



# City of Chula Vista

## Legislation Details (With Text)

---

**File #:** 15-0114 **Name:**  
**Type:** Workshop Item **Status:** Passed  
**In control:** City Council  
**On agenda:** 4/23/2015 **Final action:** 4/23/2015  
**Title:** REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION'S (GMOC) 2015 ANNUAL REPORT

A. RESOLUTION NO. PCM-14-11 OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CHULA VISTA ACCEPTING THE 2015 GMOC ANNUAL REPORT, AND RECOMMENDING ACCEPTANCE BY THE CITY COUNCIL

B. RESOLUTION NO. 2015-092 OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHULA VISTA ACCEPTING THE 2015 GMOC ANNUAL REPORT, AND DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER TO UNDERTAKE ACTIONS NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS AS PRESENTED IN THE STAFF RESPONSES AND PROPOSED IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS SUMMARY

**Sponsors:**

**Indexes:**

**Code sections:**

**Attachments:** 1. Attachment 1 - Recommendations & Implementing Actions Summary, 2. Attachment 2 - GMOC's 2015 Annual Report, 3. Attachment 3 - Appendices A & B, 4. Resolution A, 5. Resolution B, 6. Exhibit A to Resolution B, 7. Joint Workshop PowerPoint - 2015

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
4/23/2015	1	City Council	adopt	Pass
4/23/2015	1	City Council	adopt	

REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION'S (GMOC) 2015 ANNUAL REPORT

A. RESOLUTION NO. PCM-14-11 OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CHULA VISTA ACCEPTING THE 2015 GMOC ANNUAL REPORT, AND RECOMMENDING ACCEPTANCE BY THE CITY COUNCIL

B. RESOLUTION NO. 2015-092 OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHULA VISTA ACCEPTING THE 2015 GMOC ANNUAL REPORT, AND DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER TO UNDERTAKE ACTIONS NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS AS PRESENTED IN THE STAFF RESPONSES AND PROPOSED IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS SUMMARY

### RECOMMENDED ACTION

Council conduct the public meeting, 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 2015 Annual Report covers the period from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014; identifies current issues in the second half of 2014 and early 2015; 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

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 2015 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

The 2015 GMOC Annual Report addresses compliance with threshold standards for eleven quality-of-life indicators covered in the City's Growth Management Program. The rate, and therefore, the effects of growth in Chula Vista have slowed considerably since 2005 when nearly 3,300 units were issued building permits. The annual number of issued permits steadily declined until 2009, when 275 units were permitted. The number of annual permitted units has been gradually moving upward with 930 units being issued building permits in 2014.

Presented below is a summary of findings and key issues in regards to threshold compliance. The GMOC Annual Report (Attachment 2) provides additional background information, more detailed explanations of findings and discussion/recommendations.

### 1. Summary of Findings

The following table summarizes the GMOC's 2015 threshold compliance findings for the current review period (July 1, 2013 - June 30, 2014) and looking forward at any potential for non-compliance between 2015 and 2019.

#### Current and Anticipated Threshold Compliance

Not In Compliance	In Compliance	Potential Future Non-Compliance
Libraries	Air Quality	Fire/EMS
Police - Priority 1	Drainage	Libraries
Police - Priority 2	Fiscal	Parks and Recreation
Traffic	Parks and Recreation	Traffic

Fire/EMS	Schools	
	Sewer	
	Water	

## 2. Summary of Key Issues

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

### Thresholds Not in Compliance

#### LIBRARIES

##### 3.1.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard

The Libraries threshold standard has not been met for the eleventh consecutive year. Despite population growth in Chula Vista during this review period, the libraries 30,000-square-foot deficit remained steady due to a 2,000-square-foot expansion ("The Hub") at the Otay Ranch Town Center Library Branch. The lease for the Otay Ranch Library is scheduled to expire at the end of 2017, which would result in a potential loss of 5,412 square feet of library space if the lease is not renewed. Since Public Facilities Development Impact Fees (PFDIF) funding for construction of a new library will be insufficient for several more years, the GMOC would like to see the Otay Ranch Library lease extended until the Millenia library is built. According to the 2009 Development Agreement, a timetable for delivery of the Millenia library would be established within one year of completion of the updated Libraries Master Plan. Council approved the Master Plan in April 2014 and the City Manager is currently in discussions with the developer about extending the trigger.

The GMOC also determined that existing facilities were not being fully utilized during the review period because of inadequate equipment and staffing.

