



**GROWTH MANAGEMENT
OVERSIGHT COMMISSION**

**Fiscal Year 2020
ANNUAL REPORT**
July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2020

January 28, 2021

Approved by the Planning Commission (Resolution No. MPA 20-0021)
and City Council (Resolution No.__) on January 28, 2021

GMOC Members

Duaine Hooker, Chair - (Education)
Rodney Caudillo, Vice Chair - (Business)
Raymundo Alatorre - (District 1)
Michael Lengyel - (Development)
Gloria Juarez - (District 3)
Andrew Strong - (Environmental)
Jerome Torres - (Planning Commission)
VACANT - (District 2)
VACANT - (District 4)

City Staff

Kimberly Vander Bie – Associate Planner
Kimberly Elliott – Facilities Financing Manager
Claudia Ramos – Secretary

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 28, 2021

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 – GMOC Fiscal Year 2020 Annual Report

The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) is pleased to submit the Fiscal Year 2020 Annual Report for your consideration and action. In 2020, the GMOC embarked on a comprehensive review of the Growth Management Program. Since the commission and staff are focused on this effort and given the unique circumstances of 2020 due to the impacts of the COVID pandemic, it was determined that an abbreviated report was in order for Fiscal Year 2020. The report includes review of all the topics and contains one recommendation.

Preparation of the Fiscal Year 2020 Annual Report began by submitting questions to topic experts/department heads for the eleven growth management topics, limiting the questions to threshold compliance and the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, which started to affect operations in Chula Vista towards the end of the third quarter of the fiscal year. Unlike previous years, the topic experts/department heads did not meet with the GMOC; rather, the City's GMOC staff presented the GMOC with a summary report of responses to questions for all the growth management topics. With this information the GMOC concluded that two of the eleven topics, Libraries and Police, did not meet their respective threshold standards.

The details of the topics found to be noncompliant are outlined in the attached report. However, the GMOC would like to highlight a few items of special interest:

Libraries – For the seventeenth consecutive year, Libraries did not comply with the threshold standard. The deficit in square footage has been an ongoing problem, which is expected to improve when a large, full-service library is built in eastern Chula Vista. However, there will still be a shortage of at least 16,000 square feet. In addition, the expenditures budget per capita and staffing ratio continue to be amongst the lowest in the state of California.

Despite the shortage of square footage and resources, the library staff has consistently provided innovative ways to provide library services to the community. This was especially evident when the COVID-19 pandemic hit the City, forcing the libraries to be closed since March 2020. However, the library staff has continued to serve the citizens of Chula Vista by providing mobile, curbside, and passport services, virtual programming, and assuming duties as 211 operators. The GMOC would like to thank the library staff for all their hard work.

Police – The Priority 1 threshold standard was not met, but the response time improved 2.71% from Fiscal Year 2019. The Priority 2 threshold standard was noncompliant for the 23rd year in a row, but also improved. On November 19, the Police Department provided the GMOC with updated statistics, which showed that the Priority 1 threshold was being met for the past five months, and that, despite staffing shortages, response times for Priority 2 calls were also significantly improving. Chief Kennedy and her staff

have done an outstanding job with innovations such as the drone program, Active 911 and Dashboard to help improve response times. The GMOC recommends that the City Council and management support the Police Department in their efforts to maintain service levels and ensure adequate staffing by filling vacant positions and creating additional positions as the City's population increases.

The nine topics that the GMOC found to be compliant were Air Quality and Climate Protection, Drainage, Fire and Emergency Medical Services, Fiscal, Parks and Recreation, Schools, Sewer, Traffic and Water. The COVID-19 pandemic had a dramatic effect on traffic flow, which caused Traffic to meet its threshold standards for the first time in several years.

As previously mentioned, the GMOC is actively engaged in a comprehensive review of the Growth Management Program. The review was initiated by the City's GMOC staff in early 2020, per the City Council's direction. Potential new topics and metrics are being explored with department heads and various stakeholders, shifting the focus from growth impacts to a view of the overall quality of life for all citizens. The GMOC is continuing its work and looks forward to presenting the updated program for review and approval by the City Council.

