



CITY COUNCIL AGENDA STATEMENT



January 30, 2020

File ID: 19-0564

TITLE

REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION'S (GMOC's) FISCAL YEAR 2019 ANNUAL REPORT

- A. RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CHULA VISTA ACCEPTING THE FISCAL YEAR 2019 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 2019 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 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 Libraries, Police, Traffic, etc.). The Fiscal Year 2019 Annual Report covering July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019) 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 2010 and 2019, the number of residential building permits issued in Chula Vista averaged 913 units per calendar year. This rate of growth is projected to continue or increase over the next five years, according to Chula Vista's *2019 Residential Growth Forecast* (Attachment 3, Appendix A). With growth comes the demand for additional services and facilities.

Review of Growth Management Threshold Compliance for Fiscal Year 2019

The GMOC's Annual Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 covers the period between July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019. 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 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 2019 (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 2019 and looking forward at any potential areas for non-compliance between 2019 and 2023. Eight threshold topics were compliant and three were not.

Table 1

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

LIBRARIES

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 2019 and was last met in FY 2002. The current square footage is approximately 40,000 square feet (or 30 percent) below the threshold standard, and the library square footage per capita will not increase until new library facilities are constructed. The GMOC recommends that construction of a new library should be a top priority of the City.

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.

Staff Response: *The library is currently exploring several options in providing increased service to the east side community and can report on possible locations, land use options, and funding options for an east side library and will support a GMOC library subcommittee.*

POLICE

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

Table 2, below, indicates that a total of 73.72 percent of the Priority 1 calls were responded to within 7 minutes 30 seconds, approximately 7 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 2013.

Table 2

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 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.

The Police Department reported that not meeting the threshold standard was due to not being properly staffed, and they 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. The City Manager's office continues to work with the Police Department to improve staffing levels beyond what Measure A will fund, however. 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.

Despite staff shortages, Chula Vista remains as one of the safest cities in California and in the United States. In a 2018 WalletHub survey Chula Vista was ranked the safest city in San Diego county and the third safest city the state of California. 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. The Police Department has been able to bring the responses down by implementing several innovations and streamlining efforts, including:

- 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, which are based at the police station, have been especially successful at enhancing the effectiveness of Chula Vista's police officers, and the GMOC supports expanding use of them by adding another drone center in eastern Chula Vista.

The GMOC's FY 2019 Annual Report recommends:

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

Staff Response: *The Department agrees with the recommendation. The Chula Vista Police Department, with the support of the City Manager's Office, has successfully established a second launch site for the UAS¹. By partnering with Paradise Valley Hospital and Rush Properties, the Department has been able to deploy drones from their facility effective August 2019. With this new launch site drones can now respond to 30% of the geographic area within our City. The area represents approximately 70% of all the Calls for Service (CFS) received. We continue to work with the FAA and consultants to develop our capability to deploy more UAS launch sites and improve our support and response to CFS in the eastern sections of our community. The Department continues to study the proposed expansion and identify the proper funding sources.*

¹ Unmanned Aerial Systems, or drones.

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.

Staff Response: *The Department agrees with the recommendation. However, funds from Measure A will be recommended to fund three sworn positions for FY 2021. The Chula Vista Police Department will continue to work with the City Manager's Office to identify funding for the positions discussed in the Long-Term Staffing Plan for FY 2022 through FY 2025. The funding sources will be discussed during the budget process for each respective year. The Long-Term Staffing Plan has been developed after several years of studying the needs of the community and looking at best practices across the County.*

Priority 2

As indicated on Table 3 on the following page, 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.

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 five years. Therefore, the GMOC has the same recommendations for Priority 2 as for Priority 1.

Table 3

Priority 1 – Emergency Calls or Services		
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
<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. 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.</p>		

The GMOC’s FY 2019 Annual Report recommends:

Recommendations: Same as for Priority 1, above.

Staff Responses: Same as for Priority 1, above.

