

### 3.1.6 Public Services

This section of the environmental impact report (EIR) describes existing and proposed public services, and evaluates changes to the physical environment that may result from the expansion of such services as a result of Otay Ranch Village 14 and Planning Areas 16/19 (Proposed Project). Information provided in this section was incorporated from the following sources and other sources as cited within this EIR:

- Otay Ranch Final Program EIR (Otay Ranch PEIR) (City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego 1993a)
- County General Plan (County of San Diego 2011a)
- San Diego County General Plan EIR (County of San Diego 2011b)
- Otay Ranch Village 14 and Planning Areas 16/19 Public Facilities Finance Plan, prepared by Development Planning and Financing Group (Appendix 3.1.6-1 of this EIR)
- Law Enforcement Services Form (Appendix 3.1.6-2 of this EIR)
- Service Availability Letters (Appendix 3.1.6-3 of this EIR)
- Otay Ranch Village 14 and Planning Areas 16/19 Fire Protection Plan, prepared by Dudek (Appendix 3.1.1-2 of this EIR)
- Otay Ranch Village 14 and Planning Areas 16/19 Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan, prepared by Dudek (Appendix 3.1.1-3 of the EIR)

Impacts associated with recreation services, such as parks, are evaluated in Section 3.1.7, Recreation, of this EIR. Impacts associated with telecommunications infrastructure and the capacity of the domestic water system to provide adequate fire protection are evaluated in Section 3.1.8, Utilities and Service Systems. Impacts related to emergency response and access are analyzed in Section 3.1.1, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Section 2.9, Transportation and Traffic.

This section tiers from the 1993 Otay Ranch PEIR because the Proposed Project is within the boundaries of the Otay Ranch General Development Plan/Otay Subregional Plan (GDP/SRP) area (City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego 1993b), and development of the Project Area was analyzed in the Otay Ranch PEIR. The Otay Ranch PEIR determined that all impacts could be reduced to below a level of significance with mitigation measures, including preparation of master plans, service availability letters, public facilities financing plans, and construction of or contributions to the construction of facilities. (City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego 1993a). Since certification of the Program EIR, the development concept for the Proposed Project has been further refined and more precise and site-specific technical analyses were

performed to determine the potential impacts of the Proposed Project. Accordingly, this analysis for the Proposed Project is different than that contained within the Otay Ranch PEIR because it specifically considers the Project Area, which is a subset of Otay Ranch. As a result, this EIR's determinations regarding potential public service impacts is specific to the Proposed Project.

Following the issuance of the Notice of Preparation for the Proposed Project, the lead agency, the County of San Diego (County), received comment letters from public entities regarding public services. Comments included a recommendation to analyze impacts to school and general public services. The analysis presented in this section addresses these topics.

The Proctor Valley Road North, Perimeter Trail, and Preserve Trail Options, as described in Chapter 1, Project Description, have been analyzed as applicable throughout this Draft EIR. If these options are selected by the Board of Supervisors, there would be no impacts related to public services.

### **3.1.6.1 Existing Conditions**

#### **3.1.6.1.1 Environmental Setting**

##### Fire Protection

Fire protection services for the Project Area are shared by San Diego County Fire Authority (SDCFA) and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). Within the unincorporated region's emergency services system, fire and emergency medical services are provided by fire protection districts, County Service Areas (CSAs), and CAL FIRE. Collectively, more than 2,800 firefighters are responsible for protecting the San Diego region from fire. Generally, each agency is responsible for structural fire protection and wildland fire protection within its area of responsibility (CAL FIRE 2016). In addition, mutual and automatic aid agreements enable non-lead fire agencies to respond to fire emergencies outside of their district boundaries (County of San Diego 2011b).

SDCFA was formed to improve fire protection in the County's rural areas. On June 25, 2008, the County of San Diego Board of Supervisors approved a program to merge the rural fire companies and facilitate management for fire protection of the County's rural backcountry. Under this program, the County brought six volunteer fire companies under the SDCFA, and exercised the County's latent powers to provide fire and emergency medical services within the latent powers subarea of CSA 135. This reorganization encompassed approximately 942,000 acres, which represented roughly 60% of the target area. The next step added CSAs 109 (Mt. Laguna), 110 (Palomar Mountain), 111 (Boulevard), 112 (Campo), and 113 (San Pasqual) to CSA 135, resulting in service to approximately 1 million acres, or roughly 70% of the target area. The third step expanded the latent powers of CSA 135, concurrent with the dissolution of

the San Diego Rural and Pine Valley Fire Protection Districts. The combined result is that the SDCFA currently provides fire and emergency services to more than 1.5 million acres in San Diego County. The SDCFA is a combination fire agency that uses both career and reserve firefighters (County of San Diego 2011b). The Project Area is located within the SDCFA jurisdictional area. The SDCFA has indicated that it can and will provide fire protection services and emergency medical services to the Project Area, including the area formerly serviced by San Diego Rural Fire Protection District (Appendix 3.1.6-3).

The Proposed Project is within a portion of the SDCFA's jurisdictional area that is adjacent to the Chula Vista Fire Department response area. Although the Chula Vista Fire Department is nearby, and could provide fire services through an agreement between the City of Chula Vista and the County, the closest Chula Vista Fire Department station (Station No. 8) cannot respond to any of the Project Area within a 5-minute travel time (City of Chula Vista 2016), which is inconsistent with County policy. Under current circumstances, fire apparatus and an ambulance are stationed in Jamul at SDCFA Station 36, a 4- to 10-minute travel time to the Project Area. Additionally, Chula Vista Fire Station No. 8 is approximately 2.9 miles southwest of the Project Area's southerly extent. Station 8 is just over a 5-minute travel time to the southern portion of the Project Area, and up to 14 minutes to the northern portion of the Project Area (City of Chula Vista 2016).

### Law Enforcement

The San Diego County Sheriff's Department currently provides law enforcement services to the County's unincorporated areas. Services include general patrol, traffic enforcement, criminal investigation, crime prevention, juvenile services, communications dispatch, and various management support services (SDCSD 2016). As San Diego County's Chief Law Enforcement Officer, the Sheriff's Department also provides regional law enforcement services for the entire County. These services include investigation, aerial support, emergency planning and response, law enforcement training, and operation of six County detention facilities (SDCSD 2016).

Imperial Beach Sheriff's Station has been identified as a possible source for law enforcement services. This station also serves the City of Imperial Beach, the community of Bonita, and portions of East Otay Mesa. Per the County General Plan Public Facility Element, the response time threshold for urban unincorporated areas is 8 minutes for priority calls (life threatening situations or felonies in progress) and 15 minutes for non-priority calls (County of San Diego 2011a). However, the Proposed Project is held to the stricter Otay Ranch GDP/SRP thresholds stated above.

The Imperial Beach Sheriff's Station presently has 45 sworn, 10 non-sworn, seven clerical/front counter, and two Community Service Officers employees (63 total). There are 20 patrol units

each day, including general patrol, traffic enforcement, and Community Service Officers (Appendix 3.1.6-2).

### Schools

The Project Area is located within the boundaries of two elementary school districts and two high school districts. The majority of Village 14 is located within the boundaries of the Chula Vista Elementary School District (CVESD) and the Sweetwater Union High School District (SUHSD). A small (approximately 203 units) geographic area in the most northerly portion of Village 14 is within the Jamul/Dulzura Union School District (JDUSD) and Grossmont Union High School District (GUHSD) boundaries. Planning Areas 16/19 are located within the JDUSD and GUHSD boundaries.

### Elementary School Demand

#### *Jamul/Dulzura Union School District*

JDUSD administers education for kindergarten through eighth grade. JDUSD encompasses 163 square miles in eastern San Diego County (Jamul/Dulzura Union School District 2018). JDUSD serves approximately 800 students in three schools operated by JDUSD. In addition, 375 students are served by the Greater San Diego Academy Home School program (Jamul/Dulzura Union School District 2018). See Table 3.1.6-1, Jamul/Dulzura Union School District – Elementary School Capacity, for capacity and 2016/2017 estimated enrollment.

#### *Chula Vista Elementary School District*

CVESD currently serves students in 47 elementary schools (including charter schools). CVESD covers 103 square miles, including areas of Chula Vista, Bonita, Sunnyside, and South San Diego (CVESD 2016). Table 3.1.6-2, Chula Vista Elementary School District – Elementary School Capacity, lists existing elementary schools, and the capacity and enrollment of each school. Capacity of existing facilities is approximately 30,246 students, and current enrollment is approximately 28,924 students. Of the 47 elementary schools, 10 are over capacity and three are near capacity (see Table 3.1.6-2).

A CVESD K–6 school opened in Otay Ranch Village 12 in July 2017 (Saburo Muraoka Elementary School). With the addition of this new school (~~Enrique S. Camarena Elementary School~~), CVESD anticipates adequate capacity to house all projected students until additional schools are built. However, additional facilities may be necessary within the next 5 years (Appendix 3.1.6-1, Public Facilities Finance Plan). ~~The first elementary school in Otay Ranch Village 2 recently commenced construction.~~ Additional elementary schools planned within Otay Ranch include a second school in Village 2, and schools in Village 3 North, Village 8 West,

Village 8 East, Village 9, Village 10, and the Eastern Urban Center (Appendix 3.1.6-1, Public Facilities Finance Plan).

### Middle School and High School Demand

#### *Sweetwater Union High School District*

SUHSD serves approximately 40,249 students in 11 middle schools (grades 7–8) and 14 high schools (grades 9–12) and more than 32,000 adult learners at 32 campuses. SUHSD’s campuses are located in the Cities of Chula Vista, Imperial Beach, National City, and San Diego, including the communities of Bonita, Eastlake, Otay Mesa, San Ysidro, and South San Diego. Table 3.1.6-3 lists existing middle schools and the capacity and enrollment of each, and Table 3.1.6-4 lists existing high schools and the capacity and enrollment of each. There is currently capacity within SUHSD middle and high schools (Appendix 3.1.6-1).