All of the GMOC meetings in 2020 were held via teleconference, and the commission appreciates the time and professional expertise by City staff in moving the GMOC from in-person meetings to virtual meetings, which allowed the GMOC to fulfill its responsibilities and prepare the Fiscal Year 2020 Annual Report. We'd like to specifically thank Claudia Ramos for hosting and operating our virtual meetings and helping me with the script to keep the meetings on track. We would also like to thank Kim Vander Bie and Kimberly Elliott for their work with City departments and in presenting information from the questionnaires and the ongoing comprehensive review of the Growth Management Program. Finally, we would also like to thank the City departments, the school districts and the water districts, for their input to this year's annual report.

GMOC

Annual Report, Fiscal Year 2020

Table of Contents

GMOC CHAIR COVER MEMO	1-2
TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
1.0 INTRODUCTION	4-6
1.1	Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)	4
1.2	Threshold Standards	4
1.3	Annual Five-Year Residential Growth Forecast	4-5
1.4	Review Process for the Abbreviated Annual Report	5-6
2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY	7
3.1 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE DISCUSSIONS	8-22
3.2 Air Quality and Climate Protection	8
3.2.1	Threshold Compliance	8
3.2 Drainage	9
3.2.1	Threshold Compliance	9
3.3 Fire and Emergency Medical Services	9-10
3.3.1	Threshold Compliance	9-10
3.4 Fiscal	10-11
3.4.1	Threshold Compliance	10-11
3.5 Libraries	11-12
3.5.1	Threshold Compliance	11-12
3.6 Parks and Recreation	13-14
3.6.1	Threshold Compliance	13-14
3.7 Police	15-17
3.7.1	Threshold Compliance	15-17
3.8 Schools	18
3.8.1	Threshold Compliance	18
3.9 Sewer	19
3.9.1	Threshold Compliance	19
3.10 Traffic	2
3.10.1	Threshold Compliance	20
3.11 Water	21
3.11.1	Threshold Compliance	21
4.0 APPENDICES	22
4.1 Appendix A – Annual Residential Growth Forecast	
4.2 Appendix B – Threshold Compliance Questionnaires	

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Growth Management Oversight Commission

The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) was established by the City Council in 1987 to provide an independent, annual review of compliance with threshold standards established for eleven quality of life topics codified in the Growth Management ordinance (Chapter 19.09 of the Chula Vista Municipal Code (CVMC)).

Chapter 2.40 of the CVMC specifies all the duties of the GMOC, which is comprised of nine council-appointed residents of the City of Chula Vista. The commissioners represent the City’s four council districts, the Planning Commission, and a cross-section of interests, including education, environmental, business, and development. Seats for Districts 2 and 4 were vacant during this review cycle and remain unfilled.

The following table lists the commissioners, and their respective districts or interests, who served on the GMOC during the Fiscal Year 2020 review cycle. On behalf of the GMOC, one commissioner also served as a representative on the Measure A Citizens’ Oversight Committee (COC) and another on the Measure P COC, as noted below.

COMMISSIONER	DISTRICTS OR INTERESTS
Duaine Hooker, Chair	Education
Rodney Caudillo, Vice Chair	Business
Gloria Juarez	District 3
Raymundo Alatorre	District 1
Michael Lengyel	Development and Measure P COC
Andrew Strong	Environmental and Measure A COC
Jerome Torres	Planning Commission
VACANT	District 2
VACANT	District 4

1.2 Threshold Standards

When the time the City Council established the GMOC, it approved growth management threshold standards for the following topics: Drainage, Fire and Emergency Medical Services, Fiscal, Libraries, Parks and Recreation Areas, Police, Sewer, and Traffic (all City-controlled); Schools and Water (controlled by outside agencies); and Air Quality (controlled by both the City and an outside agency). Along with these standards, one or more goals, objectives, and implementation measures for each topic was approved by Council, and the current iterations are delineated in CVMC Chapter 19.09, which was updated and approved by City Council in 2015 after a multi-year, comprehensive, “top-to-bottom” review of the Growth Management Program. At that time, the “Air Quality” topic was renamed “Air Quality and Climate Protection.”

1.3 Annual Five-Year Residential Growth Forecast

The Development Services Department annually prepares a Five-Year Residential Growth Forecast (Attachment A), which forecasts the maximum number of residential building permits anticipated to be issued within the next 12-18 months and five years. Determining the projected number of permits

begins by soliciting projections from developers and builders who have completed or are undergoing the entitlement process for Sectional Planning Area (SPA) plans, subdivision maps or design review, then determining the status of compliance with map conditions and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) environmental mitigation measures that must be met prior to issuance of grading and/or 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 latest Growth Forecast, completed in October 2020, covers the period from January 2021 through December 2025 and projects that an additional 7,133 residential units that could potentially be permitted for construction in the City over the next five years, (6,482 units in the east and 651 units in the west). This equates to an annual average of 1,427 housing units, with 1,296 units in the east and 130 units in the west.

