



CITY COUNCIL AGENDA STATEMENT



August 1, 2019

File ID: 19-0172

TITLE

REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION'S (GMOC's) FISCAL YEAR 2018 ANNUAL REPORT

- A. RESOLUTION NO. MPA-18-0008 OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CHULA VISTA ACCEPTING THE FISCAL YEAR 2018 GMOC ANNUAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDING ACCEPTANCE BY THE CITY COUNCIL.
- B. RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHULA VISTA ACCEPTING THE FISCAL YEAR 2018 GMOC ANNUAL REPORT, AND DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER TO UNDERTAKE ACTIONS NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS AS PRESENTED IN THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND STAFF RESPONSES SUMMARY

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Planning Commission adopt resolution A and City Council adopt resolution B.

SUMMARY

Chula Vista's Growth Management Program was established in 1991 to assure that as new development and revitalization occurs, public facilities, services and infrastructure will exist or be provided to match the needs created by growth. Each year, the City's Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) conducts a joint workshop to present its Annual Report to the Planning Commission and City Council. The Annual Report summarizes compliance with the threshold standards established by the Growth Management ordinance for eleven public facility and service topics (such as Traffic, Police, Libraries, etc.). The Fiscal Year 2018 Annual Report covering July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018) is presented for review and consideration of proposed recommendations to address issues identified by the GMOC that result from growth.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The Project qualifies for an Exemption pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the California Environmental Quality Act State Guidelines.

BOARD/COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission will provide comments and any recommendations at the joint workshop.

DISCUSSION

1. Introduction

The City's General Plan establishes the policy framework for Chula Vista's Growth Management Program (the "Program") and Chapter 19.09 of the Chula Vista Municipal Code (CVMC), also known as the "Growth Management" ordinance, serves as a key component in implementing the Program. CVMC 19.09 codifies threshold standards for eleven public facility and service topics, including eight under the direct control of the City (Drainage, Fire and Emergency Medical Services, Fiscal, Libraries, Parks and Recreation, Police, Sewer, and Traffic), two external to the City (Schools and Water), and one that is both City-controlled and external (Air Quality and Climate Protection). The threshold standards are intended to help the GMOC identify and make recommendations on growth-related issues that may affect quality of life in Chula Vista. In addition, CVMC 19.09 establishes administration and implementation measures for the threshold standards.

In compliance with CVMC Section 19.09.030 (F), the Growth Management Oversight Commission (the "GMOC") shall annually prepare a report regarding the current and potential future compliance status of threshold standards set forth in the Growth Management ordinance. The report is intended to serve as a basis for recommending changes to the City's capital improvement program, changes to the City organization and management, engagement in interagency cooperation, and implementation of actions to assure that the threshold standards are sustained. Tonight, this Annual Report is being submitted for consideration to the Planning Commission for their input and recommendation and to the City Council for their review and action.

Growth in Chula Vista

Between 2013 and 2018, the number of residential building permits issued in Chula Vista averaged 1,008 units per calendar year. This rate of growth is projected to continue or increase over the next five years, according to Chula Vista's *2018 Residential Growth Forecast*, updated in April 2019 (Attachment 3, Appendix A). With growth comes the demand for additional services and facilities.

Review of Growth Management Threshold Compliance for Fiscal Year 2018

The GMOC's Annual Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 covers the period between July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018. The Report addresses compliance with delivery of services and facilities, based on threshold standards for the eleven service topics identified in the City's Growth Management ordinance. Each threshold is discussed in terms of current compliance, issues, and corresponding recommendations. Additionally, the report identifies current issues in the second half of 2018 and early 2019 and assesses threshold compliance looking forward over the next five years.

Presented below is a summary of findings and key issues regarding threshold compliance. A summary table of the GMOC's recommendations, staff's responses, and recommended implementing actions is included as Attachment 1. The GMOC's Annual Report for FY 2018 (Attachment 2) provides additional background information and more detailed explanations of findings and discussion/recommendations.

2. Summary of Findings

Table 1 below summarizes the GMOC's threshold compliance findings for FY Year 2018 (July 1, 2017 - June 30, 2018) and looking forward at any potential areas for non-compliance between 2019 and 2023. Eight threshold topics were in compliance and three were not.

Table 1

Facility & Service Topics	Current and Anticipated Threshold Compliance		
	Not In Compliance	In Compliance	Potential Future Non-Compliance
Libraries	●		●
Police - Priority 1	●		●
Police - Priority 2	●		●
Traffic	●		●
Fire/EMS		●	
Parks and Recreation		●	
Air Quality and Climate Protection		●	
Drainage		●	
Fiscal		●	
Schools		●	
Sewer		●	
Water		●	

3. Threshold Compliance Discussion

Below are threshold compliance summaries from the GMOC report, along with staff responses to those recommendations (as indicated in Attachment 1).