Secondary schools in SUHSD serving Otay Ranch include Eastlake High School, Otay Ranch High School, Olympian High School, Rancho del Rey Middle School, and Eastlake Middle School. Enrollment and capacity in these schools are shown in Table 3.1.6-3 and Table 3.1.6-4. Additional middle school capacity is available throughout SUHSD. SUHSD owns a middle school site within Otay Ranch Village 11 and plans to construct a new middle school (grades 7–8). However, there is no construction schedule available. SUHSD is coordinating with Otay Ranch property owners to identify an additional high school site in the southeastern portion of the Otay Valley Parcel.

#### *Jamul/Dulzura Union School District*

Oak Grove Middle School in the Jamul/Dulzura Union School District provides school services for students in grades 6 through 8. JDUSD has indicated that Oak Grove Middle School currently has capacity for 82 additional students (see Table 3.1.6-5, Jamul/Dulzura Union School District – Middle School Capacity).

#### *Grossmont Union High School District*

GUHSD serves approximately 21,257 students in 18 public and charter high schools (grades 9–12) (Grossmont Union High School District 2018). There is currently one high school planned for development within GUHSD located in the County unincorporated area of Alpine. ~~Steele Canyon~~ Valhalla High School is the nearest high school to the Project Area. ~~Steele Canyon~~ Valhalla High School has a planned capacity of 2,65600 students and has a current enrollment of 2,12563 students (see Table 3.1.6-6, Grossmont Union High School District – High School Capacity).

### Civic Facilities

No civic administrative facilities are located in the Project Area. The areas surrounding the Project Area are currently served by the County, the City of Chula Vista, and the City of San Diego.

The Project Area is located within the jurisdiction of the County. The County's central civic administrative offices are located in the County Administrative Center at 1600 Pacific Highway in downtown San Diego. The main County Operations Center, including the Department of Planning & Development Services, is located at 5510 Overland Avenue, San Diego, CA 92123. The County Courthouse and Hall of Justice are located on West Broadway in the City of San Diego. The division headquarters for the County's field operations is located in the Spring Valley area. That facility is supplemented by two small, adjacent operation centers and three additional stations located in Alpine, Campo, and Descanso (Appendix 3.1.6-1). County facilities in the vicinity of the Project Area are shown in Table 3.1.6-7, County of San Diego Civic Facilities Inventory.

### Libraries

The County has five library facilities serving the South County area. The facilities are located in Bonita, Imperial Beach, Lincoln Acres, Rancho San Diego, and Spring Valley. Bookmobile service provides circulation and distribution in rural areas (Appendix 3.1.6-1). The locations of the five County branch libraries are identified in Table 3.1.6-8, Locations of San Diego County Library Facilities Serving South County. At the end of 2014, the San Diego County Library also unveiled the 24/7 Library to Go located within the City of San Diego. This new facility is accessible 24 hours per day, 7 days per week to residents to access books and a variety of digital media.

#### **3.1.6.1.2 Regulatory Setting**

Set forth below are short descriptions of the various federal, state, and local regulations that generally apply to the resource or impact category analyzed in this section of the EIR. This information helps to place the impact analysis within its proper regulatory context. Note, however, that compliance with all applicable regulations is required. For this reason, the EIR does not specifically assess the Proposed Project's ability to comply with such regulations, except in those instances where a regulatory standard is being used as the threshold for determining impact significance.

### Federal Regulations

No federal policies concerning public services are applicable to the Proposed Project.

## State Regulations

### *California Health and Safety Code Section 13000 et seq.*

Section 13000 et seq. of the California Health and Safety Code addresses fire protection, including regulations concerning building standards (as set forth in the California Building Code, discussed below), fire protection and notification systems, fire protection devices (such as extinguishers and smoke alarms), high-rise building standards, childcare facility standards, and fire suppression training. As provided for by Section 13104 of the Health and Safety Code, the state Fire Marshal assists in the enforcement of all laws and regulations relating to fires and fire prevention and protection.

### *California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 2 and Part 9*

Part 2 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations refers to the California Building Code, which contains regulations and general construction building standards of state adopting agencies, including administrative, fire, carbon monoxide detectors, and life safety and field inspection provisions. Part 2 was updated in 2008 to reflect changes made to the base document from the Uniform Building Code to the International Building Code. Part 9 refers to the California Fire Code, which contains fire-safety-related building standards referenced in other parts of Title 24. The California Fire Code and Office of the State Fire Marshal provide regulations and guidance for local agencies in the development and enforcement of fire safety standards. The California Fire Code also establishes minimum requirements to provide a reasonable degree of safety from fire, panic, and explosion. This code is preassembled with the 2000 Uniform Fire Code of the Western Fire Chiefs Association. This code was revised in January 2008 to reflect changes in the base model/consensus code from the Uniform Fire Code series to the International Fire Code.

### *State Responsibility Area Fire Safe Regulations*

The Department of Forestry Fire Protection regulations constitute the basic wildland fire protection standards of the California Board of Forestry. They were prepared and adopted for establishing minimum wildfire protection standards in conjunction with building, construction, and development in State Responsibility Areas. Title 14, Natural Resources, regulates that the future design and construction of structures, subdivisions, and developments in a State Responsibility Area provide basic emergency access and perimeter wildfire protection measures.

### *Senate Bill 50, School Financing and Mitigation Requirements*

School financing and developer mitigation obligations are governed by Senate Bill (SB) 50, which was passed in 1998 and has been amended several times since then. SB 50 was enacted

to provide comprehensive school facility finance and mitigation reform to assist in providing school facilities to serve students from new development projects. SB 50 allows school districts to collect school facilities fees from developers of new residential and commercial/industrial building space.

SB 50 substantially revamped prior statutory and regulatory methods of providing state monies for school construction by eliminating the method used by the State Allocation Board (SAB) under the old system, originally enacted as part of the Leroy F. Greene State School Building Lease/Purchase Law of 1976 and replacing it with the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998. SB 50, among other things, established a new state program by which the SAB provides per-pupil grant funding for new school facilities construction and reconstruction, and modernization of existing facilities. An important objective of SB 50 was to provide, on a one-time basis, a baseline analysis of unhoused students and existing capacity in a local school district's school facilities for determining eligibility for new state school construction funding. In addition to providing 50% of the state funding and construction costs, which include construction cost containment mechanisms through limitations on the state per-pupil grant amounts (which grant amounts are adjusted annually by the SAB to reflect construction cost changes), the state also provides funding for 50% of the site acquisition and site development costs for a school site.

SB 50 specifically provides that it is the exclusive method for financing school facilities, and provides the methods for mitigating environmental effects related to the adequacy of school facilities. Nevertheless, school districts and developers may enter into separate mitigation agreements to provide enhanced mitigation measures beyond the requirements of SB 50. As further discussed below, the Proposed Project applicant entered into mitigation agreements with each of the two impacted school districts.

SB 50 establishes three tiers of developer fees that can be imposed on new development that is deemed to be "full and complete facilities mitigation." First is the basic state statutory fee, often referred to as a "Level 1" Fee, authorized by California Government Code Section 65995 and originally enacted as part of the 1986 School Facilities Act. At the time it was passed, SB 50 allowed school districts to impose a fee of \$1.93 per square foot of assessable space of new development. Currently, as authorized by SB 50, the Level 1 Fee is \$3.48 per square foot of assessable space as last adjusted by the SAB in January 2016. Additionally, SB 50 authorized a fee in the original amount of \$0.31 per square foot of chargeable covered or enclosed commercial/industrial space. That amount is currently \$0.56 per square foot, as adjusted by SAB in January 2016.

In addition to the Level 1 Fee, a school district may adopt an alternative, or "Level 2," Fee pursuant to California Government Code Section 65995.5. A school district is authorized to impose a Level 2 Fee if it has applied to the SAB for state funding and has conducted and



adopted a School Facilities Needs Analysis and satisfies two of four requirements contained in California Government Code Section 65995.5(b)(3).<sup>1</sup> A school district must prepare a School Facilities Needs Analysis in accordance with Government Code Section 65995.6 to justify the amount of the Level 2 Fee. As provided by SB 50, the Level 2 Fee is designed to provide approximately 50% of the cost of constructing new schools and to supply the district with its 50% match requirement of funding equivalent to that which the state is providing. (In calculating the amount of the Level 2 Fee, monies derived from surplus sites, local bond issues, and commercial/industrial developer fees may be considered and subtracted from the calculated amount of the Level 2 Fee, pursuant to the statute.)

If, in the future, the SAB is no longer apportioning state school construction funds because such funds are unavailable and no addition state bonds have been approved, a local school district may, pursuant to Government Code Section 65995.7, adopt a supplemental or Level 3 Fee, which is basically 100% of the cost of constructing new school facilities by adding to the Level 3 Fee the amount of funds that would otherwise have been provided by the state.

#### *Assembly Bill 2926*

Historically, the state has been responsible for funding public schools. To assist in providing school facilities to serve students generated by new development projects, the state passed Assembly Bill 2926 in 1986. This bill allowed school districts to collect impact fees from developers of new residential and commercial/industrial building space. Development impact fees were also referenced in the 1987 Leroy Greene Lease/Purchase Act, which required school districts to contribute a matching share of costs for construction, modernization, and reconstruction projects.

#### *California Department of Education*

The California Department of Education administers California's public education system at the state level, and the state Board of Education, by statute, is the governing and policy-determining body of the California Department of Education. The board adopts rules and regulations for the governance of the state's public schools. It also adopts curriculum frameworks in core subject-matter areas, approves academic standards for content and student performance in the core

---

<sup>1</sup> The four requirements in California Government Code Section 65995.5(b)(3) are (1) a "substantial enrollment" of elementary school pupils in a multi-track year round enrollment schedule, as further specified in that section; (2) the school district has placed on the ballot during the prior 4 years a general obligation bond issue to finance school facilities and the measure received at least 50% plus one of the votes; (3) the district has issued debt or incurred obligations for capital outlay in an amount equal to 15% of its local bonding capacity if landowner-initiated Mello Roos Community Facilities Districts (CFDs) approved after November 4, 1998, are excluded, and 30% of the local bonding capacity if land owner initiated Mello Roos CFDs approved both before and after November 4, 1998, are included; and (4) at least 20% of teaching stations are relocatable classrooms.

curriculum areas, and adopts tests for the Standardized Testing and Reporting program and the California High School Exit Examination.

