

**MINUTES OF A
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL
OF THE
CITY OF CORONADO/
THE CITY OF CORONADO ACTING AS THE SUCCESSOR
AGENCY TO THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
OF THE CITY OF CORONADO
Coronado City Hall
1825 Strand Way
Coronado, CA 92118
Tuesday, October 6, 2015**

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Attendance was taken at 3:30 p.m. A Quorum of members was present to conduct a meeting by the following results.

Present: (5) Mike Woiwode; Bill Sandke; Casey Tanaka; Carrie Downey;
Richard Bailey

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CLOSED SESSION

1. **CLOSED SESSION:** CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR
AUTHORITY: Government Code Section 54957.6
CITY NEGOTIATORS: Blair King, City Manager; Tom Ritter, Assistant City
Manager; Leslie Suelter, Director of Administrative
Services; Johanna Canlas, City Attorney
EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATION: American Federation of State, County and
Municipal Employees (AFSCME), Local 127

2. **COMMUNICATIONS – ORAL:** None.

The meeting adjourned to Closed Session at 3:30 pm.

The meeting reconvened at 3:39 pm. Mayor Tanaka announced there was no reportable action.

Mayor Tanaka called the regular meeting to order at 4 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL:

Present: Councilmembers/Agency Members Bailey, Downey, Sandke,
Woiwode and Mayor Tanaka

Absent: None

Also Present: City Manager/Agency Executive Director Blair King
City Attorney/Agency Counsel Johanna Canlas
City Clerk/Agency Secretary Mary Clifford

2. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE. Floyd Ross provided the invocation and Mayor Tanaka led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. MINUTES: Approval of the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the City Council/the City Council Acting as the Successor Agency of September 15, 2015.

MSUC (Downey/Bailey) moved to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the City Council/the City Council Acting as the Successor Agency of September 15, 2015, as submitted. The minutes were so approved. The reading of the minutes in their entirety was unanimously waived.

AYES: Bailey, Downey, Sandke, Tanaka
NAYS: None
ABSTAINING: Woiwode
ABSENT: None

4. CEREMONIAL PRESENTATIONS:

4a. Proclamation: Coronado Lions Club White Cane Days. Mayor Tanaka presented the proclamation to Councilmember Downey, Floyd Ross and members of the Coronado Lions Club.

4b. Proclamation: Rideshare Month 2015. Mayor Tanaka presented the proclamation to SANDAG iCommute Program representative Deborah Jones.

5. CONSENT CALENDAR: The City Council approved, adopted and/or accepted as one item of business Consent Agenda Items 5a through 5j.

Councilmember Bailey proposed the addition of Items 11c, 11e, 13a.

Councilmember Downey commented on Item 11e. The direction of \$8.6 million of future development agency loan repayments being allocated to the facilities refurbishment/replacement fund means that we won our lawsuit against the Department of Finance and so all of the loans that the City had made to its former Community Development Agency are now being repaid to us. The

City is using those funds in this new refurbishment fund for building replacement and refurbishment.

Councilmember Woiwode requested the removal of Item 5d. He commented on Item 5i. He wants to be sure he has this correct. The allocation of the \$750,000 for the fire apparatus was already in the budget. What is different is the additional funds outfitting it because we are going to use it as a second backup vehicle.

City Manager Blair King responded that the purchase of this pumper has been programmed and is a part of our vehicle replacement program. The only thing that is outside the norm is that we are keeping the vehicle that this vehicle is replacing in reserve. Normally we would be trading it in and transferring the equipment from one to the other. Because of reliability issues dealing with the quint, staff wants to keep this vehicle in reserve and is asking for another \$150,000 to fully outfit it. We then would have two fully outfitted pieces of equipment in reserve along with the front line vehicles.

Susan Keith commented on Item 5j by saying that this is a historic structure in town and it has never been designated by the City but it is something that the HRC has wanted to bring forth to the Council to have designated. She asked if anyone from the HRC is going to be involved with the repairs, construction, etc. Is there anyone that knows about historic preservation who is going to be working on this structure?

Mr. King responded by saying that staff was concerned that the public would respond to the high price to rehabilitate the ticket booth. The reason why it is such a high price is because it has been spec'd out to be restored as historically accurate as we know it to be. The intention is not to change the historic integrity of the building but to replace it as is. It is in poor condition now.

Mayor Tanaka invited Mr. Maurer to come forward to speak to this and repeated that the question is whether we have the expertise on staff to oversee a contractor with this reputed type of expertise.

Cliff Maurer, Director of Public Services and Engineering, explained that San Diego Construction Company has been selected to do this work and has done very meticulous work for the City in the past. This structure is not designated historic and, in fact, some of the features within the structure are not original. The company is going to do its best to replace those to get those back to as close to original as possible. For example, the cash register is not an appropriate cash register for the time. The contractor has found one, should he be awarded the contract, that he will put in that is more representative of the time. In addition, the current structure is termite ridden with a lot of termite damage and rot. It needs to be reconstructed in place. A lot of very meticulous artisan work will be done at that location.

Mayor Tanaka added that there are still opportunities for the HRC to become involved.

