

CITY OF CHULA VISTA

GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

2008 GMOC ANNUAL REPORT

Threshold Review Period 7/1/06 to 6/30/07

Commission Members

Kevin O'Neill, Chairman (Development)
Joanne Clayton, Vice Chair (Planning Commission Representative)
David W. Krogh (Sweetwater/Bonita)
Stanley Canaris (Education)
Steve Palma (Southwest)
Russ Hall (Center City)
Duane Bazzel (Environmental)
Tim P. Jones (Business)
Eric Sutton (Southeast)

Staff

Kim Vander Bie, Growth Management Coordinator
Rabbia Phillip, Management Assistant

City of Chula Vista
Planning and Building Department
276 Fourth Avenue
Chula Vista, CA 91910
(619) 691-5101
<http://www.chulavistaca.gov/>

June 5, 2008

**Approved by the Planning Commission (Resolution No. PCM 08-04) and
City Council (Resolution No. 2008-___) on June 5, 2008**

GMOC Chair Cover Memo

DATE: June 5, 2008

TO: The Honorable Mayor and City Council
Members of the Planning Commission
City of Chula Vista

FROM: Kevin O'Neil, Chairman
Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)

SUBJECT: 2008 GMOC Annual Report (July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007, to the Current Time and Five-Year Forecast)

The GMOC is appreciative of the time and professional expertise given by the staff of various City departments, as well as the school districts, water districts, and Air Pollution Control District in helping us complete this year's annual report. The comprehensive written and verbal reports presented to the GMOC illustrate the commitment of these dedicated professionals to serving the Chula Vista community. Special thanks to Rabbia Phillip, Kim Vander Bie, Stan Donn and Ed Batchelder who provided direct staff support to the Commission.

I would like to recognize the commissioners of the GMOC: Vice-Chair Joanne Clayton-Eason, Stanley Canaris, Steve Palma, David Krogh, Duane Bazzel, Tim P. Jones, Russ Hall, and Eric Sutton. This dedicated and diverse team of citizens read numerous reports, listened to detailed presentations, and participated in hours of thoughtful and lively discussion about the impact of development on the "quality of life" in Chula Vista.

Over the last few years the GMOC has been in the lead identifying ways we can become more responsive to the community and effective in our message to Council. The most important aspects of those changes have been:

- Holding an annual retreat;
- Holding (regular) public workshops;
- Focusing greater attention on western Chula Vista; and,
- Having greater future vision, by dealing with current issues and looking critically at the next five-year time period.

In December, 2005 the new Growth Management Element of the General Plan was adopted and drafts of the updated Growth Management Ordinance and Program Guidelines Document are being completed and moving forward for City Council adoption sometime in 2009, and will be available for review by the GMOC in its next cycle.

Chula Vista had been one of the fastest growing cities in the region and the state, and the City has done a remarkable job in providing the facilities and services necessary to accommodate this development. This is a testament to the current growth management program, and all the individual actions that have taken place. The current economic downturn has brought growth to a standstill. Just as the blistering pace of growth earlier in the decade brought challenges to managing the impacts of that growth, the sudden cessation of building brings a whole new set of challenges. The latter is more difficult because growth provides the fees that allow us to maintain our quality of life. The absence of growth also means the absence of fees so there is

little or no money to complete or start needed infrastructure. One of the thresholds we will highlight this evening is a perfect example and presents a conundrum in how to handle it. The GMOC ordinance has, at its core, the ability to cause a halt to the issuance of building permits when one or more of the thresholds are not met. This moratorium would presumably remain in effect until the threshold was brought back into compliance. The Libraries threshold is chronically deficient and the solution is the fees that growth will bring in, but cannot be realized under a moratorium. Police, Priority II–Urgent Response Calls, also continues to be out of compliance.

As part of the “Top-to-Bottom” Comprehensive Growth Management Program Review that the GMOC is currently in the midst of, the GMOC will be proposing a modification to the “moratorium” provision, which currently applies to Police, Fire, Traffic and Parks & Recreation. Please see page 37 for an explanation of the change that will be proposed at a later date.

Seven of the eleven quality of life indicator threshold standards were determined by the GMOC to be in compliance, including:

- Fiscal
- Air Quality
- Water
- Drainage
- Parks and Recreation
- Fire/EMS
- Schools

The four found to be out of compliance include:

- Libraries
- Police
- Traffic
- Sewer

The following report includes a more detailed presentation of the eleven threshold standards, identified issues, findings, and recommendations to the Planning Commission and City Council.

The GMOC held its second annual workshop retreat in October to informally discuss existing GMOC threshold standards and potential modifications to some of those standards. During the review cycle, the GMOC worked on the top-to-bottom review and adjustments to thresholds, as time allowed. In response to growth on the west side, the GMOC will be recommending an attainable threshold for park land on the west side of Chula Vista.

There was one City Council referral from the 2007 review cycle, which was considered and evaluated as part of this year’s review.

City of Chula Vista GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION 2008 Annual Report

Table of Contents

GMOC CHAIR COVER MEMO		1-2
TABLE OF CONTENTS		3-4
REPORT PREFACE – QUALITY OF LIFE: A BROAD OVERVIEW		5
1.0 INTRODUCTION		6
1.1	Threshold Standards	6
1.2	The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)	6
1.3	GMOC 2008 Annual Review Process	6
1.4	Growth Forecast	7
1.5	Report Organization	7
2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY		8
3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE DISCUSSIONS		9
3.1 Fiscal		9
3.1.1	Maintenance of Development Impact Fees (DIF)	9
3.2 Air Quality		10
3.2.1	Chula Vista Development Procedures Regarding Federal, State and Regional Air Quality Regulations and Programs	10-11
3.2.2	City Programs for Air Quality Improvement	11-13
3.3 Sewer		13
3.3.1	Non-Compliant Industrial Boulevard Sewer Line	13-14
3.3.2	Long-Term Treatment Capacity	14-16
3.4 Water		16-17
3.4.1	Meeting Water Demands	17-18
3.4.2	Emergency Water Supply	18-19
3.5 Libraries		19
3.5.1	Library Building Plan	19-20
3.5.2	Updating the Library Master Plan	20-21
3.6 Drainage		21
3.6.1	Maintenance of Existing Drainage	21-22
3.6.2	Funding for Future Facilities Required to Accommodate 5-Year Growth Forecast	22
3.7 Parks and Recreation		22
3.7.1	Threshold Compliance	23
3.7.2	Threshold Standard Change	24
3.7.3	Providing Park and Recreation Facilities in Western Chula Vista	24-25
3.7.4	Parks and Recreation Master Plan	25
3.8 Police		26
3.8.1	Priority I Threshold Findings	27
3.8.2	Non-Compliance of Priority II Threshold	28-29
3.8.3	Priority I Calls Taking Longer Than 10 Minutes	30

3.9	Fire and Emergency Medical Services	30
3.9.1	Reporting Period Consistency	31
3.9.2	Fire Facilities Master Plan and Advance Life Support Study	31-32
3.9.3	Outsourcing Dispatch System to San Diego	32
3.10	Traffic	32-33
3.10.1	Non-Compliance of Threshold Standard	33
3.10.2	Maintenance and Rehabilitation of City Streets	33-34
3.11	Schools	34
3.11.1	School District Accomplishments	34-35
3.12	Other Topics	35
3.12.1	Comprehensive Growth Management Program ("Top-to-Bottom") Review	35-39
3.12.2	Public Comments	39
3.12.3	Parks and Recreation	39
4.0	POTENTIAL GROWTH MANAGEMENT PROGRAM CHANGES	40
4.1	GMOG Retreat and Informal Discussion Session	40
4.1.1	Fiscal	40
4.1.2	Air Quality	40
4.1.3	Sewer	40
4.1.4	Water	40
4.1.5	Libraries	41
4.1.6	Drainage	41
4.1.7	Parks and Recreation	41
4.1.8	Police	41
4.1.9	Fire	41
4.1.10	Traffic	41-42
4.1.11	Schools	42
4.2	2007 Planning Commission/City Council Referrals	42
5.0	APPENDICES	43
5.1	Appendix A – Pubic Comments	43
5.2	Appendix B – Growth Forecast	43
5.3	Appendix C – Threshold Compliance Questionnaires	43

Report Preface - Quality of Life: A Broad Overview

The Growth Management Oversight Commission's (GMOC) principal task is to assess the impacts of growth on the community's quality of life, and to recommend corrective actions in areas where the City has the ability to act and/or can make a difference. This is an important and vital service. No other city in the region has an independent citizen body such as the GMOC to provide this kind of report card to an elected body.

The GMOC takes seriously its role of monitoring the impacts of growth and reporting to the City Council. The GMOC membership also believes that it has a responsibility to express concerns over issues that may not be part of the formal GMOC purview. For instance, maintenance and upkeep of necessary infrastructure for the City potentially impacts the quality of life for both current and future residents; increased costs of deferred maintenance could consume a significant amount of budget resources, thereby requiring cuts that may impact services, such as parks and libraries. The GMOC finds it important for this issue to be raised so that the City Council and the community have a full perspective regarding the City's quality of life. At the same time, the GMOC has tried to avoid duplication of effort, being mindful of the roles of other boards and commissions in taking the lead in addressing various types of issues, and to focus on its main priorities.

Despite the City's recent budget challenges, the GMOC believes the overall quality of life in Chula Vista remains good. However, it will be a test to maintain and improve the quality of life in the coming years as the City's limited resources will be needed to prevent degradation of City roads and facilities, and to construct new facilities, such as libraries and fire stations. The master-planned communities of eastern Chula Vista continue to be desirable and relatively affordable places to live, as home values have decreased significantly and foreclosed properties have escalated in recent months. The Otay Ranch Town Center is bringing in tax revenue and providing both residents and visitors from neighboring communities a pleasant venue for shopping, dining and entertainment. Initiatives for the Eastern Urban Center (EUC) and University Park and Research Center also continue to progress. In western Chula Vista and the Bayfront, the prospects for redevelopment give rise to opportunities for physical improvements to be realized, as they have in the east.