### *Assembly Bill 16*

In 2002, Assembly Bill 16 created the Critically Overcrowded School Facilities program, which supplements the new construction provisions within the School Facilities Program. The School Facilities Program provides state funding assistance for two major types of facility construction projects: new construction and modernization. The Critically Overcrowded School Facilities program allows school districts with critically overcrowded school facilities, as determined by the California Department of Education, to apply for new construction projects in advance of meeting all School Facilities Program new construction program requirements. Districts with School Facilities Program new construction eligibility and school sites included on a California Department of Education list of source schools may apply.

### Local

#### *San Diego County General Plan*

The San Diego County General Plan addresses community services such as law enforcement, fire protection, schools, and libraries that are important to the safety and livability of communities. They can affect the well-being of communities and should be accounted for when planning future growth. The following Land Use Element (LU) and Safety Element (S) policies and goals contained in the San Diego County General Plan are relevant to the Proposed Project (County of San Diego 2011a):

**GOAL LU-12: Infrastructure and Services Supporting Development.** Adequate and sustainable infrastructure, public facilities, and essential services that meet community needs and are provided concurrent with growth and development.

- **Policy LU-12.1: Concurrence of Infrastructure and Services with Development.** Require the provision of infrastructure, facilities, and services needed by new development prior to that development, either directly or through fees. Where appropriate, the construction of infrastructure and facilities may be phased to coincide with project phasing.
- **Policy LU-12.2: Maintenance of Adequate Services.** Require development to mitigate significant impacts to existing levels of public facilities or services for existing residents and businesses. Provide improvements for Mobility Element roads in accordance with the Mobility Element Network Appendix matrices, which may result in ultimate build-out conditions that achieve an improved LOS [level of service] but do not achieve a LOS of D or better.

- **Policy LU-12.3: Infrastructure and Services Compatibility.** Provide public facilities and services that are sensitive to the environment with characteristics of the unincorporated communities. Encourage the collocation of infrastructure facilities, where appropriate.
- **Policy LU-12.4: Planning for Compatibility.** Plan and site infrastructure for public utilities and public facilities in a manner compatible with community character, minimize visual and environmental impacts, and whenever feasible, locate any facilities and supporting infrastructure outside Preserve areas. Require context sensitive Mobility Element road design that is compatible with community character and minimizes visual and environmental impacts; for Mobility Element roads identified in Table M-4, an LOS D or better may not be achieved.

**GOAL LU-17: Adequate Education.** Quality schools that enhance our communities and mitigate for their impacts.

- **Policy LU-17.2: Compatibility of Schools with Adjoining Uses.** Encourage school districts to minimize conflicts between schools and adjacent land uses through appropriate siting and adequate mitigation, addressing such issues as student drop-off/pick up locations, parking access, and security.
- **Policy LU-17.3: Priority School Locations.** Encourage school districts to locate schools within Village or Rural Village areas wherever possible and site and design them in a manner that provides the maximum opportunity for students to walk or bicycle to school.

**GOAL LU-18: Adequate Civic Uses.** Civic uses that enhance community centers and places.

- **Policy LU-18.1: Compatibility of Civic Uses with Community Character.** Locate and design Civic uses and services to [en]sure compatibility with the character of the community and adjoining uses, which pose limited adverse effects. Such uses may include libraries, meeting centers, and small swap meets, farmers markets, or other community gatherings.
- **Policy LU-18.2: Co-Location of Civic Uses.** Encourage the co-location of civic uses such as County library facilities, community centers, parks, and schools. To encourage access by all segments of the population, civic uses should be accessible by transit whenever possible.

**GOAL S-3: Minimized Fire Hazards.** Minimize injury, loss of life, and damage to property resulting from structural or wildland fire hazards.

- **Policy S-3.4: Service Availability.** Plan for development where fire and emergency services are available or planned.

**GOAL S-5: Regional Fire Protection.** Regional coordination among fire protection agencies.

- **Policy S-5.1: Regional Coordination Support.** Advocate and support regional coordination among fire protection and emergency service providers.
- **Policy S-5.2: Fire Service Provider Agreements.** Encourage agreements between fire service providers to improve fire protection and to maximize service levels in a fair, efficient, and cost effective manner.
- **Policy S-5.3: Reassessment of Fire Hazards.** Coordinate with fire protection and emergency service providers to reassess fire hazards after wildfire events to adjust fire prevention and suppression needs, as necessary, commensurate for both short and long term fire prevention needs.

**GOAL S-6: Adequate Fire and Medical Services.** Adequate levels of fire and emergency medical services (EMS) in the unincorporated County.

- **Policy S-6.1: Water Supply.** Ensure that water supply systems for development are adequate to combat structural and wildland fires.
- **Policy S-6.2: Fire Protection for Multi-Story Development.** Coordinate with fire services providers to improve fire protection services for multi-story construction.
- **Policy S-6.3: Funding Fire Protection Services.** Require development to contribute its fair share toward funding the provision of appropriate fire and emergency medical services as determined necessary to adequately serve the project.
- **Policy S-6.4: Fire Protection Services for Development.** Require that new development demonstrate that fire services can be provided that meets the **minimum** travel times identified in Table S-1 (Travel Time Standards from Closest Fire Station).

**Table S-1  
Travel Time Standards from the Closest Fire Station\***

Travel Time	Regional Category (and/or Land Use Designation)	Rationale for Travel Time Standards**
5 Min	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Village (VR-2 to VR-30) and limited Semi-Rural Residential Areas (SR-0.5 and SR-1)</li> <li>• Commercial and Industrial Designations in the Village Regional Category</li> <li>• Development located within a Village Boundary</li> </ul>	In general, this travel time standard applies to the County's more intensely developed areas, where resident and business expectations for service are the highest.
10 Min	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Semi-Rural Residential Areas (&gt;SR-1 and SR-2 and SR-4)</li> <li>• Commercial and Industrial Designations in the Village Semi-Regional Category</li> <li>• Development located within a Rural Village Boundary</li> </ul>	In general, this travel time provides a moderate level of service in areas where lower-density development, longer access routes and longer distances make it difficult to achieve shorter travel times.

**Table S-1  
Travel Time Standards from the Closest Fire Station\***

Travel Time	Regional Category (and/or Land Use Designation)	Rationale for Travel Time Standards**
20 Min	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited Semi-Rural Residential areas</li> <li>• (&gt;SR-4, SR-10) and Rural Lands (RL-20)</li> <li>• All Commercial and Industrial Designations in the Rural Lands Regional Category</li> </ul>	In general, this travel time is appropriate for very low density residential areas, where full-time fire service is limited and where long access routes make it impossible to achieve shorter travel times.
> 20 Min	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very-low rural land densities (RL-40 and RL-80)</li> </ul>	Application of very-low rural densities mitigates the risk associated with wildfires by drastically reducing the number of people potentially exposed to this hazard. Future subdivisions at these densities are not required to meet a travel time standard. However, independent fire districts should impose additional mitigation requirements on development in these areas.

\* The most restrictive standard will apply when the density, regional category, and/or village/rural village boundary do not yield a consistent response time standard.

\*\* Travel time standards do not guarantee a specific level of service or response time from fire and emergency services. Level of service is determined by the funding and resources available to the responding entity.

- **Policy S-6.5: Concurrency of Fire Protection Services.** Ensure that fire protection staffing, facilities, and equipment required to serve development are operating prior to, or in conjunction with, the development. Allow incremental growth to occur until a new facility can be supported by development.

**GOAL S-12: Adequate Law Enforcement Facilities.** Timely development of law enforcement facilities in locations that serve the unincorporated areas of the County.

- **Policy S-12.1: New Law Enforcement Facilities.** Coordinate new law enforcement facilities and services with new development in ways that sustain the provision of comprehensive services at levels consistent with substantially similar areas of the County.

**GOAL S-13: Safe Communities.** Law enforcement facilities and services that help maintain safe communities.

- **Policy S-13.1: Sheriff Facility Locations.** Locate Sheriff facilities to best serve existing and planned development and the corresponding demand for services.
- **Policy S-13.2: Sheriff Facilities in Non-Residential Areas.** Locate future Sheriff facilities in commercial, industrial, or mixed-use areas; they may also be located within residential areas when other sites are unavailable or unsuitable based on circulation, geography, proximity to demand, and other factors that impact the practical provision of services.

**GOAL S-14: Crime Prevention.** Crime prevention through building and site design.

- **Policy S-14.3: Crime Prevention.** Coordinate with appropriate agencies and the community to reduce crime in all neighborhoods by improving communication and relationships with communities and through educational programs that address important safety issues.

#### *Otay Ranch General Development Plan/Subregional Plan*

Within the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP, the purpose of the Fire Protection and Emergency Medical facility section; the Law Enforcement Facilities section; the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space section; and the School Facilities and the Library Facilities section is to establish goals, objectives, policies, standards, and processing requirements for the timely provision of these facilities.

The policies and objectives pertaining to the Proposed Project are as follows (City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego 1993b):

- **Policy:** Otay Ranch shall site fire and emergency services facilities consistent with the following factors:
  - a. Ability to meet travel/response time policies;
  - b. Proximity to a pool of volunteer firefighters for service within the unincorporated areas, when appropriate;
  - c. Ability of the site to support the appropriate facility to serve current and future development in the intended service area;
  - d. Distances from other fire stations, including those operated by neighboring districts;
  - e. Safe access to roadways in emergency responses;
  - f. Special needs for fire suppression, and emergency services, including needs created by recreation areas and industrial land uses;
  - g. Avoid close proximity to fault traces; and
  - h. Ability to meet any adopted local community facility level standard, if appropriate.
- **Policy: Urban Service.** Provide properly equipped and staffed law enforcement units to respond to 84% of “Priority One” emergency calls within 7 minutes and maintain an average response time of all “Priority One” emergency calls of 4.5 minutes or less.
- **Policy: Urban Service.** Provide properly equipped and staffed law enforcement units to respond to 62% of “Priority Two Urgent” calls within 7 minutes and maintain an average response time to all “Priority Two” calls of 7 minutes or less.