The 2015 Annual Report recommends:

- **That City Council direct the City Manager to negotiate extension of the Otay Ranch Town Center Library Branch until the library at Millenia is built, and actively campaign for library grants, endowments, partnerships and other funding mechanisms to support library needs.**

*Staff Response:*

- ***Talks are progressing for the library at Millenia.***

##### 3.1.2 Renovation of Civic Center Library

Based on reports from the Library Director, the GMOC determined that the basement of the Civic Center Library is currently underutilized and, if renovated, could be a great community space or source of revenue from potential tenants.

The 2015 Annual Report recommends:

- **That City Council direct the City Manager to find 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 source from potential tenants.**

*Staff Response:*

- ***Civic Center space is being renovated as funds are found.***

### **3.1.3 Expanding Opportunities**

The GMOC is supportive of enhanced levels of service and any other opportunities to generate revenue, including integrating leasable space into existing and/or future facilities to supplement ongoing operational expenses. The Library Director reported that the City has had discussions with various schools about leasing some existing library space and the GMOC supports that option, as well. In addition, as future parks are constructed, especially the 70-acre park in Otay Ranch, the GMOC endorses shared use of parks and recreation and library facilities. For example, a performing arts venue, community meeting rooms and WiFi centers or computer rooms could be incorporated into recreation facilities.

The 2015 Annual Report recommends:

- **That City Council direct the City Manager to continue seeking opportunities within the library system for potential revenue generation, and support mixed use of parks and recreation and library facilities.**

*Staff Response:*

- ***Opportunities for mixed use and revenue generating options are being explored.***

## **POLICE**

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

For the second time in three years, compliance with the “Percentage of Call Responses within 7 Minutes” portion of the threshold standard was not met. It fell 1.7% short of the 81% standard.

The “Average Response Time” component of the threshold standard has been met for several consecutive years, and at 4 minutes and 57 seconds was the same as in Fiscal Year 2013.

<b>Threshold Standard</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Average Time</b>
Emergency Response (Priority 1)	81.0%	7 minutes	5:30 min./sec.
Urgent Response (Priority 2)	57.0%	7 minutes	7:30 min./sec
<b>Actual</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Average Time</b>
Emergency Response (Priority 1)	79.3%	7 minutes	4:57 min./sec.
Urgent Response (Priority 2)	42.7%	7 minutes	11:26 min./sec.

The Police Department attributed missing the threshold standard to chronically low staffing in the Community Patrol Division and indicated that they have hired a full-time recruiter to fill officer vacancies.

The 2015 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 response times to Priority 1 calls can improve.**

*Staff Response:*

- ***The Police Department has recently added hourly staff to assist with processing police officer recruit backgrounds. With these additional resources, along with new mobile data computers, improvements should be seen in response times. The Police Department will continue to monitor and evaluate recruiting and retention programs.***

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

The number of Priority 2 calls went down by almost 700 from Fiscal Year 2013 to Fiscal Year 2014; however, the threshold standard of responding to 57 percent of calls within 7 minutes was not met for the 17<sup>th</sup> consecutive year (see table above). At 42.7 percent, the percentage of calls responded to within 7 minutes was the same in Fiscal Year 2014 as it was in Fiscal Year 2013, which was 14.3 percent below the threshold standard.

The average response time of 11 minutes and 26 seconds was an 11-second improvement, but still 3 minutes and 56 seconds above the threshold standard of 7 minutes and 30 seconds. However, the response time would have complied with the new Priority 2 threshold standard of 12 minutes, which will be in effect during the next review period. During the top-to-bottom process, it was determined that the new threshold standard is a more accurate barometer for Priority 2 calls.

The 2015 Annual Report recommends:

- **Pending implementation of the new threshold standard that will be in effect for next year's report, the GMOC has no recommendation at this time.**

## **TRAFFIC**

### **3.3.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard**

One arterial segment was non-compliant during the review period, northbound Heritage Road from Olympic Parkway to Telegraph Canyon Road. It has been chronically non-compliant over the years and exceeded the Level of Service (LOS) threshold standard by four hours (three hours at LOS D and one hour at LOS E).

Once Heritage Road is connected to Main Street, the City's traffic engineers expect this segment to improve, along with other arterial segments where slower traffic patterns may be emerging. In the meantime, however, the potential for non-compliance continues to exist.

For this review period, City staff chose not to measure some arterial segments that are typically included in their analysis for the GMOC because several traffic improvement construction projects were underway, creating abnormal traffic patterns. As those construction projects conclude and the omitted arterial segments are included into future analyses, the expectation is that those segments will be compliant. However, compliance is uncertain until construction projects are completed and

data from all relevant arterial segments are analyzed.

The 2015 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 the GMOC recommendation; recommendation is accepted. The environmental document has been completed as part of the Village Three EIR. This section of Heritage Road has been fully bonded for. The developer is endeavoring to complete the connection by December 2016.*

## FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

### 3.4.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard

The Fire and Emergency Medical Services threshold standard has not been met for the fourth consecutive year.

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: 80.0%</b>						
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		
FY 2009	9,363	84.0%	4:46	3:33		
FY 2008	9,883	86.9%	6:31	3:17		
FY 2007	10,020	88.1%	6:24	3:30		
CY 2006	10,390	85.2%	6:43	3:36		

The percentage of calls responded to within 7 minutes improved from 75.7% in FY 2013 to 76.5% in FY 2014; however, the threshold standard of 80% was missed by 3.5%. The Fire Department reported that the geographical layout of the fire stations on the east side of the city and the number of stations available to serve the community contribute to response times that do not comply with the threshold standard. Response times from fire stations 6, 7 and 8, in particular, have not been meeting the threshold standard, and the GMOC would like the Fire Department to focus on these stations to improve their response times.

The Fire Department is implementing several system improvements that could significantly impact compliance, including working on solutions to problems with their FirstWatch data reporting system,

and improving methodology for data collection, amongst others. The GMOC is hopeful that these and/or other system improvements will result in threshold compliance.

The 2015 Annual Report recommends:

- **That City Council direct the City Manager to collaborate with the Fire Chief in implementing effective measures that improve response times and result in threshold compliance.**

*Staff Response:*

- ***Response times will become an objective to the goal of improving service delivery in the Fire Department's 5-year strategic plan. It is agreed to discuss with the City Manager all strategic measures that must be implemented to reach the objective.***

### **Thresholds Currently In Compliance**

Threshold Standards were found to be compliant for **Parks and Recreation, Fiscal, Schools, Sewer, Drainage, Air Quality, 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 Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan**

A draft of the updated Parks and Recreation Master Plan (PRMP) has been completed and is being reviewed by department directors. It will then be reviewed by the Parks and Recreation Commission. After that, it will move on to Council for their consideration. City staff is projecting that the PRMP will be approved by the end of June 2015

The 2015 Annual Report recommends:

- **That City Council approve the updated Parks and Recreation Master Plan by the end of June 2015 and make additional updates, as necessary.**

*Staff Response:*

- ***Staff is preparing the Parks and Recreation Master Plan for presentation before the Parks and Recreation Commission for early summer 2015 and a presentation before City Council in summer/fall 2015.***

##### **3.5.1 Mixing Uses**

As noted in the Libraries discussion, when future parks are constructed, especially the 70-acre park in Otay Ranch, shared use of parks and recreation facilities and library facilities should be explored. For example, a performing arts venue, community meeting rooms or WiFi and computer centers could be established in parks or recreation facilities.

The 2015 Annual Report recommends:

- That City Council direct the City Manager to support mixed use of parks and recreation and library facilities.

*Staff Response:*

- *Opportunities for mixed use and revenue generating options are being explored.*

It should also be noted that, while the Parks and Recreation threshold standard was compliant as of June 30, 2014, the report from Public Works indicates that it may be non-compliant by December 31, 2015, with 2.86 acres per 1,000 residents -- a deficit of 21.2 acres. By 2019, the ratio may fall to 2.67 acres per 1,000 residents - a deficit of 58.69 acres.

These projections assume that 44.48 acres of new parks will be completed as follows:

ACREAGE	LOCATION
13.10	Village 2
6.70	Village 3
3.48	Millenia
10.50	Village 8 West
6.80	Village 8 East
3.90	Orange Park

The figures regarding threshold compliance are based on population and development projections, which are subject to change. Nevertheless, there is a possibility that a park shortage may arise if master planning and construction of at least portions of the 70-acre community park site in Otay Ranch are not actively pursued.

## **FISCAL**

Although the threshold standard is technically compliant for this review period, the new threshold standard, which will be in effect during the next review period, will provide a better barometer for measuring compliance. As discussed in the Top-to-Bottom report brought to City Council earlier this year, the current Fiscal threshold standard does not incorporate quantifiable benchmarks or mechanisms to measure whether or not specific growth management goals are being met. Instead, it requires that the GMOC be provided with an annual fiscal impact report and a Development Impact Fee report, which was complied with.

## **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 section 18704.2 (a)(1) is not applicable to this decision. Staff is not independently aware, nor has staff been informed by any City Councilmember 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 appears 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 along with fiscal analysis as applicable.

### **ONGOING FISCAL IMPACT**

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 - 2015 GMOC Staff Responses and Implementing Actions Summary
- 2 - 2015 GMOC Annual Report, including the Chair Cover Memo
- 3 - 2015 GMOC Annual Report Appendices A and B

*Staff Contact: Kim Vander Bie*