2018, updated facility fees went into effect.

## **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 Threshold Compliance**

**Issue:** None.

**Discussion:** Adequate funds are available to complete some development and growth-related projects in the next 12-18 months. The largest project anticipated is the Millenia Fire Station, to be constructed by the developer for credits against their Public Facilities Development Impact Fee (PFDIF) fee obligation, rather than through direct expenditures for the PFDIF fund balance. More than \$48 million in Transportation Development Impact Fees have been appropriated for roadway improvements in the eastern portion of the City.

The adequacy of funds to complete necessary projects necessitated by either the 12-to-18-month or the 5-year forecasted growth will be determined by a number of factors, including the actual rate of development (which may fall below the rate of development projected in the September 21, 2018 Residential Growth Forecast) and other fund obligations. These other obligations include debt service, capital acquisitions, and program administration costs.

Fee programs need to be updated from time to time to reflect current construction cost trends, changes in planned development and public facilities, and changes to governing regulations. Several Development Impact Fee funds are planned for revision in 2019.

## 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:** City engineers reported that storm water flows and volumes did not exceed City Engineering Standards during Fiscal Year 2018. Additional storm water control structures were added, and more are expected as growth continues; however, no new facilities will be needed to accommodate projected growth in the next 12-18 months or the next five years.

Development projects that capture, store, or re-use storm water will become more important as storm water regulations change and demand for water increases. To keep the City in compliance with these regulations, and to support the City's growth at a watershed and regional level, continued support of the storm water management programs is important.

In October 2017, the Governor of California signed Senate Bill 231, which clarifies the definition of "sewer" to include both sanitary and storm sewers (drainage). City staff is evaluating if allowing the process used to set sanitary sewer fees may provide additional funding to operate and maintain the City wide storm sewer system assets in the future.

## 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 Threshold Compliance

**Issue:** None.

**Discussion:** Both the Chula Vista Elementary School District (CVESD) and the Sweetwater Union High School District (SUHSD) reported that they will not be able to accommodate projected growth unless new facilities are constructed within the next five years.

**Chula Vista Elementary School District**

CVESD reported that it will be able to accommodate forecasted growth through 2019. The District currently accommodates overflow conditions by shifting students to different schools when the maximum capacity at a given school is reached. This calendar year, the CVESD anticipates providing portable units at Muraoka Elementary to house 200 students.

In spring 2020, construction of a new school, funded by a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District, will begin in Otay Ranch Village 3 to accommodate future students. The addition of this school will enable the school district to provide enough facilities for the growth that is projected over the next five years.

CVESD continuously monitors enrollment and capacity to plan for additional students resulting from new residential development. Tools include a Geographic Information Systems (GIS) database and the City's Major Project Development Status Report.

The CVESD prioritizes maintenance for existing facilities using a Deferred Maintenance Plan and relevant Master Plans. The District maintains a GIS database of buildings, interior spaces, roofs, and other facilities and elements.

**Sweetwater Union High School District**

SUHSD is currently reviewing its enrollment projection methodology; thus, one-year and five-year projections should be considered draft, and are subject to change.

Currently, the SUHSD projects that its existing schools/facilities will be sufficient to accommodate forecasted growth through December 2019. The District has experienced a decline in enrollment, and this trend is expected to continue with reduction of approximately 300 students in 2019. However, with the amount of growth projected through the year 2023, additional facilities will be needed. The SUHSD is planning to add new buildings to the Eastlake High School and Olympian High School sites to accommodate the additional students anticipated with the projected growth.

In June 2018, the SUHSD's Board of Trustees adopted a new Facility Master Plan, which will be updated annually, as needed.

Regarding maintenance of existing facilities, prioritization is determined by the following internal tools: (1) facility condition assessments (2) site work order requests (3) life cycle analysis, and (4) preventative maintenance. Currently routine maintenance is funded at 2.6%, with a forecast of 3.0% for fiscal year 2019-20.