Non-Compliant Threshold Standards and Potential for Future Non-Compliance

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.*

The Libraries threshold standard was not met in FY 2018, and was last met in FY 2002. The current square footage is approximately 40,000 square feet (or 29 percent) below the threshold standard.

Statewide data was consulted to assess whether or not Chula Vista libraries are adequately equipped and staffed. The City's annual expenditures and staffing were substantially below comparable statewide averages for library expenditures (\$14.07 per capita in Chula Vista versus \$33.75 per capita statewide); library materials¹ (\$0.21 per capita in Chula Vista versus \$3.18 per capita statewide); and library staffing (0.15 full-time equivalent [FTE] staff per 1,000 population in Chula Vista versus 0.43 FTE staff per 1,000

¹ Consisting of books, digital materials, magazines, and other materials.

population statewide). Despite relatively low staffing per capita, Chula Vista libraries exceed the statewide average in numerous workload indicators, including population served per FTE, reference questions per hour, visits per open hour, etc. Nevertheless, given the disparity between City and statewide averages for expenditures and staffing, it is concluded that Libraries are not adequately equipped or staffed and therefore not compliant with the threshold standard.

It is not anticipated that existing facilities will be able to accommodate projected growth. However, if a new full-service library in the Millenia development were to be completed within the next five years, the total library square footage would be closer, but still below, the threshold standard assuming projected population growth over this period.

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; the South Library has received a new heating, ventilation, and air conditioning system

The GMOC's FY 2018 Annual Report recommends:

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.

Staff Response 1: The Library agrees with the GMOC recommendations and will continue to work with the City Manager's office to identify ways to better serve the community in innovative programming and to identify funding to support materials and staffing.

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. The amount should be at least as much as the fees collected in any given year for processing passport applications.

Staff Response 2: The Library will work with the Finance Department and the City Manager's Office to determine a fiscally responsible ongoing approach to supplement the library materials budget and staff support.

3.2 POLICE - Non-Compliant

Threshold Standard:

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

Priority 1

As shown in Table 2 below, the Priority 1 threshold for responding to 81% of calls within 7 minutes and 30 seconds was not met; the percentage reported by the Police Department was 71.8%, which was 0.4% less than in FY 2017. The threshold of a 6-minute response time was also not met; however, the response time of 6:43 was four seconds better than in FY 2017.

The department's effective patrol staffing was down about five officers in FY 2018, due to injuries and other staffing challenges. Tax revenue generated by approval of Measure A will help fund approximately 31 more sworn officers in the next five years. However, the projected ratio of 0.90 officers per 1,000 residents is substantially below the San Diego County average of 1.29 officers per 1,000 residents. In order to match the countywide average by the year 2023, the City would need to hire an additional 148 officers.

Specific units are properly staffed, but the actual units per beat count (the territory and time that a police officer patrols) is below the necessary levels to meet the demands of the community. The average amount of time officers spent on-scene in FY 2018 increased by 8:10 minutes; the reasons are being evaluated.

The Police Department was properly equipped to deliver services at the levels to comply with the threshold standards in FY 2018. However, the Police Department reported that current facilities, equipment and staff are not anticipated to be sufficient to accommodate forecasted growth in the next 12-18 months or five years.

Table 2

Priority 1 – Emergency Calls or Services				
Fiscal Year	Call Volume (Initial Priority Assigned) ^e	Timed Call Volume (Calls used in the calculation of response times ^g)	% 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^f
FY 2017	765 of 65,672	521	72.2%	6:47
FY 2016^a	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^b	1,539 of 71,859	--	80.0%	5:07
FY1992^c	--	--	81.2%	4:54
FY1990^d	--	--	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).

Priority 1 – Emergency Calls or Services				
Fiscal Year	Call Volume (Initial Priority Assigned) ^e	Timed Call Volume (Calls used in the calculation of response times ^g)	% of Call Responses Within 7 Minutes 30 Seconds (Threshold = 81%)	Average Response Time (Minutes) (Threshold = 6 Minutes)
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>				

The GMOC’s FY 2018 Annual Report recommends:

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 of recruiting new police officers.

Staff Response 1 and 2: On June 5, 2018, voters approved a one-half cent transaction and use tax ordinance that secures funding for additional officers and support staff. The City Manager’s Office is working closely with the Chula Vista Police to ensure proper staffing levels and together have developed a 10-year plan to add 43 additional positions to help improve response times. In FY 2019, the department was funded for nine new sworn and civilian positions. In FY 2020, 12 new sworn and civilian positions were approved to be budgeted. Additionally, the department is proactively seeking grant opportunities that will fund additional positions to help close the gap with the County’s staffing levels per capita. The City Manager’s Office has allocated funds to support the department’s recommended recruitment campaigns.

Priority 2

In FY 2018, the Police Department revised the methodology for calculating response times, which affected the response time calculations for Priority 2 calls. Under the new methodology, response times include any call where the received-time and the arrival-time are the same, and any call that had been holding for more than one hour. The change in methods did not affect the response time calculations for Priority 1 calls.