- **Policy: Rural Service.** Provide facilities for properly equipped and staffed law enforcement units to maintain an average response time for “Priority One” calls of 12 minutes, and 24 minutes for low priority calls.
- **Policy:** Provide 15 acres of regional park and open space per 1,000 Otay Ranch residents.
- **Objective:** Provide neighborhood and community parks and recreational facilities to serve the recreational needs of local residents.
- **Policy:** Ensure that schools are integrated into the system of alternative transportation corridors, such as bike lanes, riding and hiking trails, and mass transit where appropriate.
- **Objective:** Provide high quality and contemporary library facilities and services, which meet the needs of the entire Otay Ranch Project Area.

#### *Otay Ranch Facility Implementation Plan*

The Otay Ranch Facility Implementation Plan is part of the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP. The Otay Ranch Facility Implementation Plan identifies goals, policies, objectives, standards, existing conditions, design criteria, and processing requirements for a number of public facilities and services, including civic facilities, fire protection and emergency medical services, law enforcement, libraries, and schools (City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego 1993c).

#### *School Size Standards*

School size standards for CVESD and SUHSD are as shown in Table 3.1.6-9, School Size Standards. These sizes are “core” facilities only, and do not reflect modular temporary structures that are routinely placed on campuses to facilitate temporary expansion of classrooms.

#### *School Siting Criteria*

The Otay Ranch GDP/SRP and Facility Implementation Plan establish the following criteria for siting school facilities (City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego 1993b, 1993c):

1. At least eight (8) usable acres for an elementary school site, twenty-five (25) usable acres for a middle/junior high school, and at least fifty (50) usable acres for a senior high school, to adequately accommodate the loading and unloading of students, future expansion of facilities and offer design flexibility.
2. Centrally located to residential development to reduce bussing requirements, reduce walking distances for young children, encourage after-hours use of facilities by the public and discourage vandalism.

3. Adjacent to a street or road that can safely accommodate bike, foot, and vehicular traffic. Middle school and high school sites should have no less than two sides with street frontage. Urban high schools are best located adjacent to collectors that can handle the increased traffic volume of student drivers and the entrance to the school should be signaled.
4. Topographically and environmentally safe and suitable to reduce site preparation costs and permit maximum use of the site for physical activities.
5. Site should be of sufficient usable acreage on one level and configuration to not limit the design of buildings and provide field and parking space.
6. Surrounded by land uses that produce a minimum of noise and traffic often associated with commercial and heavy industrial areas.
7. Located adjacent to parks to enable joint field and recreation facility uses.
8. Vacant and undeveloped to reduce financial and costs of site acquisition.
9. Located such that utilities and services (e.g., cable television, fire protection, and emergency medical services) are or will be readily available, to reduce site development costs.
10. Near imminent development of adjacent properties to insure road and other necessary off-site improvements are available in a timely manner.
11. School siting should be in a location acceptable to the State Division of Aeronautics with regard to distance from Brown Field.
12. A safe distance, i.e., as required by law, from contaminants or toxins in the soil or groundwater from landfills, fuel tanks, agricultural areas, power lines, utility easements, etc.
13. Outside of floodplains; on stable soils; away from fault lines.
14. Integrated into the system of alternative transportation corridors, i.e., bike lanes, riding and hiking trails, and mass transit, where appropriate.

### *Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Plan*

The Project Area is located within the Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Plan boundary. The Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Plan (a supplement to the County General Plan) establishes goals and policies to guide development within the areas of Jamul, Steel Canyon, Dulzura, Barrett Junction, and the remainder of the area that comprises the Jamul/Dulzura Subregion of southern San Diego County. The goals and policies of the Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Plan are intended to be more specific than those of the County General Plan, as they consider the distinct history, character, and identity of the Jamul/Dulzura communities (County of San Diego 1979). Note, however, that the policies set forth in the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP take precedence over the Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Plan in the event of any conflicts.



The following policies in the Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Plan relate specifically to public services (County of San Diego 1979):

- **Policy M-13:** Include fire safe road standards as criteria for County evaluation of proposed road and subdivisions.

### *Sweetwater Union High School District Long Range Comprehensive Master Plan*

Implementation of the Sweetwater Union High School District Long Range Comprehensive Master Plan has resulted in upgrading older schools and accommodating continuing growth. In November 2000, Proposition BB was approved by voters. SUHSD leveraged \$187 million from Proposition BB into a \$327 million effort to use state funding to modernize and upgrade 22 campuses (SUHSD 2012).

In November 2006, the community supported Proposition O, a \$644 million bond measure. This bond measure addresses the safety needs of the 32 campuses within the SUHSD. The types of repairs and improvements that Proposition O addresses includes improving accessibility for people with disabilities, removing asbestos and lead paint, and upgrading fire and life safety systems. Work associated with Proposition O have commenced and construction has begun (Appendix 3.1.6-1).

In January 2012, with the addition of more than \$147 million in state matching funds bringing renovation funds up to \$334.6 million, the planning department completed 22 separate projects at 19 schools (SUHSD 2012). Proposition BB was completed in 2012 and the last \$15 million in funding was rolled over into Proposition O. The closeout of all Proposition BB projects is also part of the Proposition O work.

### **3.1.6.2 Analysis of Project Effects and Determination as to Significance**

#### Guidelines for the Determination of Significance

The County's Guidelines for Determining Significance do not include a section on public services. Therefore, for the purposes of this EIR, Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines applies to the direct and indirect impact analysis, and the cumulative impact analysis. A significant impact would result if:

- The project results in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:
  - Fire Protection

- Law Enforcement
- Schools
- Other Public Facilities

The analysis of parks is included in Section 3.1.7, Recreation.

### **3.1.6.2.1 Fire Protection**

The CEQA significance threshold is whether the Proposed Project would “result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives.” Construction and operation of the proposed on-site fire station have been assumed as part of the Proposed Project and are analyzed throughout this EIR. Therefore, future construction and operation of the proposed fire station would not have any additional impacts beyond those identified in this EIR; impacts would be **less than significant**.

#### Otay Ranch GDP/SRP Thresholds

The following threshold is contained in the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP (City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego 1993b):

- Provide sufficient fire and emergency service facilities to respond to calls within single-family communities with residential lots of less than 2 acres, or more intensive uses such as multi-family residential, including industrial development and all commercial development, except neighborhood commercial, in a 5-minute travel time.

#### Analysis

Development of the Proposed Project is projected to result in a build-out residential and employee population of approximately 4,122 persons. Using the SDCFA’s estimate of 82 annual calls per 1,000 residents (which is consistent with Chula Vista Fire Department call data of 80 annual calls per 1,000 residents), the Proposed Project’s estimated total 4,028 residents and 94 employees would generate approximately 338 calls per year (about 0.9 calls per day). Seventy percent of calls (236 calls per year, or 0.6 calls per day) are expected to be medical emergency calls. Based on the current per-capita fire call generation rate, the Proposed Project could generate 57 fire-related calls per year (0.16 per day) (Appendix 3.1.6-1).

The San Diego County General Plan includes emergency response travel time standards of 5 minutes, 10 minutes, 20 minutes, and more than 20 minutes depending on the land use and

regional category designation (County of San Diego 2011a). The Project Area includes land uses that are subject to the 5-minute travel time (Village 14) and the 10-minute travel time (Planning Areas 16/19) standards. Table S-1 of the County General Plan Safety Element (see Section 3.1.6.1, Existing Conditions, under “Regulatory Setting” for a reproduction of this table) describes response time standards. Based on Table S-1 of the County General Plan Safety Element, the proposed fire and emergency response configuration is based on achieving a 5-minute travel time standard for Village 14 and a 10-minute travel time standard for the more rural Planning Areas 16/19. Under current circumstances, fire equipment and paramedic ambulance are stationed in Jamul, a 4- to 10-minute travel time to the Project Area.

To ensure that Village 14 could be served within the 5-minute travel time standard and Planning Areas 16/19 within the 10-minute travel time standard, a public safety site has been identified as a joint facility for a fire station/sheriff ~~satellite storefront office~~ that is centrally located within the Village Core. Development of a fire station at the public safety site would provide for acceptable response coverage. The location of the public safety site across from the neighborhood Village Green park, Mixed-Use Village Square, and elementary school would also ensure that the public safety site is located near the highest anticipated potential call-generating land uses. The public safety site, in combination with Fire Station 36 in Jamul, would be able to reach all portions of the Proposed Project within the applicable General Plan travel time standards. The public safety site would be able to serve 96% of the residential lots within the Proposed Project’s 5-minute travel time standard for Village and Limited Semi-Rural Residential lots, including 100% of the Village 14 residential lots and a portion of the Planning Areas 16/19 residential lots (County of San Diego 2011a). Existing Station 36 can respond to the remaining 4% and to all of the Planning Areas 16/19 residential lots within a 4- to 7-minute travel time, well below the 10-minute travel time standard for Semi-Rural Residential lots (County of San Diego 2011a).

The provision of a permanent on-site fire station within the Village Core would be finalized and documented in a Fire Services Agreement between the Proposed Project applicant and the SDCFA. Phasing of the Proposed Project may require construction of a temporary station if the permanent station is not constructed by the commencement of construction of other Proposed Project features. The temporary fire station, if necessary, would be available and located in the Project Area per SDCFA guidance so that fire resources are available during construction and for a specified amount of time. Construction of the permanent fire station would be on the public safety site identified in the Otay Ranch Village 14 and Planning Areas 16/19 Specific Plan and Tentative Map at an agreed upon “trigger threshold” that would be detailed in a Fire Service Agreement between the SDCFA and the applicant.

The Proposed Project would provide its fair share of funding toward staffing and equipping a fire station of a size that would be needed to serve the Proposed Project’s calls. In addition to the

required fees, the County would receive 1.89% of the ad-valorem 1% property tax generated by the Proposed Project to fund staffing and operations. Other sources for funding fire and emergency medical service facilities and ongoing staffing and maintenance costs include the establishment of a County Service Area assessment district and/or formation of a community facilities district. The Fire Service Agreement between the SDCFA and the applicant would include the ~~final~~ fire service funding strategy for the Proposed Project.