## 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 Threshold Compliance

<b>SEWAGE - Flow and Treatment Capacity</b>						
<b>Million Gallons per Day (MGD)</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2016</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2017</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2018</b>	<b>18-month Projection<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>5-year Projection</b>	<b>"Buildout" Projection<sup>2</sup></b>
<b>Average Flow</b>	15.385	15.426	15.280	15.790 <sup>1</sup>	16.072	20.760 <sup>2</sup>
<b>Capacity</b>	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864

1. Represents an averaged projected flow for FY2019 and 2020.

2. The current Chula Vista Wastewater Master Plan (WMP) identifies a conservative planning level sewer generation rate of 230 gallons per EDU. The WMP estimates the City's ultimate sewer treatment capacity required for the currently planned build out condition will be 29.89 MGD. However, the treatment capacity requirement is preliminarily estimated at 20.76 MGD using a generation rate based on current metered flow data. The decrease in flow can be attributed, in part, to the recent increase in the cost of water combined with on-going water conservation efforts. The Wastewater Engineering Section will continue to track water usage trends, changes in land use and population projections to validate current generation rates and project the ultimate need for the City. Additionally, the City is currently soliciting consultants to conduct a new 5-year Sewer Rate Study which will also review appropriate generation rates.

**Issue:** None.

**Discussion:** The City continues to have sufficient sewage treatment capacity, and consistent conservation efforts are having a positive impact on average flow, which was down 0.146 Million Gallons per Day from Fiscal Year 2017 to Fiscal Year 2018.

The City's Wastewater Engineering section is continuing to monitor trends and update projections for the City's ultimate needed treatment capacity at build-out.

## **3.10 AIR QUALITY and CLIMATE PROTECTION – COMPLIANT**

### **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 Threshold Compliance**

**Issue:** None.

**Discussion:** The San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) reported that, during Fiscal Year 2018, Chula Vista did not exceed the state or federal ozone standards, and outperformed many other areas of the County. San Diego County failed to meet the 2008 standard for ozone; thus the Environmental Protection Agency will re-designate the APCD as “Serious” or “Severe”. The designation determines which levels of emissions move into more restrictive categories.

In September 2018, the City Council adopted the 2014 Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Inventory report, which showed total community emissions in 2014 were 5 percent below their 2005 baseline. The City is targeting a 15 percent reduction in GHG emissions below 2005 levels by 2020. The report also showed the City’s per capita emissions to be 4.8 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year, which is below the target of 6 metric tons per person by 2030.

The City continues to support efforts to increase air quality and environmental health through strategic planning, energy efficiency, water conservation and renewable energy, and smart growth and transportation. Staff launched the process for a Community Choice Aggregation feasibility study and a Climate Action Plan (CAP) outreach website that will provide information to residents about how to take actions to help support the CAP. No GHG California Environmental Quality Act thresholds were exceeded in any environmental documents during Fiscal Year 2018.

## 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 (OWD) and Sweetwater Authority reported that they have adequate water to accommodate the demand for several years.

#### Otay Water District

The OWD's supply and storage capacity for both potable water and non-potable water exceeds the current and future demands projected for December 2019 and June 2023. Chula Vista's long-term growth should be assured of a reliable water supply, primarily from the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), and smaller amounts coming from four other sources. SDCWA's Carlsbad Desalination Plant and San Vicente Dam, whose height was recently increased by over 100 feet, which doubled the size of the reservoir, help fulfill the demands.

Through planning, designing, and constructing water system facilities to meet projected demands, facilities are assured to be in place to receive and deliver the water supply for all existing and future customers. Currently, twenty-two maintenance, replacement, and/or upgrade projects needed to serve Chula Vista are included in the Fiscal Year 2019 six-year OWD Capital Improvement Program. The water facilities will be constructed when development activities require them for adequate cost-effective water service.

The need for a ten-day water supply during a SDCWA shutdown is being implemented and is addressed in the Water Facilities Master Plan and Integrated Water Resources Plan.

Water conservation efforts remain voluntary and a prohibition of wasteful water practices in San Diego County remains in effect. State executive orders and laws include establishing goals to help make water conservation a way of life, requiring urban water suppliers to set annual indoor water use goals to 55 gallons per person per day, and determining an allowance for outdoor water uses, which is not expected until June 2022.

#### Sweetwater Authority

Sweetwater Authority's supply and storage capacity for potable water exceeds the current and future demands projected for December 2019 and June 2023. The primary sources of water are the SDCWA and the Sweetwater Reservoir, with smaller amounts coming from National City wells and the Reynolds Desalination Facility.

Sweetwater Authority continues to invest in several system maintenance and upgrade programs to replace aging pipelines, valves, and other critical water facilities, allowing them to continue providing reliable service in the near and long term. Planned improvements, along with estimated costs, are listed in the 2015 Water Distribution System Master Plan, and current projects are listed in the Authority's Capital Budget.

## **4.0 APPENDICES**

### **4.1 Appendix A – Residential Growth Forecast**

### **4.2 Appendix B – Threshold Compliance Questionnaires**