The 2005 General Plan includes an updated Growth Management Element that provides a framework for continuing the evolution of the City's Growth Management Program. A Growth Management Ordinance and Growth Management Program Guidelines are being revised and will move forward for City Council adoption in late 2008 or early 2009.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Threshold Standards

In November 1987, the City Council adopted the original Threshold Standards Policy for Chula Vista, establishing “quality-of-life” indicators for eleven public facility and service topics. These include: Fiscal, Air Quality, Sewer, Water, Libraries, Drainage, Parks & Recreation, Police, Fire/ Emergency Services, Traffic, and Schools. The Policy addresses each topic in terms of a goal, objective(s), a “threshold” or standard, and implementation measures. Adherence to these citywide standards is intended to preserve and enhance both the environment and residents’ quality of life as growth occurs.

1.2 The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)

To provide an independent, annual, citywide Threshold Standards compliance review, the Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) was created. It is composed of nine members representing each of the City’s four major geographic areas; a member of the Planning Commission; and a cross-section of interests, including education, environment, business, and development.

The GMOC’s review is structured around three timeframes:

1. A fiscal year cycle -- to accommodate City Council review of GMOC recommendations that may have budget implications. This 2008 Annual Report focuses on fiscal year July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007;
2. The second half of 2007 and 2008 – to identify and address pertinent issues identified during this timeframe. This is to assure that the GMOC can and does respond to current events; and
3. A five-year forecast – The period from January 2008 through December 2012 is assessed for potential threshold compliance concerns. This assures that the GMOC has a future orientation.

During this process, the GMOC distributes questionnaires to each City Department and outside agency that has responsibility for reporting on the threshold standards associated with the eleven quality of life indicators, and each completes a questionnaire to provide the GMOC with a status of development impacts to the City. The GMOC reviews the completed questionnaires and deliberates issues of compliance, the appropriateness of the threshold standards and whether they should be amended, and whether any new thresholds or standards should be considered.

1.3 GMOC 2008 Annual Review Process

The GMOC held 16 meetings from October 2007 through May 2008, which were open to the public. GMOC members also participated in a City field trip on January 19, 2008. City Departments and external agencies completed threshold compliance questionnaires. The completed questionnaires were provided to the GMOC. The GMOC Commissioners reviewed the questionnaires and, where necessary, asked department

or agency representatives to appear in person to make clarifications and answer questions regarding the submitted questionnaires. City staff and the GMOC identified issues and conditions, as represented in the report. The GMOC also held a community workshop on April 17, 2008. See appendix B for this year's threshold questionnaires and responses.

The final GMOC annual report is required to be transmitted through the Planning Commission to the City Council, scheduled for June 5, 2008.

1.4 Growth Forecast

The Planning and Building Department annually prepares a Five-Year Growth Forecast, which was issued in December 2007. The Forecast provides departments and outside agencies with an estimate of the maximum amount of residential growth anticipated over the next five years. Each department and outside agency was then asked whether their respective public facility/service would be able to accommodate that growth or not. The forecast from November 2007 through December 2012 indicated an additional 8,146 residential units could be permitted for construction in the City, (6,845 in the east and 1,301 units in the west) for an annual average of 1,369 in the east and 260 units in the west, or just over 1,629 housing units permitted per year on average, citywide.

The projected units permitted per year on average, citywide, is down by 333 units from last year's forecast.

1.5 Report Organization

The 2008 GMOC Annual Report is organized into five sections:

Section 1 – Introduction; description of GMOC's role and review process; an explanation of the Residential Growth Forecast; and an outline of the 2008 report

Section 2 -- A threshold compliance summary in table format

Section 3 – A threshold by threshold discussion of issues, acknowledgments, statements of concern (if any), and recommendations

Section 4 -- A summary of potential growth management changes, including evaluation of existing threshold standards and potential changes considerations; and a review of the Planning Commission and City Council referrals from the 2007 Annual Report

Section 5 -- Appendices

2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

The following table indicates a summary of the GMOC's conclusions regarding threshold standards for the 2008 annual review cycle. Seven thresholds were met and four were not.

2007 THRESHOLD STANDARD – ANNUAL REVIEW SUMMARY				
REVIEW PERIOD 7/1/06 THROUGH 6/30/07				
Threshold	Threshold Met	Threshold Not Met	Potential of Future Non-compliance	Adopt/Fund Tactics to Achieve Compliance
1. Fiscal	X		X	X
2. Air Quality	X			
3. Sewer		X		X
4. Water	X			
5. Libraries		X	X	X
6. Drainage	X			
7. Parks & Recreation				
<i>Land</i>	X			
<i>Facilities</i>	X			
8. Police				
Priority I	X			
Priority II		X	X	
9. Fire/EMS	X			
10. Traffic		X	X	
11. Schools				
CV Elementary School District	X			
Sweetwater Union High School District	X			

3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE DISCUSSIONS

3.1 FISCAL

Threshold Standards:

1. The GMOC shall be provided with an annual fiscal impact report which provides an evaluation of the impacts of growth on the City, both in terms of operations and capital improvements. This report should evaluate actual growth over the previous 12-month period, as well as projected growth over the next 12- to 18-month period, and 5-year period.
2. The GMOC shall be provided with an annual Development Impact Fee (DIF) Report, which provides an analysis of development impact fees collected and expended over the previous 12-month period.

Threshold Finding: In Compliance

3.1.1 Maintenance of Development Impact Fees (DIF)

Issue: Reallocating collected monies within the Public Facilities DIF Fund to self-finance different projects for which the monies were not intended has left the City with an inability to meet certain threshold standards.

Discussion: The GMOC recognizes that all funds spent and / or transferred out of the DIF funds are authorized by the City Council, as identified in the budget and consistent with legal requirements. However, there has been no apparent accountability in repaying the funds for their intended use.

In 2005, the libraries fund, under the Public Facilities DIF Fund, had \$14.5 million, plus \$4 million in interest. At this time, the fund is down to \$7 million, not enough to finance a new library, which the City is obligated to do, per the threshold standard for libraries. Some of the \$11.5 million spent was used for libraries, specifically to automate the South Chula Vista Library; to design a new library branch in Rancho del Rey; and to acquire land and books for the Rancho del Rey branch. The remainder of the \$11.5 million was spent on other projects in the Public Facilities DIF fund.

Recommendation: A comprehensive plan for repayment of funds needs to be established for inter-fund reallocating that occurs within the Public Facilities DIF Fund.

3.2 AIR QUALITY

Threshold Standards:

The GMOC shall be provided with an Annual Report which:

1. Provides an overview and evaluation of local development projects approved during the prior year to determine to what extent they implemented measures designed to foster air quality improvement pursuant to relevant regional and local air quality improvement strategies.
2. Identifies whether the City's development regulations, policies, and procedures are consistent with current applicable federal, state, and regional air quality regulations and programs.
3. Identifies non-development related activities being undertaken by the City toward compliance with relevant federal, state, and local regulations regarding air quality, and whether the City has achieved compliance.

The City shall provide a copy of said report to the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) for review and comment. In addition, the APCD shall report on overall regional and local air quality conditions, the status of regional air quality improvement implementation efforts under the Regional Air Quality Strategy and related federal and state programs, and the affect of those efforts/programs on the City of Chula Vista and local planning and development activities.

Threshold Finding: In Compliance

During the period under review, the City exceeded state smog standards only two days and federal standards one day, while the San Diego Region exceeded state standards 21 days and federal standards 8 days. As in previous years, Chula Vista continues to be a leader in implementing local measures and programs that contribute to pollution reduction and air quality improvement.

3.2.1 Chula Vista Development Procedures Regarding Federal, State and Regional Air Quality Regulations and Programs

Issue: The City should enforce Section 20.04 (1982) of the Chula Vista Municipal Code (CVMC), which states that: *All new residential units shall include plumbing specifically designed to allow the later installation of a system which utilizes solar energy as the primary means of heating domestic potable water.*

Discussion: The CVMC authorizes the City building official to waive the requirement for Section 20.04 to be enforced. Enforcing this requirement will help make all new residential homes carbon neutral (balancing the amount of carbon released with the amount sequestered) by 2020, which is a goal of the California Energy Commission and the California Public Utilities Commission. Residential solar hot water systems reduce the burning of fossil fuels for home water heating, thus reducing emissions of greenhouse gases and criteria air pollutants. It is expected that energy codes will become much stricter over the next decade in order to meet the carbon neutral goal.

Recommendation: In order to comply with CVMC 20.04, the City needs to inform applicants of this requirement in the early stages of the development process, and make sure building inspectors verify installation of these systems during final inspections.

3.2.2 City Programs for Air Quality Improvement

Issue: Chula Vista needs to maintain satisfactory air quality and reduce air pollutants in the Chula Vista area.

Discussion: To improve local and regional air quality, the City of Chula Vista continues to implement several of the Action Measures in the Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) Reduction Plan, adopted by Council in November 2000, and conservation efforts related to the City's "Energy Strategy," adopted in 2001, to lower energy consumption and emissions.

Following are some non-development related air quality programs that the City is currently implementing or participating in:

South Bay Power Plant Removal

According to the Air Pollution Control District, the South Bay Power Plant (SBPP) is the third largest source of air pollutants in San Diego County and the largest in Chula Vista. Annual emissions of criteria air pollutants from the SBPP are approximately 2.3 million pounds. Over the last few years, City elected officials and staff have been researching options to close the SBPP. Even if it were replaced, a new plant would produce at least 20% less pollution than the current plant and greatly improve Chula Vista's air quality levels.