The type and size of the permanent on-site fire station would be based on the projected call volume associated with the Proposed Project and the anticipated equipment and staffing. The fire station would include an advanced life support engine company funded by the Proposed Project. The station would be equipped with a Type I or Type II fire engine, or other, at SDCFA's discretion, that is suited to respond to structure fires and vegetation fires. Staffing is expected to include an interim period where two career firefighter positions and one reserve position would be provided until a unit count or similar threshold is reached, at which time staffing would include three career positions and a reserve. Depending on the number of emergency medical calls generated by the Proposed Project, the ambulance provider may elect to move a response unit to the Project Area, but that would be a decision between the SDCFA and the ambulance provider. A Fire Service Agreement would be prepared and approved by the Proposed Project applicant and the SDCFA prior to the Proposed Project's County Board of Supervisors hearing.

As previously discussed, this proposed fire station would be able to provide first-engine response to Village 14 within the San Diego County General Plan's 5-minute travel time standard, and to Planning Areas 16/19 within the 10-minute travel time standard. The closest existing SDCFA station is Fire Station No. 36 in Jamul, which is within a 2.5- to 10-minute travel time to the Proposed Project. Station 36 averages roughly one call per day and would have capacity to assist as a second-responder engine. Station 36 is staffed with seven career firefighters and is equipped with a Type I fire engine, a ladder truck, a rescue squad truck, a light and air unit, and a paramedic ambulance.

The Proposed Project would consist of internal, looped roadways that meet County standards and provide access with a minimum width of 24 feet (two 12-foot-wide, unobstructed travel lanes) and room for parking. Additionally, the roads would provide residents the option to evacuate from two egress points in two different directions from each neighborhood. Depending on the emergency, residents can exit to the north/northeast on Proctor Valley Road or to the south. This would include public access through the community of Whispering Meadows for Planning Area 16 to provide secondary access for each community.

In certain emergencies where it is safer to remain on site, temporary refuge would be possible, particularly within the developed portions of Village 14. These temporary refuges would be included within the ignition-resistant structures that are ~~provided within~~ surrounded by defensible

open space via maintained fuel modification buffers, and the large areas of developed landscape and which provide access for firefighters and early evacuations, water and fire flow to code, and other fire protection features, as described throughout Appendix 3.1.1-2. The internal roadways from the residences to Proctor Valley Road would be designed to provide fuel modification in the form of developed/irrigated landscape. Portions of Proctor Valley Road to the north and south of the Project Area would traverse through areas with natural vegetation and the potential wildfire threat to these areas would need to be considered in terms of evacuation planning. A Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan (WFEP) was prepared for Village 14 and Planning Areas 16/19, focusing on wildland fire evacuations, although many of the concepts and protocols are applicable to other emergency situations (Appendix 3.1.1-3). This plan will be used by the homeowner's association (HOA) to educate community residents about their evacuation responsibilities and the recommended approach during wildfires and other similar emergencies. Late evacuations may not be appropriate if fire spreads toward Proctor Valley Road, and the option to temporarily refuge on site is evaluated in the WFEP (Appendix 3.1.1-3). No roads exceeding the maximum allowable dead-end road length are proposed within the Project Area. Therefore, emergency access and egress is considered adequate for the Proposed Project.

A Fire Protection Plan (FPP) for the Proposed Project was prepared by Dudek (Appendix 3.1.1-2). The FPP provides measures for fire protection that meet the 2017 San Diego County Consolidated Fire Code. It also identifies the fire risk associated with the Proposed Project's land uses, and identifies requirements for fuel modification, building design and construction, and other pertinent development infrastructure criteria for fire protection. The primary focus of the FPP is providing an implementable framework for suitable protection of the planned structures and the people living in and using them. The structures in the Proposed Project would be built using ignition-resistant materials, per the most recent County Fire and Building Codes (Chapter 7A), which include the amended California Fire and Building Codes.

The Proposed Project would include a system of water availability, capacity, and delivery; fire department access; monitored defensible space/fuel modification zones; interior, automatic fire sprinkler systems in all structures; monitored interior sprinklers in applicable structures; and other components to provide properly equipped and maintained structures with a high level of fire-ignition resistance. Implementation of fire protection strategies proposed in the FPP would reduce the potential vegetation fire threat, and would assist the responding fire authorities in controlling and/or extinguishing vegetation fires within the Project Area.

The Chula Vista Fire Department was evaluated for providing fire protection services for the Proposed Project, but it was determined that the County would be the appropriate provider. The two primary reasons for County fire protection services are that the Proposed Project is within SDCFA's jurisdictional response area, an agency that has indicated it can and would serve the Proposed Project, and there are no existing or planned Chula Vista Fire Stations that can meet

the County's 5-minute General Plan travel time standard for any portion of the Project Area (refer to Appendix 3.1.6-1).

In addition to the proposed fire station in the Project Area and the regional SDCFA fire resources, Chula Vista Fire Stations are located in the vicinity of the Project Area. Chula Vista Fire Department Fire Station No. 8 is located approximately 2.9 miles southwest of the Project Area, Fire Station No. 6 is located approximately 3.5 miles west, Fire Station No. 7 is located approximately 7.4 miles southwest, and Fire Station No. 4 is approximately 6.4 miles west/southwest (Appendix 3.1.6-1). Under a mutual aid or automatic aid agreement, the proposed fire station within the Project Area would be positioned to provide response into Chula Vista's eastern edges, and the Chula Vista Fire Department could in return provide resources for certain fire and emergency medical emergencies within the Project Area, such as rounding out the effective firefighting force.

As discussed previously, a WFEP was prepared for the Proposed Project. The WFEP used existing information from the San Diego County Office of Emergency Services and a standard template (see <http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/oes/>). The WFEP forms the backbone of hazard relocation/evacuation planning for the Proposed Project. Wildfire emergencies are one component of the WFEP. Among the important components included in the WFEP are hazard identification, a description of the area's environment, mitigation strategies, fire agency contact information, homeowner education materials, a preparedness checklist, route planning, and specific procedures for early relocation. The WFEP provides site-specific procedures for various emergency situations, including wildfire, and would be made available to Proposed Project residents and commercial tenants. The WFEP would be reviewed by residents at least annually through organized meetings and educational outreach by the HOA, Community Services District, or other means. Accordingly, the Proposed Project would comply with the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP threshold and County Safety Element travel time standard for emergency response.

Although implementation of the Proposed Project would increase the demand for fire and emergency services resulting from the conversion of vacant land to urban uses, the Proposed Project would provide for a new fire station that would respond to the Project Area while supporting the SDCFA regional strategies for the placement of fire facilities and services to East County residents. The proposed on-site fire station would allow the Proposed Project to meet the required travel time standards established by the County. The Proposed Project would adhere to all recommendations provided within the FPP and WFEP for the Proposed Project, and impacts related to fire protection and emergency services would be **less than significant**.

### 3.1.6.2.2 Law Enforcement

#### Otay Ranch GDP/SRP Thresholds

The following thresholds are contained in the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP (City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego 1993b):

- Properly equipped and staffed law enforcement units respond to 84 percent of “Priority One” emergency calls within 7 minutes and maintain an average response time to all “Priority One” emergency calls of 4.5 minutes or less.
- Properly equipped and staffed law enforcement units shall respond to 62 percent of “Priority Two Urgent” calls within 7 minutes and maintain an average response time to all “Priority Two” calls of 7 minutes or less measured annually.

#### Analysis

The Proposed Project would result in an increased demand for law enforcement services and potentially affect response time thresholds. The San Diego County Sheriff Department has been contacted by County Planning & Development Services to help determine whether adequate law enforcement services are or will be available to the Proposed Project concurrent with need, and whether new or expanded law enforcement facilities would be needed as a result of the Proposed Project. The results of this communication are included in Appendix 3.1.6-2, Law Enforcement Services Form, which indicates that the Proposed Project would result in the need for additional staff and new or expanded facilities.

The Proposed Project would include a 2.3-acre public safety site (shared site with a fire station) within the Village Core that could accommodate a Sheriff’s storefront facility. As an alternative, the 500-square-foot storefront facility may be accommodated in the commercial space within the mixed-use area of the Project Area. There are approximately 21 substations currently in use by the Sheriff’s Department located across San Diego County (SDCSD 2018). These substations provide deputies responding to calls or patrolling in the area adequate office space to access a computer, write a report, process detainees, and provide a public counter. The alternative storefront included the Proposed Project would provide a similar 500-square-foot office space to accommodate Sheriff’s Department needs.

As discussed previously, a WFEP has been prepared for the Proposed Project that uses existing information from the San Diego County’s Office of Emergency Services and a standard template to provide site-specific procedures for various emergency situations; this would be made available to residents and commercial tenants. Among other important components included in the WFEP are law enforcement contact information, homeowner education materials, and a

preparedness checklist. In combination with construction of the Sheriff's station, the Project Area would be adequately served.

Additionally, the Law Enforcement Services Form (Appendix 3.1.6-2) recommends that the following design criteria and/or comments relative to other law enforcement concerns specific to the Proposed Project be incorporated as part of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design:

- Provide adequate light for nighttime use of paths to and from entrances and exits of buildings and throughout the project or neighborhood.
- Make entrances clearly visible to patrols and the public.

In addition, the Sheriff's Crime Prevention Unit is available for design and development consultation for the Proposed Project.

The Proposed Project would result in the need for 0.5 additional sworn personnel. As stated in the Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP) (Appendix 3.1.6-1), the payment of general taxes contributes to the County General Fund, through which law enforcement facility improvements are constructed pursuant to the County's Capital Improvement Program. Therefore, tax revenues collected from the Proposed Project would ensure provision of the future required facilities.

The PFFP includes a fiscal impact analysis to determine the revenues and costs expected to be generated by the Proposed Project. Net revenues are used to finance costs associated with operations and maintenance of the public services required to serve the Proposed Project (Appendix 3.1.6-1).