1.4 Review Process for the Abbreviated Annual Report

Last fall, the City's *2020 Annual Residential Growth Forecast*, along with blank threshold compliance questionnaires for the eleven growth management topics, were distributed to applicable City departments and outside agencies, who were asked to report on the status of compliance and their ability to accommodate projected growth. When the questionnaires (Attachment B) were completed, a report summarizing responses for all the topics was presented to the GMOC, who recognized status of threshold compliance and efforts made, and identified any concerns and recommendations.

The GMOC's review was structured around three timeframes:

1. Fiscal Year 2020 (July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020);
2. The second half of 2020 to identify and address pertinent issues identified during this timeframe, and to assure that the GMOC could respond to current events and conditions; and
3. The period from January 2021 through December 2025 to assess potential threshold compliance concerns.

In a typical GMOC review cycle, the questionnaires would include a variety of questions, and representatives for the various topics (usually a department head or chief) would be invited to a GMOC meeting to discuss their responses with the commission. However, with the COVID-19 pandemic affecting the last quarter of Fiscal Year 2020 and a comprehensive review of the Growth Management Program underway, the GMOC chose to prepare an abbreviated report by asking questions that focused primarily on Fiscal Year 2020 and future threshold compliance, as well as the effects of COVID-19.

Between August 2020 and January 2021, the GMOC held eight teleconference meetings to prepare the annual report and to participate in a comprehensive review of the Growth Management Program, which staff initiated in response to the City Council's direction. When the Fiscal Year 2018 and 2019 GMOC annual reports were presented to the City Council and the Planning Commission in joint meetings, Council requested that the growth management topics and threshold standards be reviewed for relevancy and reconsidered with an emphasis on quality of life and outcomes rather than compliance with potentially outdated threshold standards. For the next several months, the comprehensive review process will continue with participation from the GMOC, City staff and stakeholders, and an updated Growth Management ordinance with revised topics and metrics will be presented to the City Council later this year.

In October, Maria Kachadorian introduced herself as the new City Manager and provided an update on the state of the City during the COVID-19 pandemic and the status of development.

The 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 28, 2021.

2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

The following table is a summary of the GMOC's conclusions regarding threshold standards for the Fiscal Year 2020 review cycle. Nine thresholds were met, three were not met.

FISCAL YEAR 2020 THRESHOLD STANDARD REVIEW SUMMARY				
Review Period 7/1/19 Through 6/30/20				
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

- Air Quality Improvement Plans (AQIPs) for three SPA plans were submitted to the Development Services Department in Fiscal Year 2020, and greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) studies were done as part of the Mitigated Negative Declarations (MNDs) for two projects.
- Chula Vista has adopted California’s Greenhouse Gas (GHG) reduction goal to return to 1990 levels, or 15 percent below 2005 levels, by 2020.
- In May 2020, the City Council adopted the 2016 Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Inventory, which reported that emissions were 12 percent below 2005 levels (28 percent below per capita). Overall GHG emissions from City operations were down approximately 30 percent from 2012 and 68 percent since 1990.
- The City is continuing to implement the 2017 Climate Action Plan (CAP) actions, such as developing the existing home energy and benchmarking ordinances to encourage energy efficiency in existing buildings and adopting the Active Transportation Plan. There are currently 28 EV chargers at five public facing municipal facilities and the City is applying for grants to install more.
- Chula Vista also continues to implement 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.
- In response to COVID-19, the City is conducting a “Slow Streets” pilot on Third Avenue, which will open additional space for biking, walking and street side businesses during evening hours.
- A report from the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) was not provided.

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

- Storm water flows and volumes did not exceed City Engineering Standards during Fiscal Year 2020.
- No new facilities will be needed to accommodate projected growth in the next 12-18 months or the next five years.

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

Table 1. FIRE and EMS Response Times FY 2020

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
2020	18,804	84.8	5:31	3:52	0:43	0:55
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.