Energy Conservation Program

In partnership with San Diego Gas & Electric, the City has just completed the second year of a three-year program to promote energy efficiency throughout the community. By saving energy, the program helps improve local air quality by reducing the energy demand on power plants. Specifically, the program is working to increase energy-efficiency within residential and business sectors by exchanging FREE Compact Fluorescent Lights and Pre-Rinse Spray Valves (food service facilities

only) for older, inefficient models. Thus far, approximately 1,200 Compact Fluorescent Lights and 500 Spray Valves have been exchanged for a total savings of 1.1 million kilowatt hours and 400 therms, respectively. The estimated carbon (i.e. GHG) reduction from the program is 444 tons CO₂ per year. For reference, 100 tons CO₂ is equivalent to the annual emissions of 16 passenger vehicles.

The program is also working to promote energy-efficiency remodels and new construction by modeling the energy impacts of several design alternatives for two new urban infill projects. The City hopes to be able to apply the results of these models to other new projects to promote energy efficient design elsewhere. Energy-efficient construction will be further promoted in 2008 through a program designed to educate planning counter staff and building inspectors in the latest energy-efficient technology so that they can promote energy-efficient alternatives as part of the standard application process.

Urban Shade Tree Program

In mid-2007 the City received a new grant from the California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection to expand its shade tree planting program over the next few years. This grant continued the work of an earlier project in which 460 new trees were planted along older residential streets. Shade trees help mitigate the Urban Heat Island Effect and improve air quality by removing CO₂, dust and other particulates. The new project will plant over 1,200 shade trees along residential streets, canyon parkways, and within community parks and will increase the air quality benefits associated with urban forests. To date, 180 trees have been planted with the help of 100 volunteers. The estimated carbon reduction from the program is 2,340 pounds CO₂ per year.

Alternative Fuel Vehicles

Vehicles using Compressed Natural Gas (CNG), hydrogen, and electricity have been incorporated into the municipal fleet. Recently, the City has been pursuing funds to reduce NO_x emissions by 50% in the transit fleet by using a blend of hydrogen and CNG. In addition, the City is launching a new Nature Center shuttle bus which showcases hydrogen internal combustion engine (H₂ICE) technology.

Although transportation planning typically occurs at a more regional level, local infrastructure improvements will help Chula Vista be prepared for growing community demand for Alternative Fuel Vehicles and fueling stations. The City continues to seek funding to upgrade a CNG fuel dispenser at the Public Works Yard to accommodate the growing public demand for a convenient CNG fueling station. Presently, the nearest public CNG dispenser is 15 miles from the South Bay area.

Climate Change Actions

On April 1, 2008, City Council adopted seven climate change actions presented by the City's Climate Change Working Group. These actions will help the City meet, or make the most progress towards meeting, its ICLEI/Kyoto commitment of reducing citywide greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to 20% below 1990 levels.

- Recommendation:**
- 1) That the City continue to vigorously implement its Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) Reduction Plan, Energy Strategy and Climate Change Actions.
 - 2) That the City Council, as it follows up with the City's Climate Change Working Group, develop options for devising an air quality Threshold Standard that would serve as an appropriate measuring device.

3.3 SEWER

Threshold Standards:

1. Sewage flows and volumes shall not exceed City Engineering Standards (75% of design capacity).
2. The City shall annually provide the San Diego Metropolitan Wastewater Authority with a 12 to 18-month development forecast and request confirmation that the projection is within the City's purchased capacity rights and an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecasted and continuing growth, or the City Public Works Department staff shall gather the necessary data. The information provided to the GMOC shall include:
 - a. Amount of current capacity now used or committed.
 - b. Ability of affected facilities to absorb forecasted growth.
 - c. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
 - d. Other relevant information.

The growth forecast and Authority response letters shall be provided to the GMOC for inclusion in its review.

Threshold Finding: Non-Compliance (#1)

In one instance, City sewage flows and volumes exceeded City Engineering Standards (75% of design capacity).

3.3.1. Non-Compliant Industrial Boulevard Sewer Line

Issue: During the period under review, sewage flows and volumes exceeded City Engineering Standards in a section of the Industrial Boulevard sewer line, which did not comply with the threshold standard.

Discussion: The City has a comprehensive Infrastructure Flow Monitoring Program that is driven by data obtained from the 2005 Wastewater Master Plan. Through that effort, Wastewater Engineering staff determined that flows in a section of the Industrial Boulevard sewer line near the intersection of Industrial Boulevard and Main Street exceeds the established threshold; that is, a pipe is more than 75% full. Therefore, that section of the sewer line may need to be upsized.

The City is in the process of completing design plans for the construction of improvements on the Main Street Trunk sewer line, which will improve the downstream flow condition near the intersection of Main Street and Industrial Boulevard. City staff has performed hydraulic studies on both the Industrial Boulevard sewer line and the Main Street Trunk sewer line. Through that analysis, staff has determined that, before upsizing the Industrial Boulevard sewer line, it would be more prudent to first complete the required improvements on Main Street (scheduled to be finished by the end of the calendar year), then re-evaluate the Industrial Boulevard sewer constraints. In the interim, staff will tentatively schedule the Industrial Boulevard Sewer improvements for inclusion in the CIP program for next fiscal year, pending the outcome of the analysis.

Recommendation: That in 2008/09, the City should complete the required improvements on the Main Street Trunk sewer line; upon completion, the Industrial Boulevard sewer line constraints should be re-evaluated. Staff should tentatively schedule the Industrial Boulevard sewer line improvements for inclusion in the CIP program for next fiscal year, pending the outcome of the analysis.

3.3.2 Long-Term Treatment Capacity

<i>SEWAGE - Flow and Treatment Capacity</i>					
Million Gallons per Day (MGD)	05/06 Fiscal Year	06/07 Fiscal Year	Projection for next 18 months	Projection for next 5 years	Projection for "Buildout"
Average Flow	16.979	17.062	17.894	19.399	25.87
Capacity	20.875	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864

*Buildout Projection based on the SANDAG (2040)

Issue: The City of Chula Vista's entitlement for treatment capacity will need to increase by 5 Million Gallons per Day (MGD) before build-out.

Discussion: While the 5-year forecast for Chula Vista's average daily sewage flow in Million Gallons per Day (MGD) does not exceed the City's treatment capacity allotted through City contracts with the City of San Diego's Metro System, the 2005 Wastewater Master Plan indicated that Chula Vista would need to acquire an additional 5 MGDs of treatment capacity to

facilitate the City's build-out. Additional capacity could be provided in either of two ways:

1. Construction of an independent treatment facility; or
2. Purchase of additional treatment capacity rights from other agencies in the Metro system.

Treatment Facility – The City recently completed a Joint Feasibility Study with Otay Water District and Sweetwater Authority, which explored the feasibility of constructing a Membrane Bioreactor (MBR) Wastewater Reclamation Plant. The intent was to evaluate the feasibility of a plant that would take a portion of the raw sewage from the sewer system, treat it and generate recycled water that would then be utilized by Otay and Sweetwater in meeting their customers' irrigation needs. The remaining sewage in the system will continue to be treated by the Metro system. By reducing the amount of flow conveyed to the Metro system, the City would not need to acquire additional treatment capacity at that plant. The study determined that it was feasible for the City to build the MBR plant if the City could enter into an agreement with Otay Water District to take the recycled water generated. The study further determined that it was not economically feasible for Sweetwater Authority to participate in the project since they did not have a separate recycled water distribution system like Otay Water District.

Staff is now in the process of working with Otay Water District to re-verify their long-term market demand projections. Concurrent with that, staff is also engaged in discussions with funding agencies (like the County Water Authority, State Water Resources Control Board etc.) to determine the availability of grants and no-cost/low interest loans that may lower the cost of the facility to make it more economical.

Purchase of Additional Treatment Capacity Rights – Concurrent with the MBR feasibility study, the City has also been exploring the feasibility of acquiring additional capacity through the purchase of treatment capacity rights from other agencies in the Metro system that may have excess capacity in the system. However, most agencies do not have excess capacity that they would be willing to sell at this time. Some have indicated a willingness to do renewable short-term leases as part of a pooled capacity plan that is being discussed among member agencies.

Currently, staff is actively engaged in discussions with the City of San Diego for the acquisition of the additional capacity rights. The negotiation has been impacted by the organizational changes in the City of San Diego, specifically, changes at the management/decision-making level of the Metropolitan Wastewater Department. Staff anticipates that in the next six months a decision would be reached on the final acquisition price. At that point the City would be in a position to decide on whether to pay that price or begin the process of building its own treatment plant.

Recommendation: By fall 2009, Council should adopt a plan to substantially begin the process of increasing additional capacity that will be needed by 2017.

This will allow the time necessary to plan and deliver the needed capacity or facility.

3.4 WATER

Threshold Standards:

1. Developer will request and deliver to the City a service availability letter from the 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 a 12-18 month development forecast and request evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecast and continuing growth. The districts' replies should address the following:
 - a. Water availability to the City and Planning Area, considering both short and long term perspectives.
 - b. Amount of current capacity, including storage capacity, now used or committed.
 - c. Ability of affected facilities to absorb forecast growth.
 - d. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
 - e. Other relevant information the Districts desire to communicate to the City and GMOC.

Threshold Finding: In Compliance

Both the Otay Water District (OWD) and Sweetwater Authority (SWA) have indicated that they will be able to meet Chula Vista's water demand for the 12 – 18 month period, and for the next five years, as shown in the tables below.