Based on the analysis contained in the PFFP (Appendix 3.1.6-1), the Law Enforcement Services Form (Appendix 3.1.6-2), the inclusion of a 2.3-acre public safety site reserved in the Project Area, and payment of general taxes, it is projected that law enforcement would be able to adequately meet average Priority One and Priority Two Urgent response times as required by the County and the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP. The 2.3-acre public safety site has been included in the environmental analysis as a part of the Proposed Project throughout Chapter 2, Significant Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project, and Chapter 3, Environmental Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of this EIR. The Proposed Project would not result in any other physical expansions of existing facilities, or new facilities that could potentially result in environmental impacts. Any additional needs, as previously discussed, relate to staffing services and would be covered through the payment of taxes, as appropriate. Therefore, impacts related to law enforcement would be **less than significant**.



### 3.1.6.2.3 Schools

#### Otay Ranch GDP/SRP Threshold

The following threshold is contained in the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP (City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego 1993b):

- Additional facilities to serve children generated by new development shall be provided concurrent with need, and shall be of the quality and quantity sufficient to meet, at a minimum, State Department of Education standards.

The purpose of the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP threshold is to ensure that school districts have the necessary school sites and funds to meet the needs of students in newly developing areas in a timely manner, and to prevent the negative impacts of overcrowding on existing schools. Through the provision of development forecasts, school district personnel can plan and implement school facility construction and program allocation in line with development.

#### Analysis

##### Elementary Schools

As discussed in Section 3.1.6.1, the Project Area is served by two districts for elementary school services. CVESD would serve students residing in Village 14, and JDUSD would serve students residing in Planning Areas 16/19. Using the student generation factors identified by CVESD, it is projected that approximately 409 elementary school students would result from development of the Proposed Project in Village 14 within the boundaries of CVESD, and 51 elementary students would result from the development of Planning Areas 16/19 within the boundaries of JDUSD (DOE 2017a). These figures are fewer than the planning capacity for an elementary (K–6) school (750–1,000 students).

##### *Chula Vista Elementary School District*

The Proposed Project reserves an elementary school site (9.7 acres) centrally located within Village 14. The Village 14 school site would be reserved for acquisition by the CVESD or dedication to the school district, pursuant to an agreement between the applicant and CVESD. If CVESD determines that the school site is needed, a graded site would be provided to CVESD, including utilities to the site and an all-weather road acceptable to the fire department and CVESD. The Otay Ranch Facilities Implementation Plan is based on the premise that schools will be constructed when no greater than half of the school's projected students reside in the community; however, facility phasing is solely determined by CVESD based on available school capacity in the vicinity of the Project Area.

A small (approximately 203 residential units) geographic area in the most northerly portion of Village 14 is within JDUSD and GUHSD boundaries. This area ~~will~~may be subject to a Transfer of Uninhabited Territory to allow those units to fall within the Chula Vista School District boundary, subject to approval by the San Diego County Board of Education. The Otay Ranch GDP/SRP and Facility Implementation Plan (City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego 1993b, 1993c) anticipate that the schools in Village 14 would be within CVESD/SUHSD boundaries, and that boundary adjustments would be appropriate to transfer any uninhabited territory from JDUSD and GUHSD to CVESD and SUHSD.

If CVESD determines that the elementary school site is needed, students residing in Village 14 are anticipated to attend existing CVESD schools prior to construction. The nearest elementary schools to Village 14 are Salt Creek Elementary (approximately 2 miles southwest), Thurgood Marshall Elementary (approximately 2.7 miles west), Arroyo Vista Charter School (approximately 2.7 miles southwest), Olympic View Elementary School (approximately 3.25 miles southwest), Liberty Elementary School (approximately 3.3 miles west), Eastlake Elementary Schools (approximately 3.75 miles west), Camarena Elementary School (approximately 3.8 miles southwest), Tiffany Burton Elementary (approximately 4.3 miles west), and Discovery Charter Elementary (approximately 5.75 miles west). These schools are either east of State Route 125 or accessed from Proctor Valley Road/East H Street, along a typical commute pattern from Village 14 to Interstate 805.

Village 14 would generate approximately 409 students based on CVESD student generation rates. As noted above, CVESD typically constructs schools when no greater than half of the school's projected students reside in the community; thus, it is reasonable to expect that approximately 205 students would reside in the community prior to the on-site school being constructed. If CVESD determines that the elementary school site is needed, these students would likely attend one of the above-listed elementary schools until the on-site school is completed.

Of the above-listed elementary schools, Arroyo Vista and Camarena are currently operating over capacity and are not included in the following totals. The remaining seven elementary schools have a total capacity of approximately 5,464 students. Current enrollment in these schools is approximately 5,267 students, resulting in existing capacity of approximately 197 students in these schools, which is approximately the demand created by the Proposed Project. Exiting school boundaries could be realigned for these schools to create additional capacity closer to the Project Area to accommodate the students residing in Village 14. In addition, several of these schools are in older neighborhoods and have experienced declining enrollment in recent years. Specifically, Tiffany Burton has seen declines since 2012/2013, and Thurgood Marshall has seen declines since 2012/2013, further reinforcing that enrollment capacity is expected to remain consistent in these schools (DOE 2017a).

In the event that elementary schools are over-enrolled and additional capacity is not available in existing classrooms, CVESD uses relocatable classrooms to temporarily house additional students until a new facility opens, such as one of the six planned schools within Otay Ranch identify in Section 3.1.6.1. Alternatively, CVESD may decide to begin construction of the on-site elementary school sooner than halfway through build-out of Village 14 should CVESD determine it necessary to do so.

#### *Jamul Dulzura ~~Unified~~ Union School District*

There are currently two schools serving elementary school students within JDUSD: Jamul Primary School (K–3) and Jamul Intermediate School (4–6). These schools are currently have capacity for additional students, as shown in Table 3.1.6-1. The combined capacity for grades 1 through 6 is 144 students. As noted above, it is estimated that Planning Areas 16/19 would generate 51 elementary school students; thus, it is anticipated that there is sufficient capacity to serve the students who reside in Planning Areas 16/19 (Appendix 3.1.6-1).

JDUSD currently has capacity to serve the students proposed to be generated by development of Planning Areas 16/19, ~~in exchange for payment of school fees~~ (Appendix 3.1.6-1). If the proposed territory transfer does not occur and the school district boundaries remain unchanged, JDUSD has adequate capacity to serve the students generated by the Proposed Project. JDUSD has not historically prepared a fee justification study to determine district student generation rates. To expedite preparation of the Specific Plan for the Proposed Project, JDUSD recommended using CVESD student generation rates to estimate the ~~amount~~ number of students anticipated to be generated from Planning Areas 16/19 (Appendix 3.1.6-1).

An elementary school site (9.7 acres) is reserved within Village 14. Development of the 9.7-acre site has been analyzed and covered throughout this EIR. Specifically, footprint-related impacts are addressed in the following applicable sections: Section 2.4, Biological Resources; Section 2.5, Cultural Resources; Section 2.6, Geology and Soils; and Section 3.1.3, Land Use and Planning. Impacts related to operation of the school site are addressed in Section 2.3, Air Quality; Section 2.7, Global Climate Change/Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Section 2.8, Noise; Section 2.9, Transportation and Traffic; Section 3.1.1, Hazards and Hazardous Emissions; and Section 3.1.5, Population and Housing. Accordingly, construction of a new school facility required to maintain acceptable performance objectives has been analyzed herein, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Alternatively, should CVESD determine that the on-site school is not required to maintain acceptable performance objectives, the Proposed Project would not result in a substantial adverse physical impact because no school would be constructed, and students residing in the Project Area would be enrolled in existing facilities.

The school district(s) and Proposed Project applicant may enter into a School Mitigation Agreement to ensure the timely construction of school facilities to serve students from new residential development, which would offset the impacts to school services. Historically, developers and school districts have entered into a School Mitigation Agreement, and school districts have used a Community Facilities District pursuant to the Mello-Roos Community Facilities District Act of 1982 to finance required school facilities. However, per Assembly Bill 2926, in absence of a School Mitigation Agreement, the developer must pay the statutory school fees under state law in effect at the time of building permit issuance.

Prior to approval of building permits, the applicant would be required to pay applicable school fees, pursuant to SB 50, to help maintain adequate school facilities and levels of service, in accordance with California Education Code 17620. SB 50 provides that the statutory fees found in the Government and Education Codes are the exclusive means of considering and mitigating for school impacts. Payment of required school impact fees is considered full mitigation for any impacts to school services related to increased enrollment caused by the Proposed Project for either school district (California Government Code, Section 65995(b)).

Through the payment of statutory school fees or implementation of a mitigation agreement, which would be required at the time of building permit issuance, as well as through the provision of a 9.7-acre school site, the Proposed Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause environmental impacts that were not already covered and analyzed under this EIR. Therefore, impacts to elementary school services would be **less than significant**.

### Middle Schools

SUHSD would serve students from Village 14 and JDUSD would serve students from Planning Areas 16/19. Based on the student generation factors identified in Table 3.1.6-10, Village 14 Student Generation for the Proposed Project, and Table 3.1.6-11, Planning Areas 16/19 Student Generation for the Proposed Project, it is projected that 121 middle school students would be added as a result of development of Village 14, and 15 students would be added from development of Planning Areas 16/19.

#### *Sweetwater Union High School District*

In response to Propositions BB and O, SUHSD officials have indicated that middle school students generated by Village 14 may attend Eastlake Middle School, which is located approximately 1.3 miles from Village 14 (SUHSD 2012). Eastlake Middle School has a planned capacity of 1,995 students. Estimated enrollment for 2016/2017 is 1,626 students; thus, existing capacity is approximately 369 students (SUHSD 2012). As discussed above, Village 14 is anticipated to

generate 121 middle school students; thus, there is sufficient existing capacity for students residing in Village 14. In addition, SUHSD owns a new middle school site ~~has been identified~~ within Otay Ranch Village ~~7/8 West~~ 11 and construction of a school facility was analyzed as part of the EIR for that project. This future middle school has a projected capacity of 1,500 students (SUHSD 2012). Once constructed, this facility may be used as an additional option by middle school students generated by Village 14. SUHSD will determine where middle school students will be served based on available capacity.