- 84.8 percent of all calls for service citywide were responded to within 7 minutes, exceeding the threshold standard by nearly 5 percent. This was a 2.1 percent improvement from Fiscal Year 2019.
- Fire stations in eastern Chula Vista averaged 78.8 percent; this represents a 12.1 percent improvement from last year.
- The Fire Department attributes the improved response times to 4-0 staffing, funded by Measure A, and apparatus and fleet replacements, funded by Measure P.
- The Fire Department expects to continue meeting the threshold standard through the next 12-18 months, but not in five years without additional fire stations.
- Fire stations will be needed for the Bayfront development and Otay Ranch Village 8 West.
- Since the COVID-19 pandemic, there has been a reduction in calls for service and ambulance transports.

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

- The Fiscal Year 2021 General Fund operating budget is \$206.7 million and the Capital Improvement Projects budget is \$21.9 million.
- “Charges for Service” revenue is projected to be approximately \$1.7 million more than in 2020 due to increased collections for city services and increased building permit activity.
- Projected revenue from Measure A, is approximately \$20.2 million.
- Revenues from Measure P are expected to generate \$19 million per year, which is \$3 million more than originally estimated. The Citizens’ Oversight Committee will review and advise on what capital projects to spend it on.
- Adequate Development Impact Fee (DIF) funds are available to complete projects needed in 12-18 months. Several of the DIF programs will be updated in 2021 and 2022.

Effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic

- The City Council adopted a 90-day economic recovery program in May 2020 to support small businesses primarily located within the Third Avenue corridor, and included financial assistance, technical assistance, and marketing support to those businesses. This program also included temporary elimination of some DIFs and sewer capacity fees and a five-year extension of the Western Chula Vista DIF Financing Program.
- Existing parking meters along Third Avenue were temporarily closed to provide free parking throughout the district.
- The City Council decided not to implement the annual DIF increases scheduled for October 1st.
- In mid-2020 anticipated sales tax related revenues (sales tax, Measures A and P) were projected to be \$5.4 million below budget, but actuals were \$2 million over budget. These figures present a more favorable outlook than expected; however, FY19-20 actuals are not indicative of FY20-21 financial results.
- COVID-19 continues to threaten City operations, revenues, and public safety. The long-term financial impacts of the pandemic are still unknown. City staff continues to explore options to address the projected future structural deficits, potentially exacerbated by the current pandemic.
- Although the City has received Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economic Security Act (CARES) funding from the County and State, those funds are only to be utilized to address the costs related to COVID-19, not revenue shortfalls. Staff anticipates having more information available later in the fiscal year in order to make additional budget balancing decisions with the goal of maintaining critical services to the public.

3.5 LIBRARIES – NONCOMPLIANT

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.

Square Footage

- The current library space square footage is 354 gross square feet (GSF) per one thousand residents, which is 146 GSF per one thousand residents below the threshold standard.
- The existing square footage will not be able to accommodate the projected growth in 12-18 months or five years.
- In 2020 the City renewed a three-year lease for the Otay Ranch Library.
- The Library is anticipating construction of a new full-service library in eastern Chula Vista within five years to help reduce the square footage deficit, but there would still be a shortage of over 16,000 square feet.

Table 2. 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 (2025)	294,042	130412/97,412	444/331
FY 2020	275,321	97,412	354
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

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.

Library Expenditures, Staffing and Services

- The Library's expenditure per capita was \$13.88; the state median is \$37.67.
- The Library's staffing ratio was 0.1482 FTEs per 1,000 population; the state median is 0.30 FTEs.
- The Library's public access computers hosted over 88,544 uses, assisting citizens without the Internet or Internet-enabled devices.

Effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic

- All City libraries have been closed since March 2020.
- The Library staff continued to offer services to the community by shifting to curbside library functions and offering passport services at the Civic Center and South branches. Additionally, programming, such as story times, crafts, S.T.E.A.M. workshops, and job assistance programs were offered virtually.
- The Library has also been influential in bridging the digital divide through the purchase of 2,000 WiFi Internet access hotspots for Chula Vista Elementary School families most in need during this time of distance learning.