Otay Water District

WATER SUPPLY CAPACITY (Million Gallons Per Day (MGD))					
	FY 2004/05	FY 2005/06	FY 2006/07	12-18 Month Projection	5 Year Projection
Total Flow Supply Capacity	130.6	138.7	144.7	144.7	184.7
Potable Storage Capacity	190.7	196.1	196.1	218.3	235.8
Non-Potable Storage Capacity	31.7	31.7	43.7	43.7	47.7
Potable Supply Flow Capacity	129.5	137.5	137.5	137.5	175.5
Non-Potable Supply Flow Capacity	1.1	1.2	7.2	7.2	9.2

Sweetwater Authority

WATER DEMAND and CAPACITY (Million Gallons Per day (MGD))			
	FY 2006	12-18 Month Projection	5 -Year Projection
Yearly Demand -- (Purchased by consumers, MG)	7,934	8,100	8,350
Yearly Supply Capacity, MG (1,2) -- LOCAL	4,281	4,281	4,281
Yearly Supply Capacity, MG (1,2) -- IMPORTED	4,757	4,757	4,757
Yearly Supply Capacity, MG (1,2) -- TOTAL	9,058	9,058	9,058
Storage Capacity, MG --Treated Water	42	42	45
Storage Capacity, MG -- Raw Water	5,676	5,676	5,676

- Notes:
- 1) Maximum supply capacity includes 62 cfs (40 mgd) treated water connection, Robert Perdue Treatment Plant (30 mgd), Reynolds Desal. plant (4mgd) and National City Wells (2 mgd).
 - 2) Normal maximum supply capacity is from Robert Perdue Treatment Plant (30 mgd), Reynolds Desal. plant (4mgd) and National City Wells (2 mgd).
 - 3) There are 11 emergency interconnections with a current 16.92 MGD capacity or 6,176 MG per year. This supply is not always readily available and can't be used for extended periods and will be counted as imported water.
 - 4) Local supply components are Desal (4 MGD), NC Wells (2MGD), and Perdue Treatment Plant (30 MGD). Imported Supply components are Treated Water Connection (40MDG). There is an imported raw water connection that is not counted since it is limited by the local Perdue Treatment plant.

3.4.1 Meeting Water Demands

Issue: None

Discussion: Otay Water District and Sweetwater Authority serve the City of Chula Vista, and both report that they will be able to meet the water demands of anticipated growth over the next five years.

Otay Water District

Otay Water District indicates that capital improvement program (CIP) facilities are built as needed, and are currently in various stages of development to meet water demands. Their six-year CIP documentation can be found, viewed, and downloaded from the Otay Water District web site at <http://www.otaywater.gov/owd/index.aspx>.

Sweetwater Authority

Sweetwater Authority indicates that some facility improvements are necessary within the service area, and more are anticipated with proposed development. Timing to complete these improvements is subject to available funding on a year-to-year basis. However, new development, such as Bayfront development, may be required to proceed with these improvements, or complete additional improvements beyond those identified in the Master Plan. The District has necessary land to accommodate new water facilities, such as water tanks; pipelines would be installed under Chula Vista public streets. Rate payers, developer capacity fees and potential government grants would finance the improvement.

Recommendation: That the City continue to work with Otay Water District and Sweetwater Authority to maintain and track future development in order to continue to meet the water availability threshold.

3.4.2 Emergency Water Supply

Issue: Provision of water supply during a catastrophic emergency.

Discussion: Both of the major water districts serving the City of Chula Vista, the Otay Water District and the Sweetwater Authority, report that they will be able to meet the water demands in case of a catastrophic emergency. State law requires that an emergency supply of up to two years be available for water company customers.

Otay Water District

The potential for interruptions to the water supply continue to be addressed by Otay Water District (OWD), San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), and Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD) through the development of long-term emergency water supply such as the MWD Diamond Valley Reservoir (six months), the SDCWA Emergency Storage Project (90 days), and the OWD ten-day storage, conservation and alternative supply strategy.

The MWD, SDCWA, and OWD continue to pursue the availability of alternative water supply and supply diversification to be used under normal and in emergency conditions. OWD's need for a ten-day water supply during a SDCWA shutdown is actively being implemented and has been fully addressed in the Water Resources Master Plan (WRMP) dated August 2002 and the recently completed Integrated Water Resources Plan (IRP). OWD has the ability to meet and exceed this requirement within the City of Chula Vista service area through storage capacity, conservation efforts, and existing interconnections with other agencies. MWD, SDCWA, and OWD all have programs to continue to meet or exceed the emergency water supply needs of the region into the foreseeable future.

Sweetwater Authority

Sweetwater Authority currently operates eleven emergency interconnections with a current capacity of 16.92 MGD and is scheduled to install two additional connections for a total capacity of 19.80 MGD.

Recommendation: That the City continue to support Otay Water District and Sweetwater Authority and their water emergency policies.

3.5 LIBRARIES

Threshold Standard:

The City shall construct 60,000 gross square feet (GSF) of additional library space, over the June 30, 2000 GSF total, in the area east of Interstate 805 by build-out. The construction of said facilities shall be phased such that the City will not fall below the citywide ratio of 500 GSF per 1,000 population. Library facilities are to be adequately equipped and staffed.

Threshold Finding: Non-Compliance

The City's library system has not kept pace with growth; the facilities ratio of 500 GSF per 1,000 population has not been met for the past four years, beginning in FY 03-04, as shown in the table below. Future forecasts indicate that the Libraries Threshold Standard will remain out of compliance until the Rancho del Rey Library is constructed.

3.5.1 Library Building Plan

LIBRARIES			
	Population	Total Gross Square Footage of Library Facilities	Gross Square Feet of Library Facilities Per 1000 Population
Threshold	X	X	500 Sq. Ft.
FY 1998-99	169,265	102,000	603
FY 1999-00	178,645	102,000	571
FY 2000-01	187,444	102,000	544
FY 2001-02	195,000	102,000	523
FY 2002-03	203,000	102,000	502
FY 2003-04	211,800	102,000	482
FY 2004-05	220,000	102,000	464
FY 2005-06	223,423	102,000	457
FY 2006-07*	227,723	102,000	448
	229,613	102,000	444

12-Month Projection - 12/31/07*			
5-Year Projection - (2012)**	253,600	132,000	520***

*Planning Division Estimate

**5-year projections are based on GMOC Forecast

***Assumes the opening of the Eastern Urban Center facility.

Issue: Four the fourth consecutive year, the City has not complied with the threshold standard of providing 500 gross square feet of library facilities per 1000 people. There is an urgency to begin construction of the Rancho Del Rey library branch.

Discussion: The Library Threshold Standard Implementation Measure requires that the City Council formally adopt and fund tactics to bring the library system into conformance, and that construction, or another actual solution, shall be scheduled to commence within three years of the threshold not being satisfied (June 2007). The Growth Management Ordinance calls for Council to hold a public hearing within 60 days to consider a moratorium.

As discussed in last year's GMOC Report, the Rancho del Rey library branch should have been built before the ratio of gross square feet of library space first fell below the threshold standard at the end of June 2004. Without the Rancho del Rey library, there is a lack of conveniently located library facilities to serve the east side of Chula Vista. The most significant influencing factor on library use is proximity of the facility to the user.

The 1998 Library Master Plan calls for the construction of a 30,000-square-foot, full-service, regional library in Rancho del Rey. The GMOC understands that the City has purchased the land for the library, and that it has a design/build agreement to complete a 31,200-square-foot library at the site; the plans are complete, and the City has a contractual commitment. Construction, which will take approximately one year to complete, can begin once Council approves funding. Staff needs to come up with a specific plan and timeline for construction; the City will be back in compliance with the Libraries threshold standard once Rancho del Rey library is completed.

Recommendation: That the City Council direct the City Manager to prepare a specific plan and timeline for the replenishment of the Libraries component of the PFDIF, and construction of the Rancho del Rey library at the earliest possible time.

3.5.2 Updating the Library Master Plan

Issue: The 1998 Library Master Plan is due to be updated and needs to reflect the December 2005 General Plan Update.

Discussion: Last year, the GMOC noted the need to update the 1998 Library Master Plan to reflect increased library needs generated by projected build-out population from the 2005 General Plan Update. The update also needs to consider changing trends to define the adequacy of library facilities and equipment, and what constitutes adequate staffing and hours of

operation. Once an updated baseline is established, the plan would recommend how to most effectively and efficiently achieve the thresholds, both in relation to new facilities and in regards to updating existing facilities, given projected infill development.

Recommendation: 1) Assess ultimate future library needs based upon the increased capacity from the City's updated General Plan, and accordingly update the Library Facilities Master Plan, and the threshold standards reference. 2) Actively pursue planning for a new Eastern Urban Center branch library in an amount sufficient to address the new General Plan build-out population needs.

3.6 DRAINAGE

Threshold Standards:

1. Storm water flows and volumes shall not exceed City Engineering standards.
2. The GMOC shall annually review the performance of the City's storm drain system to determine its ability to meet that goal.

Threshold Finding: In Compliance

Storm water flows and volumes during the reporting period were within City engineering standards.

3.6.1 Maintenance of Existing Drainage

Issue: For channels that require permits from environmental resource agencies before maintenance can be conducted, it is necessary to develop acceptable channel maintenance procedures and obtain appropriate environmental permits.

Discussion: The City currently participates in a regional work group that has been established to develop channel maintenance procedures that are acceptable to resource agencies and facilitate obtaining environmental permits for channel maintenance from resource agencies. The workgroup, consisting of 18 agencies ("co-permittees") in the San Diego region, has hired a consultant to iron out the difficulties and obtain consensus from resource agencies on a streamlined process understandable by, and acceptable to, all parties. This is important because obtaining permits for channel maintenance is a time-consuming and costly process; and in some cases, there may be conflicting requirements from different resource agencies.