#### *Jamul Dulzura ~~Unified~~ Union School District*

JDUSD has indicated that students generated by development of Planning Areas 16/19 could attend Oak Grove Middle School, which is located approximately 3.75 miles from Planning Areas 16/19 (Appendix 3.1.6-1). As shown in Table 3.1.6-5, Oak Grove Middle School currently has capacity for 82 additional students. As shown in Table 3.1.6-11, Planning Areas 16/19 are anticipated to generate 15 middle school students, thus, there is sufficient existing capacity for students residing in these Planning Areas.

Prior to approval of building permits, the applicant would be required to pay applicable school fees, pursuant to SB 50, to help maintain adequate school facilities and levels of service, in accordance with California Education Code 17620. SB 50 provides that the statutory fees found in the Government and Education Codes are the exclusive means of considering and mitigating for school impacts. Payment of required school impact fees is considered full mitigation for any impacts to school services that would result from a project (California Government Code Section 65995(b)). Through the payment of statutory school fees, which would be required at the time of building permit issuance, the Proposed Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause environmental impacts that were not already covered and analyzed under this EIR. Therefore, impacts to middle school services would be **less than significant**.

#### High Schools

SUHSD would serve high school students from Village 14. GUHSD would serve high school students from Planning Areas 16/19. It is anticipated that 228 high school students would be generated by development of Village 14, and 18 students would be generated by development of Planning Areas 16/19.

#### *Sweetwater Union High School District*

SUHSD officials have indicated that students generated by Village 14 may attend Eastlake High School, located approximately 3.3 miles from Village 14 (Appendix 3.1.6-1). Eastlake High School has capacity for 2,964 students and current enrollment is 2,965 students. Similar to

CVESD, SUHSD uses relocatable classrooms to temporarily house additional students. Enrollment at Eastlake High School was as high as 3,221 in 2002/2003 (DOE 2017b); thus, the school can accommodate approximately 255 more students with relocatable classrooms. Further, Bonita Vista is approximately 4.5 miles west of Village 14 and has existing capacity for approximately 390 students, and Otay Ranch High School is approximately 5 miles from Village 14 and has existing capacity for approximately 375 students. As discussed above, Village 14 is anticipated to generate 228 high school students. In addition, ~~a new high school site has been identified within Otay Ranch Village 11 and has a projected capacity of 2,000 students.~~ Development of this high school has been previously analyzed under the Village 11 EIR (Appendix 3.1.6-1). SUHSD is coordinating with Otay Ranch property owners and the City of Chula Vista to identify an additional high school site in the southeastern portion of the Otay Ranch Otay Valley Parcel. Once constructed, this facility may be used as an option for high school students generated as a result of the Proposed Project. SUHSD will determine where students will be served based on available capacity.

#### *Grossmont ~~Unified~~ Union High School District*

It is anticipated that high school students from Planning Areas 16/19 would be served by GUHSD and would attend ~~Steele Canyon~~ Valhalla High School. ~~Steele Canyon~~ According to GUHSD enrollment data, Valhalla High School has indicated in a letter that the school can currently accommodate up to 2,656~~200~~ students, and current enrollment in the 2017~~6~~/2018~~7~~ school year is 2,125~~42~~ students (Appendix 3.1.6-1). Therefore, ~~Steele Canyon~~ Valhalla High School has capacity to accommodate the approximately 18 students from Planning Areas 16/19. If the proposed territory transfer does not occur and the school district boundaries remain unchanged, GUHSD also has adequate capacity to serve the students generated by the Proposed Project.

Prior to approval of building permits, the applicant would be required to pay applicable school fees, pursuant to SB 50, to help maintain adequate school facilities and levels of service, in accordance with California Education Code Section 17620. SB 50 provides that the statutory fees found in the Government and Education Codes are the exclusive means of considering and mitigating for school impacts. Payment of required school impact fees is considered full mitigation for any impacts to school services that would result from a project (California Government Code Section 65995(b)). Through the payment of statutory school fees, which would be required at the time of building permit issuance, the Proposed Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause environmental impacts that were not already covered and analyzed under this EIR. Therefore, impacts to high school services would be **less than significant**.

### 3.1.6.2.4 Other Public Facilities

#### Civic Facilities

##### Otay Ranch GDP/SRP Threshold

The following threshold is contained in the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP (City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego 1993b):

- Make provisions for general governmental facilities, including regional and municipal administrative facilities and operation center(s).

#### Analysis

No civic administrative facilities are currently located in the Project Area. The areas surrounding the Project Area are currently served by the County, the City of Chula Vista, and the City of San Diego.

Buildout of the Proposed Project (up to 1,119 dwelling units at 3.6 people per dwelling unit) would result in a projected total of 3,941 residents, not including the employee population. This increase in population in the Project Area, in conjunction with the proportional regional growth of the area, could result in the need for additional or expanded civic administrative facilities. Pursuant to the Otay Ranch Facility Implementation Plan (City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego 1993c), a ratio objective of 420 square feet of civic administrative facility per 1,000 projected residents should be used in assessing demand (Appendix 3.1.6-1). The calculation of projected population multiplied by the adopted civic administrative facilities ratio results in a projected demand of 1,655 square feet of gross floor area. This demand would be satisfied through use of existing County civic facilities.

No specific civic facilities would be required for the Proposed Project. Civic facility improvements are made through the County's Capital Improvement Program, funded by the County General Fund. Payment of general taxes that contribute to the County General Fund from which civic facilities improvements are funded to the County's Capital Improvement Program would satisfy the demand created by the Proposed Project. Impacts related to civic facilities would be **less than significant**.

### Libraries

#### Otay Ranch GDP/SRP Threshold

The following threshold is contained in the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP (City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego 1993b):

- Provide 350 square feet (gross) of adequately equipped and staffed regional/area library facilities per 1,000 population.

#### Analysis

The Otay Ranch GDP/SRP establishes a threshold standard of 350 square feet of adequately equipped and staffed library facilities per 1,000 residents (Appendix 3.1.6-1). Since adoption of the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP, library planning has changed because of the prevalence of the internet and web-based research, and many library districts are reconsidering square footage ratios. Nonetheless, based on a projected population of 4,028,941 residents (not including employee population), the Proposed Project would generate demand for approximately 1,410,379 square feet of additional library space.

The demand for library facilities generated by build-out of the Project Area would ultimately be satisfied by existing libraries within the vicinity of the Project Area and any new libraries constructed in the future. The Otay Ranch GDP/SRP plans for the location of a 36,758-square-foot main library in the Eastern Urban Center (City of Chula Vista and County of San Diego 1993b). As reported in the Chula Vista Growth Management Commission 2016 Annual Report (May 2016), a 30,000- to 35,000-square-foot library is expected to be constructed by 2021 within the Eastern Urban Center (Appendix 3.1.6-1). Further, a 300-acre university campus is being planned in the southeastern portion of the Otay Valley Parcel. It is reasonably expected that such a use would provide additional library services, but the size and availability are uncertain at this time.

The planned library in the Eastern Urban Center would provide sufficient library space for residents in accordance with existing Otay Ranch GDP/SRP standards, and would provide additional library facilities in the Eastern Urban Center as envisioned in the Chula Vista Growth Management Commission 2016 Annual Report (Appendix 3.1.6-1). The addition of 30,000 to 35,000 square feet of library space would accommodate the increased population resulting from development of the Proposed Project, and would maintain acceptable service ratios. Therefore, impacts related to libraries would be **less than significant**.



### 3.1.6.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis

#### Fire Protection Services

Cumulative impacts from multiple projects within a fire agency's jurisdiction, like SDCFA, can cause fire response service decline. The geographic scope for fire service for cumulative projects is the response area of SDCFA fire stations that would serve the Project Area, including Station 36. Future growth in the cumulative area would generate additional demand on fire protection services, and would require the construction or expansion of services and facilities to maintain acceptable response times and adequate levels of service. Despite the minor increase in number of calls per year from the Proposed Project, it would contribute to the cumulative impact on fire services when considered with other anticipated projects within the SDCFA's primary response area. The largest potential projects, in addition to the Proposed Project, in this portion of SDCFA's jurisdictional area are Otay Ranch Resort Village (Village 13), Otay Ranch Village 15, and Otay Ranch Planning Area 17; however, Village 15 has been acquired by the State of California and other agencies for conservation purposes and is not expected to be developed.

Impacts to fire service facilities would not be cumulatively considerable because the Proposed Project would include constructing, equipping, and staffing a new fire station. The Proposed Project is only expected to generate approximately one call for service per day. A typical fire station can respond to approximately eight calls for service per day; thus, the on-site fire station would be available to respond to seven additional calls per day from existing and cumulative projects. Although the population in the surrounding area is projected to grow and generate additional demand on existing fire service facilities, the Proposed Project would not create a significant contribution of demand in those areas, and would instead result in the construction of a fire station that would have capacity to provide service to those areas. Further, there is a planned fire station proposed for the Resort Village (Village 13) project, which would be available to serve the Proposed Project, and vice versa, in the future. The potential impacts associated with construction of the fire station within the Project Area have been included in the analysis presented throughout this EIR. Impacts to fire protection services or facilities **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

#### Law Enforcement

The geographic scope for analysis of cumulative law enforcement impacts consists of the Rancho San Diego/Imperial Beach command area. Future growth in the cumulative area would generate additional demand on police protection, and would require the construction or expansion of services and facilities to maintain acceptable response times and adequate levels of service. The largest potential projects, in addition to the Proposed Project, in this portion of the County's command area are Otay Resort Village (Village 13), Otay Ranch Village 15, and Otay

Ranch Planning Area 17; however, Village 15 has been acquired by the State of California and other agencies for conservation purposes and is not expected to be developed. Further, the Law Enforcement Services Form (Appendix 3.1.6-2) indicates that, due to the expansion of the Otay 250 Project Sunroad and Business Park, the Otay Substation would require additional services and resources. A total of 12 deputies would be needed to staff the Otay Substation for 7-day, 24-hour coverage. Additional resources, to include Community Service Officers, Crime Prevention Specialists, and an analyst, would be taken into consideration in determining needed resources (Appendix 3.1.6-2).