Ms. Keith would feel better if historic preservation is involved with this. We don't know anything about this company that has been chosen and either the Historical Association or the City's own arm of historic preservation, the Historic Resource Commission, should be involved in this project. We have no idea what they are planning to replace. Are they going to reconstruct the whole thing? Before the City Council approves this money, she thinks they ought to see the plan.

Councilmember Bailey commented that, with the Council's support, he would like to change the recommendation on 5j to authorize the City Manager to execute a contract with San Diego Construction Company, Inc. in the amount of \$68,176 for the restoration of the Ferry Landing Ticket Booth and work with CHA and HRC to ensure that historic integrity is maintained.

Mr. Woiwode is okay with that language as long as the contractor will accept it.

MSUC (Downey/Sandke) moved that the City Council approve the Consent Calendar Items 5a through 5j with the exclusion of 5d and the addition of 11c - Consideration of Appointment to Fill One Vacancy on the Street Tree Committee (Steven Kim Moreno); 11e - Receive 2015 Asset Management Plan and Consider Formalizing the City's Strategy and Criteria for a Facilities Replacement Fund; and 13a - Consideration of Request from Councilmember Downey that City Staff be Directed to Agendize a Discussion that the City Expand the Summer Shuttle Bus Service Year Round.

AYES:	Bailey, Downey, Sandke, Woiwode, Tanaka
NAYS:	Bailey, on Item 5h
ABSTAINING:	None
ABSENT:	None

5a. Approval of Reading by Title and Waiver of Reading in Full of Ordinances on this Agenda. The City Council waived the reading of the full text and approved the reading of the title only.

5b. Review and Approve that the Warrants, as Certified by the City/Agency Treasurer, are all Correct and Just, and Conform to the Approved Budget for FY 2015-2016. The City Council approved payment of City warrant Nos. 10109041 thru 10109387. The City Council approved the warrants as certified by the City/Agency Treasurer.

5c. Acceptance of Street, Curb and Gutter Improvements Project (D Avenue and Third Street) and Direction to the City Clerk to File a Notice of Completion. The City Council accepted the Street, Curb and Gutter Improvements project and directed the City Clerk to file a Notice of Completion.

5d. Consideration of an Encroachment Permit Regarding Private Improvements within the Public Right-of-Way Adjacent to 1718 Monterey Avenue.

Councilmember Woiwode does not see why we should grant this.

Ed Walton, Director of Engineering and Capital Projects, provided a brief report.

Councilmember Sandke asked if the house at 1700 is designated historic or has any other special reason that it received that earlier encroachment permit.

Mr. Walton does not know if it is designated historic. The encroachment permit was granted many years ago.

Mr. Woiwode commented that this is one foot from the sidewalk and then there are plantings between the fence and the sidewalk. Essentially this is going to be growing up and overhanging the sidewalk. There is no such fence on the adjacent properties. If we allow this because there is one, three, or four properties away, then what we are doing is setting the stage for all those properties that are adjacent to this to develop in the same location. He doesn't think there is any intrinsic reason why it needs to be where it is. It can be properly located and that would set the stage for the rest of the block to develop as the City intended.

Councilmember Sandke drove by the property. The more concerning issue for him is that they did not get a permit to start with. It is a \$400 versus an \$800 permit so cost really shouldn't have entered into it. He has trouble with this particular fence and with granting a permit for it.

Councilmember Downey wanted to let Mr. Sandke know that, before his time, the Council has granted others around town. Sadly, these are often after the fact because the person didn't realize it was required. She gets a lot of questions about the encroachment. People want to know why they pay taxes on land they cannot use. One of the reasons the City has the encroachment area it has is because the City has to put in the sidewalk, do maintenance on those ways, and do things that a city has to do. That is why we did not allow someone who tried to put a six-foot cement wall within the encroachment. In the past she has voted to allow these very small types of fences that she did not feel would interfere with City business. She does not like the fact that someone didn't do the permitting right but she thinks this allows the City to have the access it needs to get to that property should it need to. She doesn't want to open up a floodgate and is not saying that is a good thing but as we look back to understand why we have that encroachment area, it is simply because it may need access to some of that area and she does not see this fence preventing it.

Councilmember Bailey is okay in moving forward with the staff recommendation. As indicated in the staff report, a review of the property found no reason why the fence couldn't be fully constructed within the front yard of the property and if the City deems this a hazard, it has the right to have it removed at any time.

Mayor Tanaka could go either way on this but thinks the point that has persuaded him that this one is a little different and should be denied is that in addition to the fence being in the wrong place, there are plantings in front of it and one of the things the staff report mentioned is the reason for the encroachment rules as they exist is it doesn't just have to be emergency vehicles being able to do their thing. It is just someone walking on the sidewalk. Theoretically there could be some liability for the City if someone bumps into that fence or gets snagged on a picket or now something happens with those plantings. He doesn't think it would be a disaster to go either way but he thinks he will lean to the side of denying this encroachment permit. If it is done properly and it maintains the amount of space, then there won't be as much of an issue or likelihood of a problem. Again, the plantings are in front of the fence and that is what is going to sway him to deny this.

