



Planning Commission adopt resolution A and Council adopt resolution B.

## **SUMMARY**

Each year, the GMOC submits its Annual Report to the Planning Commission and City Council regarding compliance with threshold standards for the Growth Management Program's eleven quality-of-life indicators. The 2016 Annual Report covers the period from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015 (Fiscal Year 2015); identifies current issues in the second half of 2015 and early 2016; and assesses threshold compliance concerns looking forward over the next five years. The report discusses each threshold in terms of current compliance, issues, and corresponding recommendations. A summary table of the GMOC's recommendations and staff's proposed implementing actions is included as Attachment 1.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

### **Environmental Notice**

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

### **Environmental Determination**

The Director of Development Services has reviewed the proposed activity for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and has determined that there is no possibility that the activity may have a significant effect on the environment because it involves only acceptance of the GMOC Annual Report and does not involve approvals of any specific projects; therefore, pursuant to Section 15061(b) (3) of the State CEQA Guidelines no environmental review is necessary. Although environmental review is not necessary at this time, specific projects defined in the future as a result of the recommendations in the 2016 GMOC Annual Report will be reviewed in accordance with CEQA, prior to the commencement of any project.

## **BOARD/COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION**

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

## **DISCUSSION**

In the past five years, the number of residential building permits issued in Chula Vista has averaged 746 units per year, and this rate of growth is projected to continue or increase over the next five years, according to Chula Vista's *2015 Residential Growth Forecast* (Attachment 3, Appendix A). With growth comes the demand for services, and the Chula Vista GMOC's 2016 Annual Report addresses compliance with delivery of services, based on threshold standards for eleven service topics identified in the City's "Growth Management" ordinance.

Presented below is a summary of findings and key issues regarding threshold compliance. The GMOC's 2016 Annual Report (Attachment 2) provides additional background information and more detailed explanations of findings and discussion/recommendations.

### **1. Summary of Findings**

The following table summarizes the GMOC's threshold compliance findings for the review period July 1, 2014 - June 30, 2015 and looking forward at any potential for non-compliance between 2016 and 2020.

<b>CURRENT AND ANTICIPATED THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE</b>		
<b>Not In Compliance</b>	<b>In Compliance</b>	<b>Potential Future Non-Compliance</b>
Libraries	Air Quality and Climate Protection	Libraries
Police - Priority 1	Drainage	Police - Priority 1
Police - Priority 2	Fiscal	Police - Priority 2
Traffic	Parks and Recreation	Traffic
Fire/EMS	Schools	Fire/EMS
	Sewer	Parks and Recreation
	Water	

## 2. Summary of Key Issues

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/or Potential for Future Non-Compliance**

#### **LIBRARIES**

##### **3.1.1 - Non-Compliant Threshold Standard**

The Libraries threshold standard has not been met for the twelfth consecutive year. Until this threshold is brought into compliance through construction of a new library of at least 33,200 square feet in Millenia or at the Rancho del Rey site, the GMOC is encouraging remodeling the space in the lower level of the Civic Center Library so that the usefulness of existing square footage can be maximized.

The GMOC’s 2016 Annual Report recommends:

- **That City Council direct the City Manager to maximize use of available space by finding funding to renovate the Civic Center Library, focusing on the underutilized basement so that it could be accessible to the community, or serve as a revenue resource from potential tenants.**

*Staff Response: Renovation of the underutilized lower level is underway. Space will be converted to a STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics) lab/maker space in cooperation with Qualcomm and the Chula Vista Elementary School District. Estimated completion is July 2016.*

#### **POLICE**

##### **3.2.1 - Non-Compliant Priority 1 Threshold Standard**

When the “Growth Management” ordinance was updated in 2015, the Police Priority 1 threshold standard changed from 7 minutes to 7 minutes 30 seconds for 81 percent of call responses, and the average response time changed from 5 minutes 30 seconds to 6 minutes. With these changes, the GMOC had expected the response times reported to be compliant in Fiscal Year 2015. However,

despite a slight decline in call volume, the threshold standard for calls responded to within 7 minutes 30 seconds was 9.8 percent below the 81 percent threshold standard. And the “Average Response Time” component of the threshold standard, which had been met for several consecutive years, fell 49 seconds short of the threshold standard (see table below).