Impacts to police protection facilities would not be cumulatively considerable because the Proposed Project would include construction of a Sheriff's ~~satellite~~-storefront facility and payment of taxes to support additional required services. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not significantly contribute to increased demand for police protection services in the region. Potential impacts associated with construction of a Sheriff's ~~satellite~~-storefront facility in the Project Area have been included as part of the Proposed Project and analyzed throughout this EIR. The Proposed Project would not require construction of any additional law enforcement facilities beyond those already identified in this EIR. Impacts to police protection services or facilities **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

### Schools

The cumulative study area for school service is the boundary of the applicable school districts. Accordingly, the boundaries for elementary school services are those for CVESD and JDUSD. The boundaries for middle and high school services are those for SUHSD, JDUSD, and GUHSD.

Within CVESD, there are several large master plan projects, including a few Otay Ranch villages: Otay Ranch Resort Village (Village 13), Otay Ranch Village 15, and Otay Ranch Planning Area 17. Otay Ranch Village 15 has been acquired by the State of California for conservation purposes and is not expected to be developed. Otay Ranch Village 13 includes an elementary school site that would be anticipated to serve any residential development of Village 15 or Planning Area 17.

The Proposed Project would provide an elementary school site or would provide funding for improvements to existing elementary school facilities to sufficiently accommodate elementary school students generated as a result of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would provide funding for improvements to middle and high school facilities to sufficiently accommodate all middle and high school students generated by the Proposed Project. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the additional demand on existing school facilities within the districts, and **impacts would not be cumulatively considerable**.

### 3.1.6.4 Conclusion

As described above, the Proposed Project would avoid significant impacts to fire protection and emergency services, law enforcement, libraries, civic facilities, and schools by a combination of payment of impact fees, dedication of land, and/or construction of facilities. Therefore, impacts to public services would be **less than significant**.

**Table 3.1.6-1  
Jamul/Dulzura Union School District – Elementary School Capacity**

School	Estimated Enrollment 2016/2017	Approximate Capacity	Remaining Capacity
<i>Elementary Schools</i>			
Jamul Primary (K–3)	255	369	114
Jamul Intermediate (4–6)	120	150	30
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>375</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>144</b>

Source: Appendix 3.1.6-1.

**Table 3.1.6-2  
Chula Vista Elementary School District – Elementary School Capacity**

School	Estimated Enrollment 2016/2017	Approximate Capacity	Remaining Capacity
Allen	393	438	45
Arroyo Vista Charter	1,002	850	-152
Camarena, Enrique S.	1,014	1,000	-14
Casillas, Joseph	505	577	72
Castle Park	381	489	108
Chula Vista Hills	555	588	33
Chula Vista Learning Community Charter	1,530	513	-1,017
Clear View	495	888	393
Cook, Hazel Goes	322	586	264
Discovery Charter	911	938	27
Eastlake	648	702	54
Feaster-Edison Charter	1,235	1,113	-122
Finney, Myrtle S.	363	586	223
Halecrest	503	577	74
Harborside Accelerated	700	864	164
Hedenkamp, Anne & William	1,074	1,150	76
Heritage	829	900	71
Hilltop Drive	563	564	1
Juarez-Lincoln Accelerated	552	727	175
Kellogg, Karl H.	328	427	99
Lauderbach, J. Calvin	800	1,052	252

**Table 3.1.6-2  
Chula Vista Elementary School District – Elementary School Capacity**

School	Estimated Enrollment 2016/2017	Approximate Capacity	Remaining Capacity
Liberty	739	752	13
Loma Verde Comer	477	650	173
Los Altos	356	489	133
Marshall, Thurgood	674	686	12
McMillin, Corky	845	813	-32
Montgomery Accelerated, John J.	344	513	169
Mueller Charter , Robert L.	1,364	900	-464
Olympic View	807	825	18
Otay Accelerated	552	713	161
Palomar	363	436	73
Parkview	376	536	160
Rice Comer, Lilian J.	6509	739	89
Rogers, Greg (East)	450	639	189
Rohr, Fred H	321	489	168
Rosebank	568	727	159
Salt Creek	968	975	7
Silver Wing	438	488	50
Sunnyside	456	489	33
Tiffany, Burton C.	520	586	66
Valle Lindo	474	677	203
Valley Vista	622	634	12
Veterans	892	901	9
Vista Square	648	689	41
Wolf Canyon	917	927	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>28,924</b>	<b>31,802</b>	<b>2,878</b>

Source: Appendix 3.1.6-1.

**Table 3.1.6-3  
Sweetwater Union High School District – Middle School Capacity**

School	Estimated Enrollment 2016/2017	Approximate Capacity	Remaining Capacity
Bonita Vista	1,137	1,610	473
Castle Park	877	1,324	447
Chula Vista	837	1,456	619
Eastlake	1,625	1,995	370
Granger	958	1,350	392
Hilltop	977	1,596	619
Mar Vista Middle	861	1,530	669

**Table 3.1.6-3  
Sweetwater Union High School District – Middle School Capacity**

School	Estimated Enrollment 2016/2017	Approximate Capacity	Remaining Capacity
Montgomery Middle	839	1,434	595
National City Middle	807	1,038	231
Rancho del Rey	1,778	1,796	18
Southwest	631	1,034	403
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>11,327</b>	<b>16,163</b>	<b>4,836</b>

Source: Appendix 3.1.6-1.

**Table 3.1.6-4  
Sweetwater Union High School District – High School Capacity**

School Site	Estimated Enrollment 2016/2017	Approximate Capacity	Remaining Capacity
Bonita Vista	2,326	2,603	277
Castle Park	1,607	2,099	492
Chula Vista	2,586	2,758	172
Eastlake	3,063	2,964	-99
East Hills Academy*	78	212	134
Hilltop	2,143	2,760	617
Mar Vista	1,673	2,023	350
Montgomery	1,712	2,392	680
Olympian	2,610	2,537	-73
Otay Ranch	2,413	2,737	324
San Ysidro	2,447	2,676	229
Southwest	1,910	2,519	609
Sweetwater	2,675	2,875	200
Palomar	281	564	283
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>27,524</b>	<b>31,719</b>	<b>4,195</b>

Source: Appendix 3.1.6-1.

\* East Hills Academy is a special education academy.

**Table 3.1.6-5  
Jamul/Dulzura Union School District – Middle School Capacity**

School Site	Estimated Enrollment 2016/2017	Approximate Capacity	Remaining Capacity
<i>Middle Schools</i>			
Oak Grove Middle School	231	313	82
<b>Total</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>82</b>

Source: Appendix 2.1.6-1

**Table 3.1.6-6  
Grossmont Union High School District – High School Capacity**

School Site	Estimated Enrollment 2017/2018	Approximate Capacity	Remaining Capacity
<i>High Schools</i>			
Grossmont	TBD2,219	2,2532,750	TBD531
Helix High School	TBD2,465	2,5412,758	TBD293
El Cajon Valley	TBD1,838	4,8152,662	TBD824
Mountain Miguel	TBD1,205	4,3022,678	TBD1,473
El Capitan	TBD1,675	4,6002,080	TBD405
Granite Hills	TBD2,290	2,3372,624	TBD334
Monte Vista	TBD1,640	4,6832,534	TBD894
Santana	TBD1,584	4,6042,256	TBD672
Chaparral/IDEA	TBD223	65900	TBD667
Valhalla	TBD2,125	2,4042,656	TBD531
West Hills	TBD1,723	4,8262,626	TBD903
Steele Canyon	TBD2,195	2,4632,470	TBD275

Source: Appendix 3.1.6-1.

**Table 3.1.6-7  
County of San Diego Civic Facilities Inventory**

Facility	Address
County Administration Center	1600 Pacific Highway, San Diego, California 92101
Health Services Complex	3851 Rosecrans Street, San Diego, California 92110
Hall of Justice	330 W. Broadway, San Diego, California 92101
County Courthouse	220 W. Broadway, San Diego, California 92101
County Operations Center	5555 Overland Avenue, San Diego, California 92123
East County Regional Center	250 Main Street, El Cajon, California 92020
South County Regional Center	500 Third Avenue, Chula Vista, California 91910

Source: Appendix 3.1.6-1.

**Table 3.1.6-8  
Locations of San Diego County Library Facilities Serving South County**

Library Branch	Address
Mobile Library	North County: 760-643-5125 East County: 619-660-6329
Bonita	4375 Bonita Road, Bonita, California 91902
Imperial Beach	810 Imperial Beach Boulevard, Imperial Beach, California 91932
Lincoln Acres	2725 Granger Avenue, National City, California 91950
Rancho San Diego	11555 Via Rancho San Diego, El Cajon, California 92019
Spring Valley	836 Kempton Street, Spring Valley, California 91977

Source: Appendix 3.1.6-1.

**Table 3.1.6-9  
School Size Standards**

School Type	Grades	Number of Students
Elementary	K-6	750-1,000
Middle School	7-8	1,500
High School	9-12	2,400

Source: Appendix 3.1.6-1.

**Table 3.1.6-10  
Village 14 Student Generation for the Proposed Project**

Residential Category	Units	Student Generation Rate			Students Generated		
		<i>Elementary School</i>	<i>Middle School</i>	<i>High School</i>	<i>Elementary School</i>	<i>Middle School</i>	<i>High School</i>
Single-Family	994	0.4114	0.1216	0.2291	409	121	228
Multi-Family/Mixed-Use	0	0.3481	0.0516	0.1057	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,119 994</b>	—	—	—	<b>409</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>228</b>

**Table 3.1.6-11  
Planning Areas 16/19 Student Generation for the Proposed Project**

Residential Category	Units	Student Generation Rate			Students Generated		
		<i>Elementary School</i>	<i>Middle School</i>	<i>High School</i>	<i>Elementary School</i>	<i>Middle School</i>	<i>High School</i>
Single-Family	125	0.4114	0.1216	.1460	51	15	18
<b>Total</b>	<b>125</b>	—	—	—	<b>51</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>18</b>

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK