



GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

ANNUAL REPORT for Fiscal Year 2019

July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2019

January 30, 2020

Approved by the Planning Commission (Resolution No. MPA19-14) and
City Council (Resolution No. _____) on January 30, 2020

GMOC Members

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

City Staff

Kimberly Vander Bie – Associate Planner, Project Manager
Claudia Ramos – 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

GMOC Chair Cover Memo

DATE: January 30, 2020

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 2019 GMOC Annual Report

The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) is pleased to submit its Fiscal Year 2019 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 service 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 topics included Libraries, Police (both Priority 1 and Priority 2 calls), 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 sixteenth consecutive year, Libraries remains non-compliant. The deficit in library space is expected to continue until a large library is built in eastern Chula Vista. The GMOC feels strongly that construction of a new library is long overdue and that providing a large, full-service library in eastern Chula Vista should be a top priority.

In addition to the shortage of library space, the GMOC is concerned about inadequate budgeting for library materials and personnel. The GMOC recognizes, notwithstanding budget shortfalls, that our libraries continue to exceed the statewide average in many workload indicators, including reference questions per hour and visits per hour.

Police – The Priority 1 threshold standard was not met, and the Priority 2 threshold standard was non-compliant for the 23rd year in a row. The Police Department reported that it has the equipment necessary to deliver services, but adequate staffing continues to be an issue. In their Long-Term Staffing Plan dated October 2019, the Police Department recommended to City Council that three new sworn officers per year for the next five years, along with some support staff, be added to the General Fund budget. The GMOC supports this recommendation.

The Police Department is having great success with its drone program, and the GMOC encourages expansion of the program into eastern Chula Vista. Although not meeting the threshold standards, the GMOC appreciates the fact that Chula Vista is consistently ranked one of the safest cities in the state and the nation, and in a resident opinion survey conducted by SANDAG last July, 91 percent of the participants said that they were “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied” with the Chula Vista Police Department.

Traffic – Since Fiscal Year 2016, the level of service on both eastbound and westbound Palomar Street between Industrial Boulevard and Broadway has not complied with the threshold standard due to delays caused by at-grade crossing of the San Diego Trolley Blue Line. Funding in the amount of five million dollars for the preliminary engineering and design for the grade separation at the rail crossing is being pursued from SANDAG by staff. With approval of the environmental document expected in January 2020, this is a good start to this long-awaited improvement. Many traffic projects in Chula Vista are to be funded by TransNet, and the GMOC recommends that these funds be aggressively pursued.

Drainage – Although the threshold standard for Drainage was met, it was brought to the GMOC’s attention that current storm drain fees are too low to provide adequate funding for maintenance of existing facilities. The GMOC encourages the City to raise fees, within the scope of state legislation, to levels that will significantly increase funding to maintain existing facilities.

Fire and Emergency Medical Services (EMS) – The GMOC was pleased to learn that the threshold standard for Fire and EMS was met for the third consecutive year, and that investments in new equipment and staffing, along with improvements to internal procedures, appear to be having a positive impact on response times. A potential change proposed by the Fire Department is to take over ambulance services from American Medical Response, Inc. when their contract expires. The GMOC is recommending that a fiscal impact analysis be done before the City considers such a change to ensure that it would be cost effective to the City’s budget.

On October 19, 2019, the GMOC, along with City staff, went on its annual tour of new and proposed development throughout the City. We were pleased to see some of the new construction projects, as well as some of the Measure P projects that have been completed, including a new trailer for animal control officers at the animal care facility. It is our understanding that the animal care facility is another City department that is understaffed, and the situation gets worse when personnel retire and are not replaced. While there is currently not a growth management threshold standard for animal care in the growth management ordinance, the GMOC plans to discuss the possibility of adding one.

The GMOC is looking forward to reviewing the metrics of existing threshold standards, and possible inclusion of new quality of life topics and threshold standards, during a comprehensive review of the growth management ordinance in 2020. Despite not meeting their thresholds for several years, departments such as Police and Libraries have consistently done an OUTSTANDING job of serving the public with the resources at their disposal.