As shown in Table 3 below, the Priority 2 threshold of a 12-minute average response time was not met, and the response time using the updated methodology was 20:17, or 6:34 worse than in FY 2017. However, using the previous method of response time calculation, the average response time would have been 14:24, which is 31 seconds longer than last year.

As discussed above regarding Priority 1, current facilities, equipment and staff are not anticipated to be sufficient to accommodate forecasted growth in the next 12-18 months or 5 years. Therefore, the GMOC has the same recommendations for Priority 2 as for Priority 1.

Table 3

Priority 2 – Urgent Calls for Service			
Fiscal Year	Call Volume (Initial Priority Assigned ^e)	Timed Call Volume (Calls used in the calculation of response times)	Average Response Time (Minutes) (Threshold = 12 Minutes)
FY 2018	18,969 of 65,581	16,023	20:17 ^f
FY 2017	19,309 of 65,672	14,829	13:53
FY 2016^a	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^b	22,199 of 71,859	--	10:04
FY1992^c	--	--	6:30
FY1990^d	--	--	6:15
<p>a. Threshold standard was amended by Ordinance No. 2015-3339 to current standard.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>			

The GMOC's FY 2018 Annual Report recommends:

Recommendations: Same as for Priority 1, above.

Staff Responses: Same as for Priority 1, above.

3.3 TRAFFIC - Non-Compliant

Threshold Standard:

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.*

As shown in Table 4 below, two non-urban street segments were non-compliant in Fiscal Year 2018: southbound Otay Lakes Road from Ridgeback Road to Telegraph Canyon Road, and eastbound and westbound Palomar Street between Industrial Boulevard and Broadway.

Table 4

Non-Compliant Roadway Segments		
Urban Streets	Direction	Level of Service (# of hours)
Otay Lakes Road^a (Ridgeback Rd to Otay Lakes Rd)	Southbound ^a	D (3) E (1) ^a
Palomar Street (Between Industrial Blvd & Broadway)	Eastbound	D (2) E (4)
	Westbound	E (3) F (3)
Past Performance Baseline		
Number of Non-Compliant Segments, FY 2017^b		1 (Non-Urban)
Number of Non-Compliant Intersections, FY 1992^c		0
Number of Non-Compliant Intersections, FY 1989^d		8
<p>a. 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.</p> <p>b. Threshold standard was amended by Ord. No. 2015-3339 to be based on roadway segments instead of intersections.</p> <p>c. Threshold standard was amended by Ord. No. 1991-2448.</p> <p>d. Baseline as defined in the threshold standard approved in the City Council Policy adopted by Resolution No. 1987-13346. The LOS for 1989 was based on the 1990 GMOC Report dated June 1990.</p>		

An inoperable intelligent adaptive traffic signal system (the Sydney Coordinated Adaptive Traffic Signal System, or SCATS) along the non-compliant Otay Lakes Road segment most likely caused that segment to fail the applicable growth management threshold standard. The faulty SCATS has been replaced and, with this improvement, the Otay Lakes Road segment is expected to be compliant in Fiscal Year 2019.

Eastbound and westbound Palomar Street between Industrial Boulevard and Broadway has been non-compliant since FY 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.

Due to lack of funding, urban street segments were not studied during FY 2018. Since August 2018, the Traffic Engineering Division has been fully staffed and more automated traffic monitoring devices are being installed, so substantially more data should be available for the GMOC's Fiscal Year 2019 report.

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.

Threshold Standards Compliant in FY 2018

Threshold standards were found to be compliant for: **Air Quality and Climate Protection, Drainage, Fire and Emergency Medical Services, Fiscal, Parks and Recreation, Schools, Sewer, and Water.**

DECISION-MAKER CONFLICT

Staff has reviewed the decision contemplated by this action and has determined that it is not site-specific and consequently, the 1,000-foot rule found in California Code of Regulations Title 2, section 18702.2(a)(11) is not applicable to this decision for purposes of determining a disqualifying real property-related financial conflict of interest under the Political Reform Act (Cal. Gov't Code section 87100, *et seq.*).

Staff is not independently aware, and has not been informed by any City Council Member or Planning Commission Member, of any other fact that may constitute a basis for a decision maker conflict of interest in this matter.

CURRENT-YEAR FISCAL IMPACT

Staff costs associated with the preparation of the annual GMOC report are included in the adopted budget. Additional costs related to implementation of recommended actions may be brought forward for Council consideration during the annual budget development process.

ONGOING FISCAL IMPACT

Staff costs associated with the preparation of future annual GMOC reports will be included in future budgets. Additional costs related to implementation of recommended actions may be brought forward for Council consideration during future budget development processes.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1 – Fiscal Year 2018 Report Recommendations & Staff Responses Summary
- 2 – Fiscal Year 2018 GMOC Annual Report, including the Chair Cover Memo
- 3 – Fiscal Year 2018 GMOC Annual Report Appendices A and B

Staff Contact: Kimberly Vander Bie, Associate Planner