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

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 6/30/20 ^b	Existing Parks 6/30/20 ^c	Forecasts ^d		Prior Year Comparisons		
				18-Month ^d (12/31/21)	5-Year ^d (2025)	June 2017	June 2018	June 2019 ^b
3 acres per 1,000 population East of I-805	East I-805	4.53	3.75	3.75	3.70	3.99	3.72	4.57
	West I-805	1.33	1.16	1.19	1.47	1.19	1.16	1.34
	Citywide	3.15	2.63	2.65	2.79	2.77	2.61	3.16
Acres of parkland	East I-805	708.31	587.06	599.35	640.84	604.24	578.98	703.23
	West I-805	159.17	139.17	142.37	178.31	138.95	138.95	159.17
	Citywide	867.48	726.23	741.72	819.15	743.30	717.93	862.40
Population	East I-805	156,357	156,357	159,690	173,093	151,266	155,461	153,844
	West I-805	119,470	119,470	119,763	120,948	116,651	119,697	119,183
	Citywide	275,827	275,827	279,453	294,041	267,917	275,158	273,027
Acreage shortfall or (excess)	East I-805	(239.24)	(117.99)	(120.28)	(121.56)	(150.45)	(112.6)	(241.70)
	West I-805	199.24	219.24	216.92	184.53	211.00	220.14	198.38
	Citywide	(40)	101.25	96.64	62.97	60.55	107.54	(43.32)

Notes:

- Baseline per threshold standard adopted by Resolution No. 1987-13346. Threshold standard has not been amended.
- City-owned acreage includes both currently available park acreage and undeveloped park land either owned or offered to the City for dedication.
- Existing 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;
 - Orion Park, 2.1 acres (including equivalency) and Strata Park, 2.57 acres (including equivalency); and
 - An adjustment to add 0.5 acres to Montecito Park Phase 1 previously under accounted for in 2019 figures.
- 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.

- Park land acreage as of June 30, 2020 amounted to 3.75 acres per 1,000 residents east of I-805, 1.16 acres per 1,000 in western Chula Vista, and 2.73 acres per 1,000 citywide.
- In spring 2020, two new parks opened in the Millenia development: Orion and Strata.
- In 18 months, 10 more acres of park land will be needed in eastern Chula Vista to remain compliant with the threshold standard. Future parks planned to fill that demand include Millenia Park (4.79 acres) and Otay Ranch Village 3 Escaya Park (7.5 acres).
- In five years, an additional 50.21 of park land will be needed in eastern Chula Vista to remain compliant. During that time, park land acreage will also increase in western Chula Vista and citywide.

Effects of COVID-19 Pandemic

- Parks and Recreation staff have been actively responding to community needs during the COVID-19 pandemic. Recreation centers have been used for food storage and distribution, emergency shelters, distance learning centers, and COVID-19 testing sites.
- Exercise programs were offered virtually.
- Picnicking, playing family sports activities, and sitting in the park has vastly increased since the COVID-19 pandemic began.

3.7 POLICE – **NONCOMPLIANT** (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 standards were not met.

Table 1. 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 2020	471	76.43%	6:14
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.

Table 2. Priority 2 – Urgent Calls for Service

Fiscal Year	All Calls for Service	Average Response Time (Minutes) (Threshold = 12 Minutes)
FY 2020	14,943	14:47
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.

- A total of 76.43 percent of the Priority 1 calls were responded to within 7 minutes 30 seconds, which was an improvement of 2.71 percent from Fiscal Year 2019, but 4.57 percent below the threshold.
- The average Priority 1 response time was 6 minutes 14 seconds, which was two seconds longer than in Fiscal Year 2019 and 14 seconds longer than the threshold.
- The Priority 2 average response time was 14 minutes 47 seconds, which was an improvement of 2 minutes 50 seconds from Fiscal Year 2019, but 2 minutes 47 seconds over the threshold.
- The Police Department does not expect to meet the threshold standards in the next 12-18 months or the next five years because staffing shortages continues to present challenges. (NOTE: On November 19, 2020, the Police Chief provided an update on response times, noting that they have been improving for the past several months and they are currently meeting the Priority 1 threshold with an average response time of 5

minutes 50 seconds. They are also getting closer to meeting the Priority 2 threshold with response times averaging 13 minutes 39 seconds.)

- The Police Department is actively hiring to fill vacancies for staff approved by the City Council.
- Implementing innovative technologies and policies, such as Live911, which live-streams 911 calls directly to officers in the field, eliminating the need for officers to wait for assignments from dispatch, has helped the Police Department improve its response times.
- Developing incident-based green light preemption, which turns traffic signals green as officers approach intersections during responses, will also help improve response times.
- Data-generated dashboards to track response times provides enhanced information that helps Watch Commanders determine adequate staffing.

Effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic

- Calls for Service (CFS) volumes are trending at 9 percent below the past 2-year average number of calls. The decline is likely associated with stay-at-home orders.
- Disturbance-Person calls are up 10 percent, while domestic violence and checks on a person's wellbeing are slightly down. Traffic collision calls are down 32 percent.
- Crimes such as armed robbery and non-residential burglaries are up 30 percent, and murder is up 200 percent; rapes and residential burglaries are down approximately 30 percent, and larceny is down 20 percent.
- Data shows a reduction for the top 5 types of calls for service, but the number of crimes within the community in 2020 (January – August) went up when compared to the average of the last 3 years during the same period.

Recommendation: That the City Council direct the City Manager to support the Police Department's efforts to maximize the use of technology and innovation, and to maintain service levels by ensuring adequate staffing, which includes filling vacant positions and creating additional positions as the City population increases.

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

Chula Vista Elementary School District (CVESD)

- The school district was unable to provide current enrollment and projections due to the COVID-19 pandemic but did report that kindergarten enrollment was down 40 percent.
- Distance learning information and resources are available on the CVESD web site.
- Adequate facilities should meet the demands for the next 12-18 months and five years with construction of two new schools in Otay Ranch:
 - 1) Village 3 – Construction will begin in March 2021 and will be needed by July 2022; and
 - 2) Village 2 – Construction will begin in spring of 2022 and will be needed by fall of 2023. This will be the second elementary school in Village 2.

Sweetwater Union High School District (SUHSD)

- Existing facilities will be enough to accommodate forecasted growth through 2025. No new schools are planned before then, as enrollment continues to decline.
- The SUHSD is currently processing enrollment numbers and forecasts for Fiscal Year 2022, incorporating data from an updated demographic study report underway.
- During COVID-19 pandemic, the district and school sites provide ongoing support to students and will be implementing small group cohort support on sites.

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 2018	Fiscal Year 2019	Fiscal Year 2020	18-month Projection	5-year Projection	"Buildout" Projection
Average Flow	15.2	15.9	16.6	17	17.5	20.76
Capacity	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864

- The sewage flows and volumes did not exceed capacity.
- Average flow increased .7 Million Gallons per Day (MGD) from Fiscal Year 2019 to Fiscal Year 2020 and is projected to increase .9 MGD more within five years.
- The current system and budgeted improvements can accommodate sewage flows and volumes for 18 months.
- More facilities will need to be constructed within five years and will be funded from Development Impact Fees (DIFs) and Sewer Facilities Replacement (SRF funds).

3.10 TRAFFIC – 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

- The threshold was compliant for first time in several years, which was attributed to the COVID-19 pandemic significantly impacting traffic flow.
- Significantly reduced volume resulted in improved LOS across the City for a limited time from approximately April to June 2020.
- Data collected in May 2020 indicated that pandemic related shutdowns resulted in traffic volumes that were as low as about 40 percent of the volume measured during the same time in 2019.
- In June 2020 the City Council adopted Transportation Study Guidelines (TSG) that set forth new metrics for evaluating traffic impacts under CEQA pursuant to SB743. Level of Services (LOS) was replaced by Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) as the new metric for evaluating project impacts.

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

Both the Otay Water District (OWD) and Sweetwater Authority have adequate water to accommodate the demand for several years.

Otay Water District

- Supply and storage capacity for potable and non-potable water exceeds the current demand and the demand projected by 2025.
- Demand for potable water went up .1 MGD and the demand for non-potable water went down .1 MGD since FY 2019.
- Current facilities can adequately serve growth projections for the next five years.
- Water conservation efforts remain voluntary in San Diego County since the drought restrictions enacted in 2015 were rescinded.

Sweetwater Authority

- Supply and storage capacity for potable water exceeds the current demand and the demand projected by 2025.
- Sweetwater Authority is working closely with the City, the Port District, developers and consultants on the Bayfront development, including the Costa Vista RV Park and the Pacifica Development.
- In coordination with the City, Sweetwater Authority is updating the Water Distribution System Master Plan and preparing the 2020 Urban Water Management Plan.

4.0 APPENDICES

4.1 Appendix A – Residential Growth Forecast

4.2 Appendix B – Threshold Compliance Questionnaires