TRAFFIC

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.*

As shown in Table 4 below, one non-urban street segment was non-compliant: eastbound and westbound Palomar Street between Industrial Boulevard and Broadway, which has been non-compliant since FY 2016. Most of the delay at this location 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.

Table 4

Non-Compliant Roadway Segments		
Non-Urban Streets	Direction	Level of Service (LOS)
Palomar Street (Between Industrial Blvd & Broadway)	EB WB	D (6) E (4) F (2)
Past Performance (Baseline)		
Number of Non-Compliant Segments FY 2017 ^a	2 (Non-Urban)	
Number of Non-Compliant Intersections FY 1992 ^b	0	
Number of Non-Compliant Intersections FY 1989 ^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.		

SANDAG anticipates completing construction of the I-805/SR-94 Bus On (freeway) Shoulders Demonstration Project by the fall of 2020 and planned regional transportation projects in the South Bay are to be funded by TransNet. The GMOC believes that Chula Vista must aggressively pursue funding from TransNet to complete these projects.

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

Staff Response: *The City agrees with the GMOC recommendation to pursue funding for all the regional transportation projects.*

COMPLIANT Threshold Standards:

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.** The GMOC had recommendations for the following topics:

AIR QUALITY AND CLIMATE PROTECTION

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.*

The GMOC supports the City's Climate Action Plan (CAP) and implementation of commercial solar facilities. It would like future versions of the CAP to require electric vehicle charging stations for multi-family developments.

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.

Staff Response: *This is in process. Both recommendations will be presented to the Climate Change Working Group and incorporated in any future CAP update. Staff plans to evaluate how statewide 2020 code changes (residential solar requirement and EV pre-wiring for multi-family) impact related developments before proposing additional measures later in 2020.*

DRAINAGE

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.*

The GMOC recognizes that storm drain fees are currently insufficient for the City's Storm Management Program and supports the possibility of increasing them.

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.

Staff Response: *The City's storm drain (stormwater) fee brings in approximately \$665,000 each year. In contrast, the City spends approximately \$2 million annually operating and maintaining the City's stormwater system, including program administration. This results in an annual impact to the General Fund for the stormwater system of approximately \$1.3 million annually.*

Effective January 1, 2018, SB 231 reduced barriers to increasing the City's storm drain fee by exempting stormwater-related fees from the voter approval requirements of Proposition 218. Staff supports the GMOC's recommendation to explore potential storm drain fee increases in light of this new law.

FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

Threshold Standard:

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

With the possibility of the Fire Department taking over ambulance services from American Medical Response Services, the GMOC supports the requirement to analyze if this move would be fiscally prudent to the City.

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.

Staff Response: For the past 3 years, the Chula Vista Fire Department has been researching and studying all opportunities related to ambulance transport. In September 2019, Council approved a resolution allowing the Fire Department to contract with an outside consultant to establish the value of medical transport, recommended system design, and potential system reinvestment value. The results of this study will be presented to Council on January 28, 2020. The study will include the requested fiscal impact analysis.

FISCAL

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.*

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.

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.

Staff Response: The City Council is provided a Long-Term Financial Plan which takes into account the anticipated increases in pension costs over the next 10 years. Pension related payments and debts are required payments that must be paid prior to any other obligations. The City participates in the CalPERS retirement program who is responsible for calculating the annual payment due by the City to ensure that retiree benefits are sustained. The annual payment, which fluctuates based on actual investment returns by CalPERS, is included in the annual budget for Council consideration.

The City has a General Fund reserve policy to maintain a 15% operating reserve level and 5% economic contingency reserves. These funds are available to assist in managing during tough economic times or adverse market conditions.

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 2019 GMOC Annual Report Recommendations and Staff Responses Summary
- 2 – Fiscal Year 2019 GMOC Annual Report, including the Chair Cover Memo
- 3 – Fiscal Year 2019 GMOC Annual Report Appendices A and B

Staff Contact: Kimberly Vander Bie, Associate Planner