Ms. Downey commented that the plantings are why staff said people wouldn't get stuck on the fence.

Mayor Tanaka said that would be after it grows for a while. That may be true but he is not sure that the plantings won't create a similar problem.

MSC (Woiwode/Sandke) moved to deny the encroachment permit.

AYES: Sandke, Woiwode, Tanaka
NAYS: Bailey, Downey
ABSTAINING: None
ABSENT: None

5e. Adoption of an Ordinance Amending Title 70, Building and Construction, of the City of Coronado Municipal Code to Add Chapter 70.35, Small Rooftop Solar Energy Systems. The City Council adopted AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO, CALIFORNIA, AMENDING TITLE 70, BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION, OF THE CITY OF CORONADO MUNICIPAL CODE BY ADDING CHAPTER 70.35, SMALL RESIDENTIAL ROOFTOP SOLAR ENERGY SYSTEMS. The Ordinance, having been placed on First Reading on September 15, 2015, was read by Title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by Council as Ordinance No. 2053. The vote at the introduction of the ordinance was unanimous.

5f. Acceptance of 44 Trauma Kits Valued at \$3,253 from the San Diego County Law Enforcement Foundation. The City Council authorized the Police Department to accept the equipment.

5g. Acceptance of California Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) Police Grant Funds in the Amount of \$5,462 and Authorized the Acceptance of Additional Grants Funds from the BSCC through Fiscal year 2019-2020. The City Council accepted and appropriated grant funds received from the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) through Fiscal Year 2019-20, a five-year period.

5h. Adoption of a Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Successor Memorandum of Understanding Between the City of Coronado and the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Local 127 for Fiscal Years 2015-16 through 2017-18. The City Council adopted A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE CITY OF CORONADO AND THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY, AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES (AFSCME) LOCAL 127 FOR FISCAL YEARS 2015-16 THROUGH 2017-18, APPROVING TWO SIDE LETTER AGREEMENTS TO REVIEW CERTAIN CLASSIFICATIONS, AND APPROVING CORRESPONDING CHANGES TO THE PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATION AND COMPENSATION PLAN. The Resolution was read by title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by City Council as RESOLUTION NO. 8767.

5i. Authorization for the City Manager to Execute a Purchase Agreement for an Amount Not to Exceed \$750,000 Through a Cooperative Purchasing Program for a 2016 Pierce Triple Combination Pumper Fire Apparatus and Approve \$150,000 from the Vehicle and Equipment Replacement Fund to Fully Outfit the Apparatus. The City Council authorized the City Manager to execute the purchase agreement for an amount not to exceed

\$750,000 from the FY 2015-16 Vehicle and Equipment Replacement (VER) Fund 135 for a 2016 Pierce Triple Combination Pumper Fire Apparatus and approved \$150,000 from the VER Fund to fully outfit the new apparatus.

5j. Award of a Contract for Restoration of the Ferry Landing Ticket Booth to San Diego Construction Company, Inc., in the Amount of \$68,176 and Authorize the City Manager to Execute the Contract. The City Council authorized the City Manager to execute a contract with San Diego Construction Company, Inc., in the amount of \$68,176, for the restoration of the Ferry Landing Ticket Booth and work with CHA and HRC to ensure that historic integrity is maintained.

6. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

- a. **Jeff Tyler**, Cultural Arts Commissioner for Public Art, announced, on behalf of the CAC and in celebration of Coronado's 125th anniversary, that the CAC would like to provide the City Council with commemorative 125th anniversary nametags.
- b. **Christine Donovan** thanked the City Council for the vote on that fence. The rest of us in town have to give up our three feet next to the sidewalk and everyone should have that same rule. She attended the BAC meeting yesterday when members, once again, discussed the idea of renaming the committee something along the lines of Committee on Active Transportation. It seems that grant money for bike centric committees has dried up and grant givers are now focused on the expanded concept of active transportation which includes both cyclists and pedestrians. In that the BAC was formed to, "...advance the cause of bicycling..." per its inaugural meeting on December 5, 2011, she believes it would be deceptive to change the committee's name without changing its mission and its membership both of which embrace bicycle advocacy with no mention of pedestrians. If the purpose of a Coronado Bike Committee is no longer relevant, it should be dismantled and an authentic active transportation committee should be formed according to established municipal guidelines with opportunity for public input along the way. At that point, more relevant community objectives can be identified and committee members can be appointed to reflect this expanded focus. The alternative to allow the BAC to rename itself so it can ostensibly represent the interest of Coronado's pedestrians would not only deny rightful City participation, it would misrepresent this lack of proper process in Coronado's grant applications. Please do not allow this to happen.
- c. **Susan Keith** thought it was a little shocking to see Coronado advertised on Channel 7. She saw this twice and understands it was on at least three times. The CTID, with authorization from the City Council, now is spending \$1.3 million to advertise Coronado. She thinks we have plenty of tourists in town. This is the time of year when the residents can really enjoy Coronado. Network advertising has to be expensive. The City Council has authorized the CTID to spend this money. She thinks the CTID should be dissolved. We don't need to be spending that kind of money to bring more tourists into this town. You are supposed to be representing the residents. You are not supposed to be representing the tourists.
- d. **Andy Hanshaw, San Diego County Bicycle Coalition**, spoke about the now famous bike lanes in Coronado. The decision and discussion related to bike lanes at the last meeting raised a lot of eyebrows on a local and national level. He spoke to address a letter that was submitted to the City Council asking the Council to follow up on that item and not to delay implementing the Bicycle Master Plan too long to increase the safety for bicyclists in Coronado. We know that bike lanes are good for many things, including bicycle and