<b>PRIORITY 1</b>			
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Call Volume</b>	<b>% of Call Responses within 7:30</b>	<b>Average Response Time (Minutes)</b>
<b>Threshold Standard</b>		<b>81.0%</b>	<b>6:00</b>
FY2015	675 of 64,008	<b>71.2%</b>	<b>6:49</b>

One explanation for non-compliance was that when the threshold standard changed, the methodology for reporting the response data also changed. Specifically, the clock now starts at “received to arrive” instead of “route to arrive”; a normalization calculation in place since 1999 has been eliminated; and false alarm calls for service, which were excluded from calculations since 2003, have been added back in. Because the two cannot be compared, the GMOC’s report includes a table showing times reported using both the old methodology and the new methodology, for informational purposes only.

Another explanation for non-compliance, according to Police Chief Bejarano, is chronically low staffing in the Community Patrol Division. During the review period, there were some gains in staffing and the GMOC supports ensuring that adequate staffing continues to be a priority so that response times can improve.

The GMOC’s 2016 Annual Report recommends:

- **That the City Council direct the City Manager to monitor the retention and recruitment programs and procedures for police officers so that the department will be properly staffed and Priority 1 response calls can improve.**

*Staff Response:* As part of the Police Department’s Strategic Plan, the “People” initiative prioritizes recruitment and retention programs to develop the best possible staff to carry out the Department’s mission. Unfortunately, the Department has the lowest sworn officer to population ratio in the region (0.93 per 1000 residents compared to the regional average of 1.31). Current sworn staffing levels have challenged the Department to meet its response thresholds.

Although adequate staffing has been a concern for the Police Department to meet its GMOC response time thresholds, the Department is seeking alternate solutions to meet the thresholds. The Police Department is in the process of updating its Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) system, which will include Automated Vehicle Location (AVL) technology. AVL will show dispatchers which units are closest to a given call, which will have a positive impact to police response times.

**3.2.2. - Non-Compliant Priority 2 Threshold Standard**

As with the Priority 1 threshold standard, the Priority 2 threshold standard changed when the “Growth Management” ordinance was updated in 2015. The “Average Response Time” changed from 7 minutes 30 seconds to 12 minutes, and the “percentage of calls responded to within 7 minutes”

portion of the threshold standard was eliminated, in favor of all calls needing response within the 12 minutes. Implementation of the current Priority 2 threshold standard follows the same methodology used for the current Priority 1 threshold standard, including: 1) Starting the clock at “received to arrive” rather than “route to arrive”; 2) Eliminating a “normalization” calculation that was created due to higher reporting times in eastern versus western Chula Vista; and 3) Adding false alarms to the call volume.

The Priority 2 Average Response Time came in 1 minute 50 seconds short of the current threshold standard (see table below). For the 18th consecutive year, the Police Priority 2 threshold standard has not been met.

<b>PRIORITY 2</b>		
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Call Volume</b>	<b>Average Response Time (Minutes)</b>
<b>Threshold Standard</b>		<b>12:00</b>
FY 2015	17,976 of 64,008	<b>13:50</b>

As with the Priority 1 threshold standard, the Police Chief attributed non-compliance of the Priority 2 threshold standard to “staffing,” adding that it “must be significantly increased in the Community Patrol Division in order to meet the Priority 2 response time goals. Without additional staff, improvements to the response time will most likely be limited.”

As noted in Section 3.2.1 of this report, the GMOC would expect to see improved response times in the next report, due to significant staff increases and computer advances that have occurred since the growth management review period ended.

The GMOC’s 2016 Annual Report recommends:

- **Same as for Priority 1 in Section 3.2.1, above.**

*Staff Response: Same as for Priority 1 in Section 3.2.1, above.*

**TRAFFIC**

**3.3.1 - Non-Compliant Threshold Standard**

Two Arterial Level of Service (ALOS) non-urban streets did not comply with the Traffic threshold standard, as indicated in the table below. However, all Urban Street Level of Service (ULOS) streets complied with the current Traffic threshold standard, updated in 2015.

<b>NON-COMPLIANT ROADWAY SEGMENTS</b>		
<b>NON-URBAN STREETS</b>	<b>Direction</b>	<b>LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS)</b> (Threshold allows maximum of 2 hours a LOS D during peak hours)
<b>Otay Lakes Road (East H St./Telegraph Canyon Rd.)</b>	<b>NB SB</b>	<b>D(4 hours) D(4 hours) E(1 hour)</b>
<b>Heritage Road (Telegraph Canyon Parkway)</b>	<b>NB SB</b>	<b>D(6 hours) D(5 hours)</b>

URBAN STREETS	Direction	Level of Service (LOS) (Threshold allows maximum of 2 hours at LOS E during peak hours)
None	-	-

Heritage Road between Telegraph Canyon Road and Olympic Parkway has been chronically non-compliant in either one or both directions for several years, and was non-compliant both northbound (six hours at LOS D) and southbound (five hours at LOS D) during this review period. In order to comply with the threshold standards as projected growth occurs over the next five years, connection of Heritage Road to Main Street will be essential, according to city engineers. However, progress on construction of Heritage Road, which is funded by developer impact fees, has been delayed while the developer for Village 3 secures environmental mitigation necessary to obtain state and federal permits. The GMOC is concerned about further delays; however, they appreciate the developer's efforts to comply with the environmental regulations so that progress on Heritage Road can continue.

Also, despite recent improvements to Otay Lakes Road between Telegraph Canyon Road and East H Street, Otay Lakes Road was non-compliant both northbound (four hours at LOS D) and southbound (four hours at LOS D and one hour at LOS E) during this review period. City engineers expect this segment to comply when hardware and software updates for the adaptive signal system, in the process of being implemented, are completed.

The GMOC's 2016 Annual Report recommends:

- **That City Council direct the City Manager to support City engineers in their efforts to ensure that a minimum of two lanes of Heritage Road be constructed from Santa Victoria Road to Main Street by the end of calendar year 2016.**

*Staff Response: The Public Works Department concurs with and accepts the recommendation. Obtaining the 404 permit from the Army Corps of Engineers is still in process, and completion of the Heritage Road extension from Santa Victoria Road to Main Street is expected to be delayed until approximately February 2017.*

## FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

### 3.4.1 - Non-Compliant Threshold Standard

The Fire and Emergency Medical Services threshold standard was non-compliant for the fifth consecutive year, as outlined on the table below.

FIRE and EMS Response Times						
Review Period	Call Volume	% of All Calls Responded to Minutes	Average Response Time for all Calls <sup>2</sup>	Average Travel Time	Average Dispatch Time	Average Turn-out Time
<b>Threshold Standard:</b>		<b>80.0%</b>				
FY 2015	12,561	78.3	6:14	3:51	1:12	1:10
FY 2014	11,721	76.5%	6:02	3:34	1:07	1:21
FY 2013	12,316	75.7%	6:02	3:48	1:05	1:08
FY 2012	11,132	76.4%	5:59	3:43		

FY 2011	9,916	78.1%	6:46	3:41		
FY 2010	10,296	85.0%	5:09	3:40		

Note 2: Through FY 2012, the data was for "Average Response Time for 80% of Calls."

At 78.3 percent, the citywide percentage of calls responded to within 7 minutes was just 1.7 percent below the threshold standard of 80 percent, an improvement from Fiscal Year 2014, which averaged 76.5 percent. However, the average response time for all calls took 12 seconds longer than the previous fiscal year, which the Fire Department attributed to travel time.

Since Fiscal Year 2013, the Fire Department has provided statistical data to the GMOC, per their request, on response times for fire stations in the east, west, and citywide. The statistics show that fire stations 6, 7 and 8 in eastern Chula Vista have been more than 20 percent below the threshold standard. Although there was a 5.7 percent improvement from Fiscal Year 2014 to Fiscal Year 2015, the GMOC is concerned about the shortfall and is recommending that improving response times in the east should be a priority.

The GMOC's 2016 Annual Report recommends:

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

*Staff Response: Staff met with software vendor, DECCAN INTL, to include this analysis as part of our annual update. Station and unit placement/coverage are to be examined and recommendations made. Responses are expected by summer 2016.*

### **Threshold Standards Currently In Compliance**

Threshold standards were found to be compliant for **Parks and Recreation, Fiscal, Schools, Sewer, Drainage, Air Quality and Climate Protection, and Water**. However, the GMOC had comments and or recommendations for Parks and Recreation and Fiscal, as outlined below:

#### **PARKS AND RECREATION**

##### **3.5.1 - Threshold Compliance**

The parks to people ratio is at 2.94 acres per 1,000 in eastern Chula Vista, as of June 30, 2015. While the threshold standard is 3 acres per 1,000 people in eastern Chula Vista, the GMOC considers anything above 2.9 to be compliant and, therefore, determined that the threshold standard is compliant. Population forecasts for the next five years indicate that the parks to people ratio may be as low as 2.82 acres per 1,000 people in eastern Chula Vista in 2020. This calculation assumes that several parks totaling over 38 acres will be delivered in eastern Chula Vista by then, including: Stylus Park in Millenia (1.97 acres); P-3 in Village 2, Phase 1 (3.9 acres); P-2 in Village 2 (7.10 acres); Strata Park in Millenia (1.51 acres); P-1 in Village 3 (6.7 acres); P-1 in Village 8 West (7.5 acres); Town Square in Village 8 West (3 acres); and the Neighborhood Park in Village 8 East (6.8 acres). The GMOC has no recommendation at this time.