Although the City went through the steps of hiring its own consultant to help obtain the required permits, a consultant has not been hired, due to funding constraints.

Recommendation: The City should continue to participate in the Regional Channel Maintenance Workgroup subcommittee, as the group's consultant continues to work with environmental resource agencies in streamlining a process for obtaining environmental permits.

3.6.2 Funding for Future Facilities Required to Accommodate 5-Year Growth Forecast

Issue: General impacts on developed areas in western Chula Vista may need to be funded by the City.

Discussion: Development and redevelopment is projected in the 5-year forecast for the Telegraph Canyon Basin west of Interstate 805. Priority 1 drainage projects in this basin include the unimproved portion of the channel downstream (southwest) of Sierra Way, associated drainage facilities near the intersection of Third Avenue and L Street, and culverts at Country Club Drive and First Avenue. Such improvements, both capacity and erosion, can be partially funded through the Telegraph Canyon Drainage DIF. However, there may not be sufficient funds in the DIF to finance all the improvements needed in this basin. Since the areas adjacent to most new development are generally privately owned, the property owner will fund their proportionate share of these improvements as a condition of development. However, general impacts on developed areas may need to be funded by the City.

Insufficient facilities and/or funds could result in an increased potential for flooding, for collapse of corroded CMP, and for erosion. For the City's NPDES program, it could result in impairment of water quality within receiving waters and create a condition of non-compliance with the Municipal Permit, exposing the City to penalties.

Engineering staff has had two workshops with City Council to identify infrastructure needs. The first was held in April 2007; the second in February 2008. A third workshop will be held to discuss funding.

Recommendation: Through local, state and federal monies, the City should be prepared to fund any shortfalls associated with construction of new improvements and/or improvements to existing drainage facilities.

3.7 PARKS & RECREATION

Threshold Standard:

Three acres of neighborhood and community parkland with appropriate facilities shall be provided per 1,000 residents east of I-805.

Threshold Finding: In Compliance

3.7.1 Threshold Compliance

Land

Issue: None

Discussion: The land threshold is in compliance for the period under review. Current (6/30/07) eastern Chula Vista parkland inventory will provide adequate acreage to accommodate up to 129,814 persons. With a current population of 108,524 persons in the east, there is a current developed parkland overage of 63.87 acres.

The 18-month forecast projects an eastern Chula Vista population of 113,152 (an increase of 4,628). The increase would necessitate an additional 13.88 acres of developed parkland. With a current overage of 63.87 acres, east inventories are adequate to accommodate the anticipated 18-month population forecast.

It is anticipated that the 5-year population forecast of 129,442 for eastern Chula Vista (an increase of 20,918) will also be accommodated by required parkland acreage. With Mount San Miguel Community Park and All Seasons Park slated for construction in the latter half of 2008, and two neighborhood parks in Otay Ranch Village 2 planned for late 2011, there will be 41.3 acres of additional parkland, bringing the eastern Chula Vista parkland inventory to 430.73 acres, which can accommodate a population 143,577. This would result in a projected overage of 42.4 acres.

Recommendation: None

Facilities

Issue: None

Discussion: During the period under review, the facilities sited within the requisite park acreage are consistent with the types of facilities identified in the City's Park and Recreation Master Plan and are, therefore considered "appropriate" in the context of the threshold standard, which does not identify a quantity of facilities necessary to be in compliance. The City's Park and Recreation Master Plan and the parkland dedication ordinance has a formula, however, to determine the quantity of facilities necessary to meet the recreational demand of the residents. Based on the formula, certain types of facilities (e.g., practice softball fields, baseball fields, practice soccer fields, tennis courts, basketball courts, and swimming pools) are currently experiencing shortages in terms of meeting current demands, although some of the demand for these fields and courts is being met at non-public park sites, such as school sites.

Recommendation: None

3.7.2 Threshold Standard Change

Issue: The Parks & Recreation threshold standard should be changed to address new growth, citywide.

Discussion: The existing threshold standard for Parks & Recreation specifies that three acres of neighborhood and community park land with appropriate facilities shall be provided per 1,000 residents east of Interstate 805. The ratio is currently being satisfied, and the threshold standard monitors that. However, in western Chula Vista, it is anticipated that there will be new population growth with requisite park and recreation needs, thereby necessitating a citywide threshold standard. Therefore, it is recommended that a citywide standard be used that can ensure that parks and recreation facilities keep pace with new growth. Additionally, it should be ensured that all parks developed with funding from new residential growth west of I-805 be developed in within this area.

The current ratio of parks west of Interstate 805 is approximately 1.15 acres per 1,000 residents (.91 acres per 1,000 between Interstates 5 and 805). It will take an additional 157 acres of park land to achieve a citywide ratio of 3 acres per 1,000 residents; however, new development cannot be made legally responsible for increasing park land above 3 acres per 1,000 new residents resulting from new development. Beyond the responsibilities of new development, creative new strategies for increasing developed park land west of Interstate 805 are needed to build upon pre-existing park acreage levels.

Recommendation: 1) As part of the Top-to-Bottom review, the Parks & Recreation threshold standard should be amended to read: "Three acres of park land, with appropriate facilities, shall be provided per 1,000 residents for new development, citywide."

2) A City policy should be adopted that requires that all new parks developed with funding from new residential growth west of Interstate 805 be developed within this area.

3.7.3 Providing Park and Recreation Facilities in Western Chula Vista

Issue: There is a need for additional parks and recreational facilities in western Chula Vista, and for acquiring land and funding for construction, to meet the needs for new residential population.

Discussion: A challenge exists in western Chula Vista in terms of the delivery of and development of parkland and recreational facilities to meet the demands created by future residential development. Concern exists regarding the

challenge of acquiring new parkland in developed areas of the City, particularly western Chula Vista.

While future growth will result in the need and requirement for additional parkland and recreational facilities, there will be increased challenges in securing appropriate park and recreation sites in western Chula Vista, where land is primarily built out. Lack of vacant and under-utilized parcels of land and/or competing demands and uses for land in the west represent obstacles to expanding park and recreation facility inventory. Developing creative strategies for delivering park and recreation facilities is essential to providing for new residential population.

The internal draft Parks and Recreation Master Plan document includes a focused discussion on park delivery in western Chula Vista. Strategies for future western Chula Vista parkland development include developing parks on public agency controlled lands, developing parks on underutilized and vacant lands suitable for parks, and developing parks of varying sizes and character (community, neighborhood, and urban parks) that demonstrably meet defined recreational needs. Future recreational needs in western Chula Vista can be addressed by individually and or collectively applying these strategies.

Recommendation:The City shall develop: 1) new models and approaches for meeting recreational land and facility needs in developed western Chula Vista; and 2) a plan for acquiring and funding land and facilities.

3.7.4 Parks and Recreation Master Plan

Issue: Updated Parks and Recreation Master Plan is still incomplete.

Discussion: An internal draft of the update to the Parks and Recreation Master Plan has been completed and reviewed by legal staff. Parks and Recreation staff is currently responding to legal's comments and incorporating suggested changes into a final draft. The document maintains consistency with the established General Plan policy pertaining to providing 3 acres of park land per 1,000 residents for new residential development, citywide.

The GMOC requests the opportunity to review updated studies and plans that address how future parkland and facility needs will be addressed in western Chula Vista, including the updated Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

Recommendation: A draft of the updated Parks and Recreation Master Plan shall be made available for review by the GMOC as part of its next (2009) annual review cycle.

3.8 POLICE

Threshold Standard:

Priority I

Emergency Response: Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to 81% of the Priority I emergency calls throughout the City within seven (7) minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority I calls of five minutes and thirty seconds (5.5 minutes) or less (measured annually).

Priority II

Urgent Response: Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to 57% of the Priority II urgent calls throughout the City within seven (7) minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority II calls of seven minutes and thirty seconds (7.5 minutes) or less (measured annually).

Threshold Finding:

Priority I: Compliance
 Priority II: Non-Compliance

Threshold Standard	Percent	Time	AverageTime
Emergency Response (Priority 1)	81.0%	7 minutes	5:30 min./sec.
Urgent Response (Priority 2)	57.0%	7 minutes	7:30 min./sec
Actual			
Emergency Response (Priority 1)	84.5%	7 minutes	4:59 min./sec.
Urgent Response (Priority 2)	43.3%	7 minutes	11:18 min./sec.

3.8.1

Priority I Threshold Findings

PRIORITY I CFS – Emergency Response, Calls For Service			
	Call Volume	% of Call Response w/in 7 Minutes	Average Response Time
Threshold		81.0%	5:30
FY 2006-07	976 of 74,277	84.5%	4:59
FY 2005-06	1,068 of 73,075	82.3%	4:51
FY 2004-05	1,289 of 74,106	80.0%	5:11
FY 2003-04	1,322 of 71,000	82.1%	4:52
FY 2002-03	1,424 of 71,268	80.8%	4:55
FY 2001-02¹	1,539 of 71,859	80.0%	5:07
FY 2000-01	1,734 of 73,977	79.7%	5:13
FY 1999-00	1,750 of 76,738	75.9%	5:21
CY 1999²	1,890 of 74,405	70.9%	5:50
FY 1997-98	1,512 of 69,196	74.8%	5:47
FY 1996-97	1,968 of 69,904	83.8%	4:52
FY 1995-96	1,915 of 71,197	83.0%	4:46

Issue: None

Discussion: During the period under review, the Police Department responded to 84.5% of Priority I Emergency Response calls within 7 minutes. This is 3.5% better than the threshold standard requires.

With an average response time of 4 minutes and 59 seconds, the response time increased by 8 seconds from last year, but still complies with the threshold standard of 5 minutes 30 seconds, or less.