pedestrian safety, businesses, drivers, traffic calming, property values, and increasing the quality of life for everyone. Nearly 70% of the kids in the City of Coronado bike or walk to school. That is a really important number and a really high one.

- e. **Mike Donovan** spoke about bullying. It seems that this term has come up in the last few months on a lot of the hot button issues that have come before the City Council. A couple of meetings ago a former Council member was up at the podium and provided his feedback and his position on one of these contentious issues. He was listening and he didn't agree with what the person was saying but did understand where he was coming from. The former Council member's final comment to the City Council was not to be bullied into changing or reassessing its position. At the time, he thought about that and wondered if the former elected official was saying that anyone who dares to forward their position on a contentious issue is labeled a bully. He thought that was kind of odd. But then as the weeks followed and we started to become involved with the media with articles on the Internet and in newspapers, social media, late night TV, that word kept coming back. People are bullies. They don't want bike lanes. He also found out that not only are those people on that side of the issue bullies but they are also elderly white women. His point is that just because some of the residents don't agree with what the City Council is doing or with other people's positions, they certainly shouldn't be called bullies. What he does think is bullying is when people come to Coronado, people with special interest groups and such, and try to tell us how to run our City. That is wrong. Most of these people don't know anything about Coronado. They don't live here and they don't give a darn about the quality of life. He thinks the Council should be listening to the majority of residents, no matter what their positions are, and give them some additional weight and priority when making decisions.
- f. **Ann Sonne** was interested to hear about the amount of money the CTID is spending. She is unsure of the process for things. Has a decision been made? Has the Council approved the expenditure of these funds? She doesn't know what happened or if it can be stopped or if the Council wants it stopped.
- g. **Carolyn Rogerson** thanked the City Council and staff on behalf of grateful residents for providing government of the people, by the people and for the people. Thank you for listening and encouraging all voices to come forward with their needs, concerns, requests, and opinions. Thank you for not kowtowing to a few people representing a very special interest group who apparently have quick access to big media. Their efforts to quash free speech from those who do not march in lock step and support their narrow agenda has failed to shut us up. Hyperbole and humor beat out ridicule every time. We all want a safe and sane and loving Coronado.
- h. **Norm Funk** commented about the tourists. This town exists because of commercial draw. We are a destination whether we like it or not. The Hotel Del is a very important part of that destination. He owns a small business and appreciates the image that the CTID can create. He is in favor of marketing Coronado on a business level. The tourists are necessary and we just need to manage them.
- i. **Phil Monroe** hoped to bring clarity to one issue. The \$1.3 million that was referred to as what the CTID spends does not come from the City's treasury at all. It is collected from the tourists that come here. The four largest hotels charge a total of one percent on the bills the tourists pay and that is the money that is being spent. The result from that is a lot of TOT that the City Council gets a chance to spend. It is not Coronado's money that is doing that.

Mayor Tanaka pointed out that the City saves some of that TOT as well as spends it.

- j. **Councilmember Downey** wants the public to understand that it can send her anything it wants but it is a public record. Someone could put in a public record act request and she would be required to produce that information. Some people want to know why the Council does the blue sheeting. What does that mean? If a communication was sent after the agenda was published, then it is copied and added to the agenda on a blue sheet so it is seen as new. It does not get any more weight than the email that was sent before the agenda was published. She encouraged the public to send emails earlier than right before the meeting so that Council members can give them a little thought. She commented that the City Council received great emails on both sides of today's issue and she respects both sides. There are a lot of legitimate, honest concerns whether you support wanting to do more or whether you want to do nothing. Let's all agree that we have to talk about this as a whole. She talked about bullying. At least three times for this agenda we were threatened to the point where she almost spoke to the Chief of Police about it. All those emails are public records. The City Council is doing its best and she is sorry if they don't agree with it. Keep it productive. Keep it positive. As we talk about options for what we can do going forward, people gave great ideas some of which were so great we are already doing them. That means we have done a bad job of publicizing what has already been done. She wishes the iCommute representative from SANDAG had reported that one of the leading entities in the San Diego County region for iCommute and encouraging carpooling and vanpooling and mass transit is actually Naval Base Coronado. Every year for the past many they have gotten the Diamond Award for being the top in the region. Approved on the consent calendar was her request for the Council to talk about offering the free summer shuttle year round. As we talk about alternatives to traffic, one of the best ways we can help deal with traffic is to get some people out of their cars and out of all the parking by getting on the bus.

7. **CITY MANAGER/EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR:**

7a. **Update on Council Directed Actions and Citizen Inquiries.** City Manager Blair King reported on two items. Mr. King introduced Jesse Brown, the City's new Senior Planner, who has filled the position previously held by Ann McCaull. As Councilmember Downey stated, he wanted to also mention that the City reached another milestone with regard to the redevelopment property tax trust fund involving redevelopment. Last week, the City did receive an additional \$2.5 million of what is a disputed amount of money that is referred to as the sequestered money that was at the Auditor Controller's office. The lawsuits have resulted in one award of \$5.8 million and this award of \$2.5 million so we are now over \$8 million that has been recovered through these legal actions and there is a third act to go through.

8. **PUBLIC HEARINGS:** None.

8a. **Public Hearing: Consideration of an Application for a Historic Resource Preservation (Mills Act) Agreement for the Property Addressed as 815 Alameda Boulevard (HP 2015-01 City of Coronado) and Provide Direction to Staff Regarding Annual Prioritization of New Mills Act Agreement Applications.** Tricia Olsen, Associate Planner, provided the staff report.

Mayor Tanaka referred to page 153 and the Mills Act waiting list and asked if that is reflective of the 50% cap.

Ms. Olsen responded by saying that it is reflective of the 50% cap but the proposed exclusions are not included in the estimated impact to the City. Once that is factored in by the County Assessor, the estimated impact to the City would, in theory, go down a bit because the property owner would not be receiving a tax break for the value of those improvements.

Councilmember Sandke commented that it has been discussed a couple of times that the calculation for what it costs the City is probably overstated in that once one of these properties that has been granted a Mills Act changes hands, the reevaluation of the property that takes place by the County during that transaction bumps up that value. So you might still have 50% but it might be 50% of a bigger number. Is it just simply too hard to calculate and anticipate and is that why we go with this simple straightforward formula? It is not quite as dire, from a financial standpoint, as it seems and when we talk about \$10,000, \$20,000, \$30,000 or \$40,000 per year, he thinks that nobler goal of producing historic preservation in our Coronado built environment is pretty darn good. If we can promote that through a different look of what it will "cost" the City, maybe that does us all a little favor.

Ms. Olsen explained that the way that we calculate the impact to the City is using the current value as given to us by the County tax assessor. They provide an estimate for the City. We use the estimated impact to the City as the percentage that the City foregoes of the property tax revenue based upon the current assessed value of the property.

Councilmember Downey followed up on Mr. Sandke's comments. She thanked Ms. Olsen for everything that was included in the packet as it was exactly what she was looking for. She understands using the current value for the ones going forward because we don't know when it will change hands. As far as she can tell, we have never gone back and looked at the impact for the ones that have already been approved. We know what the impact was at the time but we don't know if that has changed.

Ms. Olsen explained that the numbers shown for the previously approved properties are shown in real numbers that she receives from the County tax assessor. The numbers show the actual restricted value and the impact to the City. Attachment 3 is all actual numbers. Each property is reevaluated each year and she receives new numbers each year.

Ms. Downey asked if we have ever compared whether or not we were accurate with what we said the expected impact to the City would be and what it actually was to find out if it cost us as much as we thought.

Ms. Olsen commented that there are a few places in the report where you may be able to see that in action. Usually you can tell as it will be a pretty low number in one year followed by a pretty big jump. She referred to 611 A Avenue as an example. In 2013, the impact to the City was \$7,663. In 2014, the impact was \$18,873 because it changed hands in that year.

Ms. Downey added that it would not be possible to know whether the sale of the property was affected by the fact that there is a Mills Act contract on the property.

Mayor Tanaka began by suggesting that the City move 815 Alameda into the Mills Act.

MSUC (Sandke/Woiwode) moved that the City Council approve a Mills Act Agreement for 815 Alameda Boulevard.

Councilmember Downey understands the \$15,000 fiscal cap and wanted the public to know that the City has raised it several times. She has been happy to raise it because the City has the funds and she is happy to encourage historic preservation. She doesn't like the fact that 1027 F Avenue is not going to be able to participate until 2028 and she is trying to figure out what we could do.

Mayor Tanaka thinks that Ms. Downey is leading into the next discussion. This motion will just decide whether this one home goes into the Mills Act. He would like to do the one that staff has listed to get it out of the way procedurally.

AYES:	Bailey, Downey, Sandke, Woiwode, Tanaka
NAYS:	None
ABSTAINING:	None
ABSENT:	None

Mayor Tanaka continued by saying there have been several past practices. One was a cap of \$5,000 in terms of lost revenue, then \$10,000, then \$15,000. By the time we got up to \$15,000 as a cap, there was a bigger problem as there were too many homes queued up and we weren't processing them fast enough with a dollar cap and so we moved away from a fixed cap. We had 35 homes and we said we would do seven a year and over five years we pushed all 35 through. Right now, there are 31 homes and then there are an additional five more that have applied but still need to finish the application process. One way of going forward is doing the same kind of math and saying seven a year was a prudent way as you don't fully know what it is going to cost in the future. Some people have a greater comfort level that maybe those concerns are being overstated. Do we want to keep going with the number seven? Do we want to move these homes faster? The most aggressive thing would be to move 31 of them through in a year or two years and he would say that he is not convinced that is the right way to go. His preference would be to start at the discussion of keeping the number at seven or are there three Council members that want to move more aggressively than seven per year.

Councilmember Woiwode thinks the progress we have made in the past is a good template for the future. Seven would take us to about \$40,000 if we took them in the sequence in which they are listed. Another thing the Council is being asked is to determine whether that is the right sequence. If we assume that it was, it seems like a manageable bite and he would be happy to see the City do seven again this year.

Mayor Tanaka asked if anyone is opposed to continuing with first come, first served. The alternative would be to let HRC prioritize the list. He thinks that earlier on, when the City was newer to this, there was a desire to prioritize. We are not early on anymore and have put 70 something through the Mills Act. We are at a point now where we are trying to process people.

Ms. Downey thinks that HRC is currently providing the list in a prioritized order.

Ms. Olsen offered clarification. Prioritization has been in place as long as she has been here. The way it works is applications submitted within a calendar year are given to the HRC for prioritization regarding various aspects of historic significance. A property could move ahead of

properties from other years. There is a weighted application date value that sort of keeps them down toward the bottom but it is not unheard of for an application to jump ahead of one submitted the year before.

Mayor Tanaka stands corrected. Are we comfortable keeping the process that is in place?

Councilmember Sandke feels seven is a good number. He was under the impression that we were still doing some type of dollar limit. He thinks predictability would be nice, though. Maybe that is something the Council wants to look at. Predictability in government is a good thing. He understands both sides of that discussion.

Mayor Tanaka thinks it is a good thing that the City hasn't heard complaints or at least not many complaints about the current process. Hopefully that process has created some of that predictability.

Ms. Downey agrees with seven. That is exactly what she was thinking as it worked in the past. She understood Mr. Sandke's concern and that is why the HRC does it independent of anyone else because we trust that they are the experts. She is comfortable leaving it up to HRC.

Councilmember Bailey thinks that the question is how much the City really values historic preservation. He thinks this Council, in general, really does value historic preservation. He thinks the community values historic preservation. The Mills Act serves as an incentive to preserve our historic homes. Because of that, he thinks the community would support the Council if it wanted to get more aggressive in terms of processing these applications sooner. He would be in favor of becoming more aggressive with that, whether that is increasing the cap or increasing the number of homes we allow each year. It doesn't sound like the rest of the Council would necessarily support that but if anyone is open to discussing that further, he would be supportive of that.

Mayor Tanaka likes the number seven.

Mr. Woiwode thinks the seven Mayor Tanaka described is different than the seven he had in mind. Ms. Downey agreed. Mayor Tanaka asked if the Council wants to count Items 2-7 as one property, which they agreed. There seemed to be agreement on Items 1-12.

MS (Woiwode/Downey) moved that the City Council approve Mills Act Agreements for properties 2-12 on the Mills Act Waiting List.

Mayor Tanaka asked if the motion includes the idea that Council policy is to try to move seven of these at a time through the Mills Act.

Mr. Woiwode is not sure the Council is being asked that question.

Mayor Tanaka thinks staff has asked for direction. The City Attorney suggested that these items could be bifurcated.

Mr. King commented that there is one issue. With regard to this year, pursuant to Municipal Code section 84.10.10, a public hearing is required. This public hearing was advertised for this one unit, 815 Alameda. If the Council wishes to consider the others without announcing its intention with

regard to how it might vote, as that has to be preserved for the public hearing, staff could be directed to place the next six houses for a public hearing to be heard by the Council as soon as the public notification is completed.

MSUC (Woiwode/Downey) moved that the City Council direct staff to agendize a public hearing to consider Mills Act Agreements for properties 2-12 on the Mills Act Waiting List.

AYES: Bailey, Downey, Sandke, Woiwode, Tanaka
NAYS: None
ABSTAINING: None
ABSENT: None

Mayor Tanaka reported that the City Attorney was wondering whether the Council wanted to make a motion for future direction to staff on Mills Act Agreements.

Councilmember Downey likes predictability and the number seven but the next seven happen to have some large numbers associated with them. She knows it doesn't help with predictability but we almost might want to come back and look at them. The next seven become real money. The Council might want to think about that. She likes getting away from the \$15,000 cap but she doesn't want to tie the next Council's hands.

Mayor Tanaka suggested that perhaps there is consensus to just leave this as it is.

Mr. Woiwode offered the idea of saying seven, provided they don't go over some certain number. Would that be sufficient guidance to give staff something to shoot for? He suggested seven provided that the number does not go over \$50,000.

MSUC (Woiwode/Bailey) moved that the City Council direct staff to target seven properties per year for inclusion in the Mills Act program provided that the fiscal impact to the City does not exceed \$50,000.

AYES: Bailey, Downey, Sandke, Woiwode, Tanaka
NAYS: None
ABSTAINING: None
ABSENT: None

Mayor Tanaka opened the public hearing and seeing no one wishing to speak on the item, the public hearing was closed.

9. **ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS:** None.

10. **COMMISSION AND COMMITTEE REPORTS:** None.

11. **CITY COUNCIL BUSINESS:**

11a. **Council Reports on Inter-Agency Committee and Board Assignments.** No reports.

11b. Receive Report on the Potential Range of Improvements to State Route 75/282 (Third and Fourth Streets) and Provide Direction to Staff. Ed Walton, City Engineer, introduced Dawn Wilson, consultant on the project.

Dawn Wilson, registered traffic engineer and civil engineer, Fehr and Peers, provided the report.

Councilmember Bailey talked about the no right turn on red. Ms. Wilson mentioned that might cause backup further down Orange, which might lead to further diversion on other streets. Mr. Bailey asked how many people are turning right currently when the signal is red?

Ms. Wilson will look that number up and get back to Mr. Bailey.

Councilmember Downey was hoping to see some kind of modeling to figure out how to count diversion. She wanted to be clear that from Ms. Wilson's educated opinion there is not a current model in existence that could count that diversion, both what currently exists as diversion and what would or would not be caused by some of these proposed changes.

Ms. Wilson explained that there are ways we can monitor existing traffic patterns. It is not a traffic model. It is actually taking data that we can collect from Bluetooth-type technology that can show exactly paths people take every day on the island. What we can then do is use that to change how people's travel times might differ if we implemented different traffic calming measures. We have a lot of data that can support what kind of delay would be imposed based on the things that we are suggesting. With that we can then go ahead and reroute traffic. It is not necessarily going into a computer software. We use a mathematical algorithm to redo that. She doesn't know if that is going to give any better results than human nature understanding how humans reallocate their trips. There are ways we can get a ton of data to do that but she doesn't think the model is the right way to do that.

Ms. Downey commented that, if at the end of today the Council agrees on something and wanted further study, that is something Ms. Wilson could study for us. She could show us that, based on these two things, this is what she would predict would happen.

Ms. Wilson agreed and said that they could tell exactly how people are travelling and where they are going and there is months and months of data that can be collected for that and presented.

Ms. Downey continued by saying that she would be able to tell us what would be predicted to happen if we put a stop light in.

Councilmember Woiwode referred to the use of the term road diet. How did she look at that? He didn't see a discussion of reducing the number of lanes anywhere, from three to two for instance.

Ms. Wilson explained that as part of the alternatives analysis process they looked at reducing the lanes on the west side of Orange from three down to two. In particular, we took the parking lane and allowed that to be a flex lane so that during peak periods you could use that as travel and during off peak periods that would be used as parking. When we presented that back to the community and they did micro simulation modeling to see what the types of delays would be and what the queues would be with that kind of a situation, they received very negative responses back

to that type of a treatment. Therefore, they did not proceed with that as part of their recommendations that are being presented this evening.

Mr. Woiwode asked, if you have two lanes instead of three, would any of the crossing devices function differently or would that present an opportunity, for instance, for a refuge.

Ms. Wilson responded that a refuge island would need to be placed in the center of a two-way roadway and not in a one-way roadway.

Mr. Woiwode referred to the report where it talks about the traffic calming measures being done in conjunction with the signals. If they are not done in conjunction with the signals, then additional analysis would be needed and potentially extra measures would be needed. He asked Ms. Wilson to talk to that a little further.

Ms. Wilson explained that in the recommendations they have put forth, one thing that they looked at was the spacing of the different devices. As you go along the corridor, their objective is every two to three blocks for there to be a treatment. What that will do is create this constant and consistent 25 mph speed. If we take out the signals, for example, which is one of the measures we can use through the coordination of the traffic signals to maintain that 25 mph speed, other devices may be recommended whether they are speed tables or curb extensions or other measures to help maintain that speed because one of those devices will come out of the overall plan.

Mr. Woiwode commented that taking the signals out would not necessarily mean you couldn't still do the traffic calming measures but you may need additional ones. What would suffer would be the crossing ability.

Ms. Wilson agreed and commented that is their greatest benefit to the community – the north-south connectivity.

Mr. Woiwode summarized that they are less about traffic calming and more about crossing.

Mr. Bailey asked to see the slide that spoke to the service level west of Orange along Third and Fourth. What jumped out to him is obviously the service level is better, not great but better, on Third Street than Fourth Street. He is guessing that is because of the traffic signal that exists currently on Orange Avenue.

Ms. Wilson responded that it is primarily because in the afternoon peak, the levels of service they are presenting on Third are for the morning peak and on Fourth for the afternoon peak and the delay on the side streets for vehicles trying to cross Third and Fourth exceed the acceptable delay for crossing. It is the queues that form along Fourth and the lack of gaps in traffic when the queue isn't there that is making it hard for the cars to get across.

Mr. Bailey asked if there are more gaps along Third Street because of that signal on Orange Avenue.

Ms. Wilson explained that part of the situation on Third is that the traffic actually clears through before the morning peak actually occurs and when the morning peak is at its greatest, there is not a lot of crosstown traffic because it is very early in the morning so the two are not coinciding with

one another. Mr. Bailey does have a point that at Orange it is holding the traffic every 160 seconds. When it is resting and green, you get a good 30 to 40 second gap between the next platoon of vehicles that head down Third. That does create some gaps in traffic. It is probably a balance of the two.