##### **3.5.2 - Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan**

Based on staff's response to the GMOC's recommendation that the draft Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan go to City Council by June 2015, the GMOC expected the plan to go to Council by fall 2015. However, staff now reports that the draft plan will go to Council fall 2016, after it goes back to stakeholders and the general public.

Staff members from Development Services, Public Works and Recreation Departments have identified the need to incorporate an updated "Recreation Needs Assessment" (completed in February 2016) and to add a new chapter to the document addressing operations and maintenance. In addition, there may be items relevant to the "Cost Recovery, Resource Allocation and Revenue Enhancement Study," which will be completed this fall. The GMOC is recommending that Council approve the document by fall 2016, and that any outstanding issues should be handled through future amendments to the document.

The GMOC's 2016 Annual Report recommends:

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

*Staff Response: The Parks and Recreation Master Plan is on schedule to go to City Council for their consideration by fall 2016.*

## **FISCAL**

### **3.6.1- Deferred Maintenance Costs**

For several years, the GMOC has been well aware that the city has been suffering from deferred infrastructure maintenance, and they have made recommendations in previous annual reports to try to address the issues.

This year, the GMOC was visited by city staff members who provided updates on the city's fiscal health, and on the city's asset management program/study to identify Citywide infrastructure needs and to develop a financing plan to cover those needs. Staff introduced two potential bond measures to the commissioners-a sales tax increase and/or a bond/property tax measure. The GMOC was very supportive and made the recommendation below.

The GMOC's 2016 Annual Report recommends:

- **That City Council direct the City Manager to strongly consider ballot measures to increase property and/or sales taxes to address identified infrastructure needs.**

*Staff Response: On July 12, 2016, staff is bringing a recommendation forward to Council for their consideration to place a temporary ½ cent sales tax measure to fund infrastructure on the November 2016 ballot.*

Chula Vista's economic development is also of great interest to the GMOC and they are in favor of economic development through tax incentives.

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

*Staff Response: The City does consider, on a case by case basis, tax incentives for certain*

*industries that generate jobs and an overall increase in the generation of sales and/or property tax revenue to the City.*

### **DECISION-MAKER CONFLICT**

Staff has reviewed the decision contemplated by this action and has determined that it is not site-specific and consequently, the 500-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.

### **LINK TO STRATEGIC GOALS**

The City's Strategic Plan has five major goals: Operational Excellence, Economic Vitality, Healthy Community, Strong and Secure Neighborhoods and a Connected Community. The Growth Management Program's Fiscal threshold standard supports the Economic Vitality goal, "encouraging policies, planning, infrastructure, and services that are fundamental to an economically strong, vibrant city." The Air Quality, Libraries and Parks and Recreation threshold standards support the Healthy Communities goal, promoting "an environment that fosters health and wellness and providing parks, open spaces, outdoor experiences, libraries and recreational opportunities that residents can enjoy." And the Police, Fire and Emergency Services, Traffic, Sewer and Drainage threshold standards support the Strong and Secure Neighborhoods goal, ensuring "a sustainable and well-maintained infrastructure to provide safe and appealing communities to live, work and play" and maintaining "a responsive Emergency Management Program."

### **CURRENT YEAR FISCAL IMPACT**

None of the staff responses and proposed implementing actions appear to require additional staff or other resources beyond those already included in the currently approved budget. In such instance as any additional resources may be required, these requests will be returned to Council for consideration along with fiscal analysis, as applicable.

### **ONGOING FISCAL IMPACT**

The Police Department's Fiscal Year 2017 budget requests related to response times and staffing include two new police officer positions and a part-time civilian Homeless Outreach Coordinator (approximate annual cost of \$336,813) and a new Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) system (\$1.4M).

The Fire Department's Fiscal Year 2017 budget requests related to response times and staffing include three full-time employee firefighter/emergency medical technicians to upgrade one engine company to a staffing of four (annual cost of \$358,027).

As any follow-up implementing actions are brought forward to the City Council, fiscal analysis of these actions will be provided, as applicable.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

- 1 - 2016 GMOC Staff Responses and Implementing Actions Summary
- 2 - 2016 GMOC Annual Report, including the Chair Cover Memo

3 - 2016 GMOC Annual Report Appendices A and B

*Staff Contact: Kim Vander Bie, Associate Planner*