Recommendation: None

¹ All figures after FY 2000-2001 (as well as Priority II figures on the next page) reflect a change in citizen-initiated call reporting criteria. Prior to FY 01-02, citizen-initiated calls were determined according to call type; they are now determined according to received source. Using the old method of reporting calls for service to better compare change over time, total citizen-initiated calls actually increased 1.5% from FY00-01 to FY01-02.

² The FY98-99 GMOC report used calendar 1999 data due to the implementation of the new CAD system in mid-1998.

3.8.2

Non-Compliance of Priority II Threshold

PRIORITY II CFS – Urgent Response, Calls for Service			
	Call Volume	% of Call Response w/in 7 Minutes	Average Response Time*
Threshold		57.0%	7:30
FY 2006-07	24,407 of 74,277	43.3%	11:18
FY 2005-06	24,876 of 73,075	40.0%	12:33
FY 2004-05	24,923 of 74,106	40.5%	11:40
FY 2003-04	24,741 of 71,000	48.4%	9:50
FY 2002-03	22,871 of 71,268	50.2%	9:24
FY 2001-02	22,199 of 71,859	45.6%	10:04
FY 2000-01	25,234 of 73,977	47.9%	9:38
FY 1999-00	23,898 of 76,738	46.4%	9:37
CY 1999	20,405 of 74,405	45.8%	9:35
FY 1997-98	22,342 of 69,196	52.9%	8:13
FY 1996-97	22,140 of 69,904	62.2%	6:50
FY 1995-96	21,743 of 71,197	64.5%	6:38

* These figures do not include responses to false alarms beginning in FY 2002-03.

Issue: Priority II calls continue to be in non-compliance with the threshold standard.

Discussion: For ten consecutive years, the threshold standard for Priority II - Urgent Response has not been met. During the period under review, there was improvement from the previous year, however. For percentage of call responses within 7 minutes, the number increased 3.3%; but at 43.3%, it was still 13.7% below the threshold standard.

The average response time during the period under review also improved from the previous year. With an average of 11 minutes 18 seconds, the response time improved 1 minute 15 seconds from last year's 12 minutes 33 seconds. However, this year's improved response time was still 3 minutes 48 seconds over the threshold standard of 7 minutes 30 seconds.

There has been a correlation between staffing levels and the average response time for Priority II calls. Based on a review of patrol staffing levels and response times during 35 swing shifts in February and March of 2007, when staffing was heaviest (18 to 20 officers), response times averaged 11.3 minutes; when staffing was lightest (12 to 13 officers), response times averaged 15.4 minutes.

While the Police Department does not have a position on whether the threshold standard should be modified regarding Priority II calls, they

advise that response times should be viewed with some caution. National research¹ on response times has shown the following:

Victims of robbery, rape, assault and other “victim-involvement” crimes waited an average of 41 minutes before calling police;

- If victims wait 9 minutes or more before calling police, the likelihood of arrest is not related to police travel time;
- Reducing response times is unlikely to reduce crime levels;
- Community satisfaction with police response times is very dependent on incident-specific expectations. That is, if a dispatcher indicates a patrol car will arrive quickly and it doesn't arrive as fast as the caller expected, it's more likely the caller will be dissatisfied. If a dispatcher's response time prediction is accurate – even if they indicate the response will be delayed – it's more likely the caller will be satisfied.

A final report from SANDAG on the 2007 Chula Vista Police Department Resident Opinion Survey indicates that:

- 94% of residents are satisfied with the services of the Chula Vista Police Department;
- 93% of residents feel police officers show fair treatment, display professional conduct, and have a respectful attitude; and
- The top three public safety concerns for residents are speeding vehicles, aggressive driving, and vehicles running red lights.

Last year's GMOC report recommended that the Police Department be directed to implement an action plan addressing the decline in performance relative to meeting the GMOC threshold for Priority II calls. The Police Chief is in the process of preparing a memo.

Recommendation: The City Council shall direct the City Manager to have the Police Department complete and implement an action plan which addresses the decline in performance relative to meeting the GMOC threshold for Priority II calls, by fall 2008.

¹ *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising: A Report to the United States Congress*, prepared for the National Institute of Justice by Lawrence W. Sherman, Denise Gottfredson, Doris MacKenzie, John Eck, Peter Reuter, and Shawn Bushway in collaboration with members of the Graduate Program, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, University of Maryland, 1997.

3.8.3

Priority I Calls Taking Longer Than 10 Minutes

Priority I Calls Exceeding a 10-Minute Response Time By Fiscal Year			
Fiscal Year	Priority I Calls ¹	Calls Over 10 Minutes	Percentage
06-07	814	37	4.5
05-06	850	50	5.9
04-05	1,023	65	6.4
03-04	1,106	63	5.7
02-03	1,216	62	5.1

Issue: City Council has asked that Priority I response times that are 10 minutes or longer be sent to the GMOC for Council review.

Discussion: During the period under review, 4.5% of Priority I calls (37 of the 814 calls available for analysis) had response times greater than 10 minutes. This is the second consecutive year that the numbers have improved. Last year 5.9% (50 of 850) Priority I response times exceed 10 minutes. Based on a review of the 37 Priority I call for service narratives/ accompanying case reports, there were no negative results due to the longer response times in 31 of the calls. In six of the calls it is impossible to determine whether there were negative results. However, there is no evidence that responding any faster to these calls would have changed the outcome of the calls.

Recommendation: The Police Department shall closely monitor performance with regards to Priority I calls with response times over 10 minutes.

3.9 FIRE / EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

Threshold Standard:

Emergency response: Properly equipped and staffed fire and medical units shall respond to calls throughout the city within seven (7) minutes in 80% (current service to be verified) of the cases (measured annually).

Threshold Finding: In Compliance

Threshold Standard	Percent	Time
Emergency Response	80.0	7 minutes
Actual		
Emergency Response	88.1	6 minutes 24 seconds

¹ This column includes only those calls that had arrive times or were not canceled prior to officer arrival (in these cases, no response time can be calculated), and those calls with original priorities of I.

3.9.1 Reporting Period Consistency

FIRE/EMS - Emergency Response Times			COMPARISON	
Review Period	Call Volume	% of All Call Response w/in 7:00 Minutes	Actual Response Time for 80% of Calls,	Average Travel Time
THRESHOLD		80%		
FY 2007	10,020	88.1%	6:24	3:30
CY 2006	10,390	85.2%	6:43	3:36
CY 2005	9907	81.6%	7:05	3:31
FY 2003-04	8420	72.9%	7:38	3:32
FY 2002-03	8088	75.5%	7:35	3:43
FY 2001-02	7626	69.7%	7:53	3:39
FY 2000-01	7128	80.8%	7:02	3:18
FY 1999-00	6654	79.7%		3:29

Note: Reporting period for FY 2001-02 and 2002-03 is for October 1, 2002 to September 30, 2003. The difference in 2004 performance when compared to 2003 is within the 2.5% range of expected yearly variation and not statistically significant.

Issue: None

Discussion: The Fire response time threshold standard was met during fiscal year 2007. This is the first time in two years that the threshold standard was measured by fiscal year, rather than calendar year. Last year, the GMOC recommended that the threshold standard resume being measured by fiscal year, as it had been up until 2005.

From calendar year 2006 to fiscal year 2007, the percentage of calls responded to within 7 minutes improved by nearly 3%; the response time went down by 19 seconds; and the average travel time improved by 6 seconds.

Recommendation: None

3.9.2 Fire Facilities Master Plan and Advance Life Support Study (ALS)

Issue: The Fire Facilities Master Plan and Advance Life Support Study (ALS) are complete but have not been brought to City Council for review and action.

Discussion: The Fire Department has completed its Fire Facilities Master Plan Advance Life Support (ALS) Study, and has already presented a preliminary summary of the ALS Program to the public safety committee. However, neither have been brought to City Council.

Existing facilities, staffing and equipment may not be sufficient to accommodate forecasted growth for the next five years if major projects such as the Bayfront Master Plan, Urban Core Specific Plan and the

University move forward. The impact of this development is addressed in the Fire Facilities Master Plan.

Recommendation: The Fire Facilities Master Plan and Advance Life Support Study should be brought to City Council for review and action during the upcoming GMOC review cycle so that any fire and emergency response issues related to future growth can be addressed.

3.9.3 Outsourcing Dispatch System to San Diego

Issue: The GMOC is concerned that meeting the threshold standard will be negatively affected by outsourcing Chula Vista’s emergency dispatch system.

Discussion: In December 2007, Chula Vista decided to outsource its fire dispatch calls. Since March 2008, fire and medical dispatch calls for Chula Vista have been handled by dispatchers in San Diego, an arrangement that is supposed to save money and improve response times to emergency calls. However, the GMOC believes that meeting the threshold has been directly affected by the City having its own dispatch center. The system allows San Diego and Chula Vista to communicate instantly, rather than having to pass information through multiple dispatch centers. Both cities are supposed to benefit by sharing resources, including fire engines, ladder trucks, brush engines and personnel.

Recommendation: The Fire Chief shall furnish the GMOC with data on response and calls for service after the transition to San Diego dispatch.

3.10 TRAFFIC

Threshold Standard:

Citywide: Maintain Level of Service (LOS) “C” or better as measured by observed average travel speed on all signalized arterial segments, except that during peak hours a LOS “D” can occur for no more than two hours of the day.

West of I-805: Those signalized arterial segments that do not meet the standard above, may continue to operate at their current (year 1991) LOS, but shall not worsen.