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 Claudia Ramos 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 Fiscal Year 2019

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 Fiscal Year 2019 Annual Review Process	5
1.4 Annual Five-Year Residential Growth Forecast	5-6
2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY	7
3.1 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE DISCUSSIONS	8-24
3.2 Air Quality and Climate Protection.....	8-9
3.2.1 Threshold Compliance	8-9
3.2 Drainage.....	9-10
3.2.1 Threshold Compliance	9-10
3.3 Fire and Emergency Medical Services.....	10-12
3.3.1 Threshold Compliance	10-11
3.3.2 Financial Impacts of Taking Over American Medical Services, Inc.	11-12
3.4 Fiscal.....	12-13
3.4.1 Threshold Compliance	12-13
3.5 Libraries.....	13-15
3.5.1 Threshold Compliance	13-15
3.6 Parks and Recreation.....	15-16
3.6.1 Threshold Compliance	15-16
3.7 Police	17-19
3.7.1 Threshold Compliance	17-19
3.7.2 Threshold Compliance	19
3.8 Schools.....	20-21
3.8.1 Threshold Compliance	20-21
3.9 Sewer.....	21
3.9.1 Threshold Compliance	21
3.10 Traffic.....	22-23
3.10.1 Threshold Compliance	22-23
3.11 Water	23-24
3.11.1 Threshold Compliance	23-24
4.0 APPENDICES	25
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, 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 the Fiscal Year 2019 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
Gloria Juarez	Southwest
Rodney Caudillo	Southeast
Michael Lengyel	Development and Measure P COC
Andrew Strong	Environmental
Jerome Torres	Planning Commission
VACANT	Business
VACANT	Northeast

The GMOC's review of the eleven 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 Fiscal Year 2019 Annual Report focuses on Fiscal Year 2019 (July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019);
2. The second half 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 2020 through December 2024 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 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 2019

The GMOC held six regular meetings, one meeting without a quorum, and one city-wide development tour between September 2019 and January 2020, all of which were open to the public. At the first regular meeting, Assistant City Manager Maria Kachadoorian provided updates on new businesses in Chula Vista, and expenditures for sales tax Measures A and P. At subsequent GMOC meetings, the commissioners reviewed the eleven 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 January 30, 2020.

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 2019. 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. Based on developer input, the growth projections from January 2020 through December 2024 indicated an additional 6,077 residential units that could potentially be permitted for construction in the City over the next five years, (5,671 units in the east and 406 units in the west). This equates to an annual average of 1,215 housing units, with 1,134 units in the east and 81 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 2019 review cycle. Eight thresholds were met, three were not met.

FISCAL YEAR 2019 THRESHOLD STANDARD REVIEW SUMMARY				
Review Period 7/1/18 Through 6/30/19				
Threshold Standard	Threshold Met	Threshold Not Met	Potential for Future Non-compliance	Adopt/Fund Tactics to Achieve Compliance
1. Air Quality and Climate Protection	X			
2. Drainage	X			
3. Fire/EMS	X			
4. Fiscal	X			
5. Libraries		X	X	X
6. Parks and Recreation	X			
7. Police				
<i>Priority 1-Emergency</i>		X	X	X
<i>Priority 2-Urgent</i>		X	X	X
8. Traffic		X	X	X
9. Sewer	X			
10. Schools	X			
11. Water	X			

3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE DISCUSSIONS

3.1 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.

3.1.1 Threshold Compliance

Issue: None.

Discussion: The City has adopted the state's Greenhouse Gas (GHG) reduction goal to return to 1990 levels, or 15 percent below 2005 levels, by 2020, and is just 3 percent below that goal.

A future state and City goal is to get down to 40 percent below 1990 GHG levels, or 55 percent below 2005 levels, by 2030. The City also continues to look at the state per capita reduction goal, which needs to be scaled appropriately for Chula Vista by including only those GHG emission sources that are relevant to the City. The anticipated goal is to be around 2 metric tons (MT) of CO₂ equivalent per person by 2035, which aligns with the state's goal of 40 percent below 1990 levels. This will be presented to the City Council in 2020.

In the past year, the City has made progress in implementing two major plans to guide its future air quality and overall environmental sustainability efforts:

- 1) The City Operations Sustainability Plan, which establishes numeric targets and strategies for energy use, water use, green purchasing, waste management, pollution prevention, transportation, and green buildings/infrastructure. Based on the working draft of the most recent GHG inventory for 2016, there has been approximately an 18 percent reduction in overall GHG emissions from City operations since 2012 (a 63 percent reduction since 1990). The 2016 inventory will be brought to City Council in 2020; and
- 2) The 2017 Climate Action Plan (CAP), which includes 11 strategies for reducing GHG emissions in Chula Vista, such as requiring LED outdoor lights on non-residential

projects a year before the Building Code requires them, and the start of the South Bay Bus Rapid Transit system. Staff is still working to design policies related to requiring energy efficiency upgrades in existing buildings that are undergoing additions or alterations and other implementation actions.

The San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) reported that, during Fiscal Year 2018, Chula Vista did not exceed the one-hour state ozone standard (.090 parts per million); however, it exceeded the 8-hour federal average ozone standard (.070 parts per million) one day. Chula Vista also complied with both the 23-hour and the annual standard for particulate matter and outperformed many other areas in the San Diego region.

Recommendation: That the City Council direct the City Manager to support implementation of the commercial solar photovoltaic requirement in the City's Climate Action Plan (CAP) and, in future CAP updates, include a requirement for electric vehicle (EV) charging stations at multi-family developments.

3.2 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.

3.2.1 Threshold Compliance

Issue: Storm fees are insufficient.

Discussion: Storm water flows and volumes did not exceed City Engineering Standards during Fiscal Year 2019, and no new facilities will be needed to accommodate projected growth in the next 12-18 months or the next five years. Maintaining existing facilities is fiscally challenging, however.

Storm fees collected during the review period were insufficient for the City's storm water management program, and costs continue to increase with each re-issued permit, due to additional program staffing, operating and maintaining new and existing storm drain structures, and implementing and inspecting water quality monitoring programs. Additional regulatory programs will be required for the 2020 Regional Storm Water Permit and the Statewide Trash Amendments.

To help provide adequate funding, City staff is exploring the potential to increase the storm drain fee through mechanisms outlined in California Senate Bill 231.

Recommendation: That the City Council direct the City Manager to support staff in exploring the potential to increase storm drain fees and assessments, as outlined in California Senate Bill 231.

3.3 **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.

3.3.1 **Threshold Compliance**

Issue: None.

FIRE and EMS Response Times FY 2019						
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 Turn-out Time	Average Dispatch Time
2019*	20,367	82.0	5:51	4:11	0:43	0:57
2018	13,986	81.4	5:45	4:06	0:49	0:50
2017	13,665	80.6	5:50	4:07	0:50	0:53
2016	13,481	74.8	6:15	4:25	0:56	0:55
2015	12,561	78.3	6:14	3:51	1:10	1:12
2014	11,721	76.5	6:02	3:34	1:21	1:07
2013	12,316	75.7	6:02	3:48	1:08	1:05

*Source switched to CAD data (Dispatch) instead of RMS (Outcome), which was used in and prior to 2018.

Discussion: For the third 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, 82 percent of the time, which was 1.6 percent better than the previous year.

There was a substantial increase in the number of calls for service in Fiscal Year 2019. The reason for the 6,381 difference between Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019 is the methodology used to calculate the number of calls. In previous years, the Records Management System (RMS) was used, which calculates calls based on their outcome. The Fire Department switched to Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) data (as did the Police Department), which begins calculating calls at dispatch.

Fire calls accounted for 9.1 percent of all calls, EMS calls accounted for 88.7 percent, and all other calls accounted for 2.2 percent. The majority of all calls responded to were in northwest and southwest Chula Vista, where the threshold standard was met by the fire

stations that responded. The response times for fire stations in eastern Chula Vista marginally improved but continued to fall short of the threshold standard. Nevertheless, as shown in the table below, the percentage of calls responded to within seven minutes for all stations in Chula Vista met the threshold standard of 80 percent or more.

FY 2019 FIRE and EMS Response Times - By Fire Station					
Fire Station #	General Location	Total Calls for Service		(B) All Calls Responded to Within 7 Minutes (Threshold = 80%)	(A) X (B)
		(A) # of Calls	% of All Calls		
1	NW	6,311	31.0	88.9	5,608
2	NW	1,551	7.6	80.3	1,245
3	East	1,210	5.9	78.1	945
4	SW	1,152	5.7	80.2	924
5	SW	4,786	23.5	86.3	4,130
6	East	799	3.9	74.7	597
7	East	1,885	9.3	63.5	1,196
8	East	1,185	5.8	66.6	789
9	SW	1,488	7.3	85.2	1,267
TOTAL		20,367	100%	78.2	16,701 (82.0%)
				Straight Average (B) / 9	Weighted Average (B) / (A)

The fire and EMS units were properly equipped and staffed to meet the threshold standard. Current and future facilities, equipment and staff should be able to accommodate citywide projected growth and meet the threshold standard during the next 12-18 months and in the next five years, due to the following:

- Addition of several new apparatus
- Replacement of fire station apparatus bay doors
- Opening of Millenia fire station
- Strategic re-location of fire stations 5 and 9 in the southwest
- Installation of new USDD Fire Station Alerting Systems in six existing fire stations
- Continued implementation of the Measure A Expenditure Plan, including additional squad units and four person staffing
- Implementation of smart phones for all operational personnel to assist with turnout time improvements and instant routing while responding to calls
- Continued performance measure assessment of turnout times for all companies via battalion monthly reports

3.3.2 Financial Impacts of Taking Over AMR Services

Issue: The Fire Department is considering taking over ambulance services.

Discussion: The Fire Department currently has a contract with American Medical Response, Inc. (AMR) to provide ambulance services. The Fire Department is exploring the possibility of taking

over the AMR services when the contract expires. Before such a change would occur, however, a financial impact analysis should be conducted to determine the cost effectiveness, taking into account associated personnel's salaries and benefits.

Recommendation: That the City Council direct the City Manager to require a fiscal impact analysis on the cost effectiveness of the Fire Department taking over AMR services.

3.4 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.

3.4.1 Threshold Compliance

Issue: None.

Discussion: The Fiscal Year 2019-20 Adopted General Fund Budget of \$197.0 million is an increase of \$22.2 million or 12.8 percent when compared to the Fiscal Year 2018-19 Adopted General Fund Budget. The majority of the increase is due to the budgeting of the first full year of Measure A funds.

The Fiscal Year 2019-20 Adopted General Fund Budget expenditures focus on maintaining current levels of service with limited additions; however, it includes a net increase of 44 staffing positions. Of the net increase in staffing, 34 positions or approximately 78% of the additional staffing are for public safety departments.

Based on projections from the City's FY 2021 – 2030 Long-Term Financial Plan, there will be deficits in the future, primarily related to retirement and health care costs. The GMOC is concerned about the sustainability of long-term retiree benefits.

In the short-term, adequate funding from Public Facilities Development Impact Fee (PFDIF) fee obligations is available to complete some development and growth-related projects in the next 12-18 months. The largest project needed during this timeframe is Fire Station No. 10, currently under construction within the Millenia (Eastern Urban Center) development.

In addition to the construction of the Millenia Fire Station, the City continues to construct roadway improvements in the eastern portion of the City via the Eastern Transportation Development Impact Fee (ETDIF) program. The current edition of the ETDIF nexus study

identifies more than \$250 million in transportation improvements, and an additional \$605,000 of TDIF funds has been allocated for the Capital Improvement Program budget in the adopted Fiscal Year 2018-2019 budget. This includes Heritage Road bridge improvements, a traffic count station program, and phase II of the Willow Street bridge widening.

The adequacy of the Development Impact Fees to complete 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 GMOC Forecast Report) 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 2020.

Recommendation: That the City Council direct the City Manager to: 1) prioritize a detailed written plan to ensure that long-term retiree benefits can be sustained; and 2) have a strategic plan to ensure that benefits are not offset by future adverse market conditions.

3.5 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.

3.5.1 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)
5-Year Projection (2024)	293,663	130,412	444
FY 2019	278,273	97,412	350
FY 2018	275,158	97,412	354
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 2005	220,000	102,000	464
FY 2004	211,800	102,000	482
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 sq ft 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 sixteenth 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 totaled 97,412 GSF, which is about 30 percent below the threshold standard requirement. Although the City will renew a three-year contract for the Otay Ranch library in 2020, the library square footage per capita is not expected to increase until a new full-service library in eastern Chula Vista is constructed. The GMOC believes that construction of a new library in eastern Chula Vista is long overdue and that providing one as soon as possible should be a top priority of the City.

The City's library materials did not comply with the threshold standard to provide adequately equipped library facilities, and the materials budget continued to decline. Median state public library expenditure per capita (reporting period FY 17/18) was \$21.52, compared to Chula Vista's expenditure of \$13.38. The state's number declined because there was a significant decline in Escondido's expenditure per capita due to outsourcing library services to a third-party vendor.

The City's library staffing did not comply with the threshold standard to provide adequately staffed library facilities. With 0.15 full time employees (FTE) per 1,000 population, Chula Vista Library's FTE ratio per capita was at the bottom 5.4% of the statewide average of 0.31 FTE for public libraries.

Despite low staffing per capita, Chula Vista Library continued to exceed the statewide average in many workload indicators, such as population served, reference questions per hour, visits per open hour, etc.

The library and City management continue to work together to find opportunities to increase the library's materials budget, including grant opportunities, such as the Zip Books grant from the California State Library, which provides up to \$6,000 a month in materials.

In Fiscal Year 2019, the library generated over \$900,000 total revenue; over \$800,000 of that was from processing passports. Other sources of revenue were late fees, printing fees and audio/visual fees. In the upcoming year, the library may begin charging for private meeting room space and for notary service (in partnership with the City Clerk) and expand passport services to the South Chula Vista Library.

Recommendation: That the City Council direct the City Manager to provide staff to support a GMOC library subcommittee or assign staff to prepare a report to the GMOC on possible locations, land use options, and funding options for library facilities east of Interstate 805.

3.6 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.

3.6.1 Threshold Compliance

Issue: None.

PARK ACREAGE Threshold, Forecast, and Comparisons Baseline 1989^a – Population: 131,603 Parkland Acreage: 299.15 Parkland/1000 Residents: 2.27								
Threshold Standard	Area of City	City-Owned or IOD parkland 6/30/19 ^b	Current Available 6/30/19 ^c	Forecasts ^d		Prior Year Comparisons		
				18-Month ^d (12/31/20)	5-Year ^d (2024)	June 2016	June 2017	June 2018
3 acres per 1,000 population East of I-805	East I-805	4.57	3.78	3.72	3.71	2.83	3.99	3.72
	West I-805	1.34	1.17	1.19	1.38	1.21	1.19	1.16
	Citywide	3.16	2.64	2.63	2.75	2.11	2.77	2.61
Acres of parkland	East I-805	703.23	581.98	586.56	634.94	421.00	604.24	578.98
	West I-805	159.17	139.17	142.37	165.37	142.66	138.95	138.95
	Citywide	862.40	721.15	728.93	800.31	563.07	743.30	717.93
Population^{e, f}	East I-805	153,844	153,844	157,832	171,286	148,714	151,266	155,461
	West I-805	119,183	119,183	119,267	120,262	118,275	116,651	119,697
	Citywide	273,027	273,027	277,099	291,548	266,969	267,917	275,158
Acreage shortfall or (excess)	East I-805	(241.70)	(120.45)	(113.06)	(121.08)	25.67	(150.45)	(112.6)
	West I-805	198.38	218.38	215.43	195.64	212.17	211.00	220.14
	Citywide	(43.32)	97.93	102.37	74.33	237.84	60.55	107.54

Notes:

- Baseline per threshold standard adopted by Resolution No. 1987-13346. Threshold standard has not been amended.
- City-owned acreage includes undeveloped park land either owned or offered to the City for dedication.
- 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.
- Forecast data includes addition of parkland anticipated to be opened within the identified time horizon. See responses to questions 2 and 3 of this report for additional information.
There is acreage expected to be created because of the expansion of the existing Bayside Park (a.k.a. future Harbor Park), however, the limits of work for this expansion have yet to be determined. Therefore, the acreage has not been included in the 2024 total.
- Projected population increases are lower than in previous years due to reductions in both developer estimates and actual permits issued.
- The existing population for 6/30/2019 is lower than 6/30/2018 because last year's projection incorrectly included population growth after 6/30/2018.

Discussion:

In eastern Chula Vista, the City owns 4.57 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents; 0.79 acres of that is undeveloped, leaving 3.78 acres per 1,000 residents currently available for public use, which exceeds the threshold standard requiring 3 acres per 1,000 residents in eastern Chula Vista. The City is forecasted to have 3.72 acres per 1,000 residents by 2020, and 3.71 acres per 1,000 by 2024 in eastern Chula Vista.

3.7 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.”

3.7.1 Threshold Compliance

Issue: The threshold standard was not met.

Priority 1 – Emergency Calls or Services			
Fiscal Year	All Calls for Service	% of Call Responses Within 7 Minutes 30 Seconds (Threshold = 81%)	Average Response Time (Minutes) (Threshold = 6 Minutes)
FY 2019	506	73.72%	6:12
FY 2018	507	71.8%	6:43 ^e
FY 2017	521	72.2%	6:47
FY 2016 ^a	520	71.0%	6:31
FY 2015	465	71.2%	6:49
FY 2014	534	73.6%	6:45
FY 2013	517	74.1%	6:42
FY 2012	529	72.8%	6:31
FY 2011	518	80.7%	6:03
FY 2002 ^b	--	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). 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. 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			

Priority 1 – Emergency Calls or Services			
Fiscal Year	All Calls for Service	% of Call Responses Within 7 Minutes 30 Seconds (Threshold = 81%)	Average Response Time (Minutes) (Threshold = 6 Minutes)
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.			

Discussion: Table 1, above, indicates that a total of 73.72 percent of the Priority 1 calls were responded to within 7 minutes 30 seconds, 6.28 percent short of the threshold standard of 81 percent, but a 1.92 percent improvement from Fiscal Year 2018. The average response time was six minutes and twelve seconds, missing the threshold standard of six minutes by twelve seconds; however, the average response time was 31 seconds better than in Fiscal Year 2018, and the best average response time since Fiscal Year 2012.

The following department innovations and streamlining efforts have helped bring the response times down:

- Dispatching based on unit closest to the call;
- Deploying drones as first responders;
- Retraining staff on how to dispatch calls more efficiently;
- Changing procedures to reduce the need to modify call priority; and
- Downgrading Priority 2 calls when the urgency has changed

Drones have been especially successful at enhancing the effectiveness of Chula Vista's police officers. The City's drone center, located west of Interstate 805, is the first of its kind where drones are used as First Responders. The GMOC supports expanding use of the drones by adding a center in eastern Chula Vista, also.

Although the Police Department was properly equipped to deliver services at the levels necessary to comply with the threshold standards in Fiscal Year 2019, they reported that they were not properly staffed to do so, and that they continue to work with the City Manager's office to improve staffing levels. They also project that they will not have adequate facilities, equipment and staff to be able to accommodate citywide growth in the next 12-18 months or the next five years, based on population projections in Chula Vista's 2019 Residential Growth Forecast.

Despite staff shortages, Chula Vista remains as one of the safest cities in California and in the United States. And in a resident opinion survey conducted by SANDAG last July, 91 percent of the participants said that they were "very satisfied" or "somewhat satisfied" with the Chula Vista Police Department.

In October 2019, the Police Department presented their Long-Term Staffing Plan to the City Council, recommending the addition of three sworn officers per year for the next five years, and some civilian support positions, all funded by the City's General Fund. The GMOC supports this recommendation.

Recommendation 1: That the City Council direct the City Manager to support staff in expanding the drone program into eastern Chula Vista.

Recommendation 2: That the City Council direct the City Manager to support the Police Department's Long-Term Staffing Plan, as presented to City Council in October 2019, which recommends adding three sworn positions to the General Fund each year through Fiscal Year 2025, and a small number of civilian positions to provide for critical support needs.

3.7.2. Threshold Compliance

Priority 2 – Urgent Calls for Service		
Fiscal Year	All Calls for Service	Average Response Time (Minutes) (Threshold = 12 Minutes)
FY 2019	15,571	17:27
FY 2018	15,989	20:18 ^e
FY 2017	14,829	13:53
FY 2016 ^a	14,729	13:50
FY 2015	13,694	13:50
FY 2014	13,681	13:36
FY 2013	14,258	13:44
FY 2012	17,185	14:20
FY 2011	17,054	12:52
FY 2002 ^b	--	10:04
FY1992 ^c	--	6:30
FY1990 ^d	--	6:15
Notes: 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. 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 5:54 minutes (Average Response Time: 20:18). Priority 1 calls were not affected by the change since they are addressed immediately.		

Issue: The threshold standard was not met.

Discussion: The Priority 2 average response time for Fiscal Year 2019 was above the 12-minute threshold standard by 5 minutes 27 seconds; however, this was a 2-minute 51-second improvement from Fiscal Year 2018.

Recommendation: Same as for Priority 1.

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: The Chula Vista Elementary School District (CVESD) reported that it will be able to accommodate projected growth, provided that new facilities are constructed within the next five years. However, due to declining enrollment, the Sweetwater Union High School District (SUHSD) reported that, with the addition of some new buildings, existing schools will be able to accommodate forecasted growth for the next five years.

Chula Vista Elementary School District

The CVESD reported that it will be able to accommodate forecasted growth through 2020 but not through 2024. Therefore, two new schools are being planned. Architectural review and funding are complete for a second elementary school in Otay Ranch Village 2, which is being planned for fall of 2021. In addition, the school district is in the process of completing architectural review and funding for a school in Otay Ranch Village 3.

The CVESD prioritizes maintenance by assessed need.

Sweetwater Union High School District

The SUHSD projects that, with the addition of some new buildings, its existing schools will be sufficient to accommodate forecasted growth through December 2024. The school district is planning to begin adding buildings to both Eastlake and Olympian High Schools in 2021.

Enrollment was down by approximately 600 students from the 2018-19 to the 2019-2020 school year and this trend is expected to continue.

Prioritization of maintenance is determined by several internal tools: 1) life safety; 2) facility condition assessments; 3) site work order requests; 4) life cycle analysis; and 5) preventative maintenance. Currently, routine maintenance is funded at 3 percent of general fund expenditures.

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

SEWAGE - Flow and Treatment Capacity						
Million Gallons per Day (MGD)	Fiscal Year 2017	Fiscal Year 2018	Fiscal Year 2019	18-month Projection	5-year Projection	"Buildout" Projection
Average Flow	15.42	15.24	15.9	16.7	17.2	20.76*
Capacity	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864

* 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.

Issue: None.

Discussion: The City continues to have sufficient sewage treatment capacity, and consistent conservation efforts continue to have a positive impact on average flow, which marginally increased 0.66 Million Gallons per Day from Fiscal Year 2018 to Fiscal Year 2019.

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 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.

3.10.1 Threshold Compliance

Issue: The threshold standard was not met.