Threshold Finding: Non-Compliance

SEGMENT	DIR.	LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS)
Heritage Rd (Olympic Pkwy – Telegraph Canyon Rd)	NB	D (3 Hrs)
Heritage Rd (Telegraph Canyon Rd. – Olympic Pkwy)	SB	E (3 Hrs)
La Media Rd (Telegraph Canyon Rd. – Olympic Pkwy)	NB	D (3 Hrs)
Otay Lakes Rd (Telegraph Canyon Rd – E. H St)	NB	D (4 Hrs)
Otay Lakes Rd (E. H St – Telegraph Canyon Rd)	SB	D (3 Hrs), E (1 Hr)

There were five signalized arterial segments that failed to maintain Level of Service (LOS) “C” and three of the five operated at LOS “D”, or less, for more than two hours a day.

3.10.1 Non-Compliance of Threshold Standard

Issue: There were three non-compliant arterial segments during the period under review.

Discussion: The three arterial segments, noted in the table above, that do not comply with the threshold standard, are located in eastern Chula Vista in proximity to the SR-125 toll road. Heritage Road (Olympic Parkway/Telegraph Canyon Road) is non-compliant for the second year in a row. In last year’s review cycle, traffic signal timing was an issue for that segment, and the GMOC recommended that no modifications be made, and that the situation be re-evaluated after the opening of SR-125.

SR-125 opened in November 2007, after the period under review ended. The impacts of the toll road on major east/west roadways in eastern Chula Vista are currently being monitored, and City engineering staff will prepare a report on its findings in June. If the three segments continue to be non-compliant, the report will include recommendations that will mitigate the impacts.

Recommendation: City engineering staff shall provide recommendations that will mitigate non-compliance if post-SR-125 traffic studies indicate that the three segments continue to be non-compliant with the Traffic threshold standard.

3.10.2 Maintenance and Rehabilitation of City Streets

Issue: Street pavement and maintenance.

Discussion: The City’s Pavement Management consultant completed most of the work on the City’s new Pavement Management System during Fiscal Year 2006-07. At a City Council workshop on April 5, 2007, the overall results of the Pavement Management System were presented. Although the City’s overall pavement condition is classified as good, annual rehabilitation is required to prevent continued pavement deterioration. The goal is to perform the most cost-effective treatments to maintain the best overall pavement condition, not just to rehabilitate the “worst first”.

Council passed a resolution at the April 2007 workshop, reaffirming its commitment to the implementation of a true Pavement Management System. Staff then generated various rehabilitation scenarios, based on available funding. The City has begun to award pavement rehabilitation contracts based on these recommendations.

Recommendation: Contracts should continue to be awarded based on recommendations in response to the Pavement Management System.

3.11 SCHOOLS

Threshold Standard:

The City of Chula Vista shall annually provide the two local school districts Chula Vista Elementary School District (CVESD) and Sweetwater Union School District (SUHSD), with a 12-18 month forecast and request an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecasted and continuing growth. The Districts' replies should address the following:

1. Amount of current capacity now used or committed.
2. Ability to absorb forecasted growth in affected facilities.
3. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
4. Other relevant information the Districts desire to communicate to the City and GMOC.

Threshold Finding: CVESD – In Compliance
SUHSD – In Compliance

3.11.1 School District Accomplishments

Comment:

Both school districts indicate that additional facilities will be required to accommodate growth in the next five years, and that they will be constructed when funding is available.

Sweetwater Union High School District

- A grade 7-12 campus is planned for Otay Ranch Village 11 within the next five years.
- Proposition O passage will allow the District to continue modernization and limited new construction efforts on the west side. Capacity exists currently on the east side with the 2006 opening at Olympian High School (High School 13). A campus for grades 7-12 has completed design and will complete DSA approval by mid-2008. It is positioned to start construction, but is not needed until 2010 (projected). The site has been acquired. Construction on Proposition O projects in 2009 will include Hilltop High School, Chula Vista High School and Chula Vista Middle School.
- The District has a three-story campus design with grades 7-8 on a portion of the campus and a 9-12 campus adjacent with shared service facilities. For Middle School 12/High School 14, construction will commence in 2009, if needed. Site selection, architectural review, funding identification for land and construction, commencement of site preparation, and service by utilities and road have all been completed.

Chula Vista School Elementary District

- Additional schools will be constructed in Otay Ranch Villages 2 and 11, as needed to serve students moving into Otay Ranch, and as state funding becomes available.
- The District has a two-story design planned for the Village 11 school site. Eventually, it will be used in Village 2 and the Eastern Urban Center, as well.

3.12 OTHER TOPICS

3.12.1 Comprehensive Growth Management Program (“Top-to-Bottom”) Review

In 2003, at the request of City Council, a comprehensive review of the Chula Vista Growth Management Program (commonly known as the “Top-to-Bottom” review) was initiated with the support of the GMOC. This was the first comprehensive review and updating of the Program since its inception, over 15 years ago.

Interaction with the GMOC and others in carrying out a comprehensive review of the City’s Growth Management Program documents/components was spearheaded in 2004 by the GMOC Coordinator, Dan Forster, and the City’s consultant, Walter Kieser of Economic and Planning Systems, Inc. (EPS). The review was designed to keep Chula Vista on the cutting edge of growth management efforts, and included review and amendment of four documents/components:

- The General Plan Growth Management Element;
- The Growth Management Program Document;
- The Growth Management Ordinance; and
- Portions of the Threshold Standards.

City Council provided input at a workshop on May 27, 2004, after a “White Paper” summarizing review of the above documents/components was presented, which described issues, ideas, and options for changes. Based on Council’s input, an interactive process involving operating departments, various stakeholders, and the GMOC was undertaken to prepare proposed draft revisions to the General Plan Growth Management Element and Threshold Standards, and to prepare a new Growth Management Guidelines Document to replace the Growth Management Program Document.

The 2005 GMOC Annual Report included a synopsis and recommendations for changes to the General Plan Growth Management Program and Threshold Standards. City Council’s adoption of the 2005 GMOC Annual Report in August 2005 approved those recommended changes in concept, and provided direction to staff to finalize the documents for formal consideration.

Since that time, the revised General Plan Growth Management Element was adopted as part of City Council’s approval of the General Plan Update (GPU) in

December 2005, and pre-final drafts of the revised Growth Management Guidelines Document and Threshold Standards were routed for departmental and administration reviews in November-December 2005. Staff and EPS also began work on corresponding revisions to the Growth Management Ordinance.

In January 2006, Mr. Forster, the GMOC Coordinator, left the City for employment elsewhere, and the Top-to-Bottom process paused while remaining staff focused on completing the GMOC's annual reviews. However, we are now at a point where we intend to focus resources on completing the remaining Top-to-Bottom documents/components, including:

- 1) Growth Management Guidelines Document - A new Growth Management Guidelines Document contains the implementing policies and procedures for the Growth Management Program, and replaces the existing Growth Management Program Document and the "Policy, Thresholds/Standards and Growth Management Oversight Commission" Document. The combined Guidelines document format will provide clearer, more up-to-date documentation by eliminating duplication and outdated information. It will also clarify that the City's Growth Management "Program" is the collection of all provisions and regulations, not just the name of one of the related documents. Under the pending revisions, for instance, the Ordinance contains the requirement to prepare Public Facilities Finance Plans (PFFP's), while the Guidelines Report sets forth the details for their contents and administration.
- 2) Growth Management Ordinance - The updated Growth Management Ordinance is pending, providing the legal underpinning.
- 3) Portions of the Threshold Standards - Some of the main changes for particular thresholds are summarized below:

Libraries - In addition to square footage standards for library facilities, the currently adopted Threshold Standard already includes language referencing "adequately equipped and staffed." The revised Threshold Standard language also specifies "with appropriate hours of operation."

Parks and Recreation - The existing threshold standard calls for three acres of neighborhood and community park land with appropriate facilities per 1,000 residents east of Interstate-805. The revised threshold standard references a citywide standard of three acres of public parkland per 1,000 residents for new development. In addition to the existing "appropriate facilities" language, text is added to include "adequately staffed with appropriate hours of operation."

Police - Recognizing the higher priority associated with Emergency Response (Priority 1) calls for service in comparison to Urgent Response (Priority 2) calls, the implementation measure for Priority 2 calls if the threshold is not satisfied because of growth-related impacts would be a "Statement of Concern", rather than consideration of a moratorium. It is also recognized that response time is not the only factor that defines whether Police services are being maintained.

Fire/Emergency Medical Services - The Threshold Standard is more clearly defined for growth management purposes to include dispatch, turnout, and travel time to the building address.

Traffic - An “urban street level of service” standard is added to the Traffic Threshold Standard. The Guidelines Report also references the importance of maintaining a safe and efficient system for additional travel modes, such as walking, bicycling, and transit. Another change is that if a Traffic threshold failure is predicted within three years, a “Statement of Concern” could be issued to offer additional tools for addressing the anticipated problem.

Schools - The Schools Threshold Standard is revised to specifically indicate that “accommodation” refers to physical facilities and not programs. It also allows for the analysis of sub-areas to consider differing situations in developed and undeveloped parts of the City.

Less significant changes are proposed for the following Threshold Standards:

Fiscal - Threshold language is added to clarify the intent that the City is developing land uses that are providing an adequate tax base for provision of services currently and over the next five years.

Air Quality - Revised threshold language references compliance with all applicable federal, state and regional air quality regulations.

Sewer - Threshold language is modified to consider budgeted system improvements as well as the current system; to provide five-year forecasts in addition to shorter-term forecasts; and to reference capacity in the Metro sewer system and the status of Chula Vista’s share.

Water - Threshold language is added clarifying the intent of water service availability letters to confirm that adequate water supplies are available to serve new development. Also, five-year forecasts are to be provided in addition to shorter-term forecasts.

Drainage - Current local, state and federal regulations, as they may be amended from time to time, are referenced.

Other changes to implementation measures include the following.

References to moratoriums - The current Growth Management Program contains a provision that if there is a threshold failure for Police, Fire, Traffic, or Parks (if not remedied within three years), “the City Council shall schedule and hold a public hearing for the purpose of adopting a moratorium on the acceptance of new tentative map applications.” Recommended changes are to: 1) make use of a moratorium a consideration (the new language is: “the City Council shall schedule and hold a public hearing for the purpose of considering the adoption of a moratorium”), and 2) tie a moratorium to issuance of building

permits, rather than approval of new tentative subdivision map applications, recognizing that thousands of dwelling units could be in process with approved tentative maps, but with building permits not yet issued.

Use of statements of concern - An additional change regarding implementation measures is that if the GMOC identifies a problem regarding compliance with a threshold, the Commission would have broader latitude to issue a “Statement of Concern” (i.e., for any of the thresholds), and may make specific recommendations to the City Council regarding what actions the City may take to assist in resolving the problem.

Growth rate monitoring and limitation - One of the most important changes resulting from the Top-to-Bottom review is establishing the use of additional controls of the rate of development activity. Under provisions added, the City Council may, on the basis of recommendations provided by the GMOC and making specified findings, impose an annual limit or other rate control on building permits.

Process change – Currently, it is stipulated that the GMOC Annual Report be forwarded to the City Council “via the Planning Commission”. In practice, the Annual Report is presented to the Planning Commission and City Council in a joint session with the GMOC. Since a Planning Commission representative is one of the designated GMOC members, and the GMOC is an advisory body to the City Council, this change provides for the Planning Commission to receive the report at the same time it is sent to the Council. Thus, the Planning Commission retains an important role in the process, but a separate Planning Commission action is not required as a prerequisite for final Council action.

Further refinements - Some further revisions have been crafted as the draft documents were re-circulated for internal review given the time that elapsed since their prior consideration. The additional refinements include:

- Adding language to the Introduction (page 1) in the Guidelines Report to provide further recognition of the relationship and interplay between growth and overall “quality of life” considerations that may transcend the impacts attributable to growth.
- Providing clarification in the Ordinance regarding the role and contents of the Growth Management Guidelines Report.
- Adding brief descriptions of Water Conservation Plans (WCP’s) and Air Quality Improvement Plans (AQIP’s).
- Clarifying the role and standing of Facility Master Plans and related plans, such as strategic plans, in the Components Chapter (Chapter IV) of the Guidelines Report.
- Creating a consolidated “Financing Program” section in the Guidelines Report in lieu of the “Related Financing Program” subsections under several threshold topics in prior drafts.

- Further refining the Traffic Threshold urban street level of service standard.
- Further refining the Parks and Recreation Threshold Standard and implementation measure language.
- Clarifying the focus on the impacts of new development with respect to the Drainage Threshold.
- Emphasizing the City's overall financial health in the Fiscal Threshold.
- Other editorial changes to ensure internal consistency between the Ordinance and the Guidelines Report.

In moving to complete the process, staff briefed and re-oriented the current GMOC membership to the remaining three draft documents/components; walked the GMOC through the purpose, intent and content of the draft documents/components; and sought their final input as part of this year's GMOC process. Drafts, which embody the content and changes endorsed by the GMOC prior to October 2006, have been prepared, but have not undergone final review; therefore, they are not ready to be forwarded to the Planning Commission and City Council for action.

3.12.2 Public Comments

Throughout the course of the annual review process, public comments were received. Any formal comments received and associated responses are included in the Appendices. They include:

1. "Parks" Threshold Standard in GMOC Ordinance, by Peter Watry
2. Suggested Changes to the GMOC Ordinance, by Peter Watry (February 2008)
3. Top-to-Bottom Review of Threshold Standards, by Peter Watry (April 3, 2008)

3.12.3 Parks and Recreation

The existing threshold standard calls for three acres of neighborhood and community park land with appropriate facilities per 1,000 residents east of Interstate 805. The revised threshold standard references a citywide standard of three acres of public park land per 1,000 residents for new development. In addition to the existing "appropriate facilities" language, text is added to include "adequately staffed with appropriate hours of operation." Additionally, the Guidelines call for assurance that parks developed with funding from new residential growth west of Interstate 805 be developed within that area.

4.0 POTENTIAL GROWTH MANAGEMENT PROGRAM CHANGES

4.1 GMOC Retreat and Informal Discussion Session

The GMOC convened on Saturday, October 20, 2007 in the Ken Lee Building Conference Room for a retreat and informal discussion regarding existing and future thresholds that may be entertained during the next GMOC cycle. The discussion included the following topics:

- The role of the commission, as overseeing the management of growth or quality of life issues
- The need to ask the right questions of staff
- The necessity of re-crafting the questionnaires
- The necessity of revising the process (concentration on product rather than on process)
- Thresholds review with the consultant, Walter Kieser of EPS, was submitted to staff in November 2006 and needs to be finalized as part of the Top-to-Bottom review directive from Council.

The commissioners discussed the 11 quality of life indicators. Following summarizes their discussions:

4.1.1 Fiscal

- The Fiscal threshold standard could possibly have two fundamental changes: DIF system should be growth paying its way, not putting a strain on the City, per the existing 20 years' review; and overall fiscal health.
- The commissioners discussed DIF and cross-use by departments

4.1.2 Air Quality

- Air quality is a regional issue, difficult to monitor
- Steps should be taken with new development to reduce emissions
- APCD reports and other reports for latest data should be given to GMOC; RAZ Strategy is on a 5-year cycle; conservation is a long-term rather than knee-jerk reaction

4.1.3 Sewer

- Sewer relies on engineering standards; plumbing is sufficient
- Flow collection and treatment is monitored by the City with metering

4.1.4 Water

- Water-flow proposed decrease ruling

4.1.5 Libraries

- There is no moratorium on Libraries. The City still has options to achieve compliance. If there are inadequate funds for a new facility, then the existing facilities should be improved, although given a lesser degree of priority.
- According to the Library Master Plan, the sq/k included Rancho del Rey, the EUC in Otay Ranch and the overlap of 10k square feet in Eastlake High School.

4.1.6 Drainage

- There are drainage problems at Telegraph Canyon Road/Olympic Parkway due to inadequate maintenance.

4.1.7 Parks & Recreation

The disparity of park acreage on the west side of Chula Vista versus the east side. The 3 acre/1k baseline was established in the 1980s for the east side; the GMOC should focus on Parks & Recreation ancillary facilities and/or joint usage where land is not readily available. This should be factored into a revised threshold for the City. It was noted that the San Diego Golf Course should be counted towards the park acreage of western Chula Vista; all recreation/parks opportunities should be accounted for. But it was clarified that that golf courses and OVRP are not part of Chula Vista's threshold standard, which only evaluates City-owned parks. Some pocket areas exist in western Chula Vista that can be converted to parks, so attaining the standard or getting close to it is possible. It was also noted that recreation areas for adults was an important consideration.

4.1.8 Police

The numbers in the threshold standard are from the 1980's. The threshold standard should be revised with a new base of standards that are more current. The volume of calls for service has increased as the City has grown.

4.1.9 Fire

The threshold standard includes dispatch, turnout and travel in its statistics. The volume of calls for service has increased as the City has grown.

4.1.10 Traffic

Traffic expectations were different for different streets, using the same measure, With Top-to-Bottom, the threshold standard should be modified regarding the west side of the City. Gridlock at the trolley and at various intersections needs to be addressed. Mitigate with SANDAG. Flow of cars and pedestrians should be considered. The City is synchronized to CalTrans intersections around freeways.

- Traffic issues compounded at times of schools drop-off and pick-up, should have school districts educate students and parents on the negative impact.

4.1.11 Schools

- Ad Hoc Schools Task Force should be involved to address safety patrols and traffic/safety etiquette
- The threshold standard addresses their ability to serve/accommodate

After discussions, it was agreed that:

- the GMOC will not impose on policy decisions at department or agency level;
- the GMOC should get educated and understand the dynamics of departments and agencies;
- the GMOC's typical process should be to hone in on specific problem issues, not revisiting issues that have already been resolved in previous cycles;
- the GMOC's report should get to the Council on time to affect decisions on funding, budget time;
- the GMOC should recommend to the Council that they share/forward the GMOC's determination to the specific oversight groups
- the structure of the meetings should be more streamlined, with the last 10 minutes dedicated to new business
- the previous year's cycle started late, this year the commission should aim at having the draft of the report out by the end of April in order to get public feedback.
- should the Annual Report should be serial
- the commission would decide which issues of the questionnaires should be raised for discussion
- the format for the meetings should have the first half of the meeting addressing and discussing the items from the questionnaire, and the last half of the meeting should include drafting related input for the annual report
- the November meeting should be focused on the group tailoring the questionnaires to be sent out, with possibly two meetings in December (to discuss the Forecast), and January to March. The draft calendar would be distributed at the first meeting.

4.2 2007 Planning Commission/City Council Referrals

The following is a comment or "referral" from the joint City Council/GMOC/Planning Commission meeting held on August 2, 2007. The referral was reviewed by the GMOC and included in the 2008 Annual Report.

Fiscal:

In the future, a report should be provided to City Council when a priority project was established that would required funding to be shifted from another project so the Council would better understand the implications of the expenditures they approve and the ability to provide the facilities that the neighborhoods expect and deserve. Review with the Department of Finance and Office of Budget Analysis to ensure that 8% of reserve capacity during future reviews is set aside for the fiscal health of the City.

5.0 Appendices

5.1 Appendix A – Public Comments

5.2 Appendix B – Growth Forecast

5.2 Appendix C – Threshold Compliance Questionnaires