Non-Compliant Roadway Segments		
	Direction	Level of Service (LOS)
Palomar Street (Between Industrial Blvd & Broadway)	EB	D (6)
	WB	E (4) F (2)
PAST PERFORMANCE (BASELINE)		
Number of Non-Compliant Segments FY2017 ^a		2 (Non-Urban)
Number of Non-Compliant Intersections FY1992 ^b		0
Number of Non-Compliant Intersections FY1989 ^c		8
The 1989 LOS was based on the June 1990 GMOC Report.		
Notes:		
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: One non-urban street segment was non-compliant: eastbound and westbound Palomar Street between Industrial Boulevard and Broadway, which has been non-compliant since Fiscal Year 2016. Most of the low level of service can be attributed to the at-grade rail crossing for the Blue Line Light Rail System that interrupts vehicular flow over 200 times per day; grade separating the rail crossing is necessary to improve the situation. City staff is working with the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) on approval of the

environmental document by January 2020, and on an agreement to provide \$5 million in funding for preliminary engineering and design for the project. Identification of approximately \$50 million in future funding is still necessary to cover construction costs.

In January 2019, a South Bay Rapid Transit project was completed by SANDAG with commencement of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) extending approximately 21 miles from downtown San Diego to the Otay Mesa International Transportation Center (ITC) adjacent to the U.S./Mexico Otay Mesa International Border crossing. SANDAG anticipates completing construction of the I-805/SR-94 Bus On (freeway) Shoulders Demonstration Project by the fall of 2020.

TransNet is the San Diego Transportation Improvement Program funding countywide transportation facility and service improvements for highways, rail transit services, new bus rapid transit services, local bus services, senior and disabled transportation services, local streets and roads, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, transportation-related community infrastructure to support smart growth development, and related environmental mitigation and enhancement projects. Chula Vista must aggressively pursue funding from this resource to help fund all the planned regional transportation projects in the South Bay.

The City has issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to interested consulting firms to support the City in developing policies and procedures for projects to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act as amended by California State Bill 743, requiring traffic impacts to be measured by vehicle miles traveled (VMT) rather than level of service (LOS). It is anticipated that projects in the City will be required to analyze both LOS and VMT.

Recommendation: That the City Council direct the City Manager to aggressively pursue funding for all the regional transportation projects in Chula Vista.

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 have adequate water to accommodate the demand for several years.

Otay Water District

The Otay Water District's supply and storage capacity for both potable water and non-potable water exceeds the current demand and the demand projected by December 2020 and June 2024. Eighty percent of OWD's capacity comes from the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), with smaller amounts coming from four other sources.

Water conservation efforts remain voluntary in San Diego County since the drought restrictions enacted in 2015 were rescinded. A prohibition on wasteful water practices such as watering during rainfall or hosing off sidewalks remains in effect. Under Executive Orders B-37-16 and B-40-17, the state is taking measures to make water conservation a way of life through four primary goals of eliminating water waste, strengthening local drought resilience, improving agricultural water use efficiency, and drought planning.

Twenty maintenance, replacement, and/or upgrade projects needed to serve Chula Vista are included in the FY 2020 through 2025 OWD Capital Improvement Program document.

OWD continues to investigate additional water supply sources, particularly the Rosarito, Mexico desalination facility, projected to produce 100 million gallons per day (MGD) of potable water. A required Presidential Permit has been obtained, and discussions with the State of California regarding treatment requirements are continuing.

Sweetwater Authority

The Sweetwater Authority's supply and storage capacity for potable water exceeds the current demand and the demand projected by December 2020 and June 2024. Approximately 76percent of the Sweetwater Authority's capacity comes from the San Diego County Water Authority and the Sweetwater Reservoir, with smaller amounts coming from National City wells and the R.A. Reynolds Desalination Facility.

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. Sweetwater Authority issued revenue bonds in November 2017 to fund the replacement of approximately three miles of 36-inch water transmission pipeline through Bonita Valley, construction of secondary mains to facilitate the work on the 36-inch transmission main, construction of a new 800,000 gallon Central-Wheeler Tank, and replacement of the stairs on Loveland Dam, all of which are critical for continued long term water supply reliability to the City of Chula Vista.

4.0 APPENDICES

4.1 Appendix A – Residential Growth Forecast

4.2 Appendix B – Threshold Compliance Questionnaires