Patrick Garahan, CTC Chairperson, also provided a report on the CTC recommendations.

Councilmember Sandke asked why Mr. Garahan's comment about a light at Fourth and B wasn't included in the recommendations. If you went left on B from Third and you got to that Fourth and B light, you would be prohibited from going straight. You would have to turn left. That is not included in any of the analysis here.

Mr. Garahan commented that they decided they did not want to reengineer...it is included in their report. There is a picture of what the sign would be. That wasn't in the Fehr and Peers report but it is in the CTC report. He did that specifically because he wanted to respond to the constraints of those people. It is certainly true that they are aware that there are people who are not happy with their recommendations but they think this is the right thing to do to proceed. If we don't proceed, we are right back where we began and it would be a waste of two and a half years. That is not the most important part but what is are the problems here that have to be addressed and he thinks if we proceed with the engineering maybe there are things we haven't thought of. HAWKS didn't used to exist. Maybe someone can create something new.

Mr. Walton offered additional comments.

The City Council went into recess at 6:40 pm.

The City Council reconvened at 6:51 pm.

Mayor Tanaka asked for a count of those supporting the recommendations. There were 14 in support.

Mayor Tanaka asked for a count of those opposing the recommendations. There were 61 opposed.

Mayor Tanaka asked for a count of those in favor of all but the traffic signals. There were 36 in support of all but the traffic signals.

Mayor Tanaka invited public comment.

Claudia Holman commented that if you go over to the high school, you will see literally hundreds of bikes parked by the office. You think this is awesome. It is great that hundreds of kids can safely ride their bikes to school. They must feel safe, too, because only about half of those bikes have helmets hanging off the handlebars. What is being presented here today will unleash something on these unsuspecting kids that they are not prepared for. Adding stoplights to the Third and Fourth Street corridor will not make our neighborhood streets safer. It is misleading to claim enhanced safety on the highway if there is increased endangerment on the side streets. The experience and caution necessary to negotiate with a stream of commuter drivers who are in a hurry to beat the light and find a short cut around it will be a challenge for kids on bikes. We are told that synchronizing the lights will keep the traffic on the highway. So, the motorcyclist exiting

from the base who cannot even keep to his lane but has to squeeze between lanes in his haste to get over the bridge is going to patiently wait at a red light. She doesn't believe it. We are also told to look at the Grape/Hawthorn Street corridor downtown as an example of synchronization that works. We are asked to compare it with our Third and Fourth Street corridor; however, according to SANDAG, the Grape/Hawthorn area has a daily average of only 20,000 cars compared to Coronado's daily average of 70,000 or more. Have you ever picked up your college student at the airport on the Wednesday afternoon before Thanksgiving? That is what it will be like in Coronado every day and diverted traffic is not a problem in the downtown business corridor. They welcome it. It has been great for the businesses in Little Italy. One can find an expert to defend almost any point of view; leaving this decision of traffic lights to yet another study is avoiding the responsibility that this City Council has to keep our kids safe. Bicycle lobbying groups who want a green light from the ferry to the Hotel Del have been heard. It is understood that their idea of a bike friendly town means more bike tourism. But a bike friendly town to some of us means save our streets for the residents, young and old. Save it for biking to Von's, to school, to the library or to a doctor's appointment. More traffic lights will not serve the interests or the safety of Coronado residents and that should be the primary concern of the City Council. Recently, a late night TV comedian said that Coronado is like a utopia. If it is a utopia, it is due to a City Council willing to listen to residents who care enough to speak up.

Jason Pettit wants to keep his children safe and his neighborhood quiet. Before we go too far into public comment, he would like to remind everyone that we have dealt with several emotional issues over the past few Council meetings – save the beach, bike lanes and now the traffic study. Each case has been a civics lesson on how representative government should and does work. He thanked the members of the Council for upholding their oath to represent the interests of the majority of Coronado. Today is another one of those days when the Council will be tested by informed and misinformed opinions. Today, you consider the recommendations of the Third and Fourth Street Traffic Study. Not all the recommendations in the study reflect the consensus of the community that participated in the workshops. This is a very important point as many believe that the study is solely the result of community input at these workshops. It is not. The study documents as fact, on page 1.1, "...it should be noted that although there was a lack of support for traffic signals along the corridor, the recommended concept plan does include new traffic signals on both the east and west side of Orange Avenue." The community expressed a concern that if traffic signals are installed the traffic along north and south streets would increase and affect the quality of life for residents who own property along the streets affected. Nothing has changed. By definition, the study reflects some of the input of the community and some recommendations made by the experts. It is the Council's job today to direct staff to take actions that do represent the wishes of the citizens of Coronado. He has lived in Coronado for most of his life. Over the years, most steps we have taken as a community, with regard to traffic, have been designed to redirect traffic onto Third, Fourth and Orange and keep traffic out of our residential neighborhoods. Now we want to make Third and Fourth obstacle courses. He does not believe this is the right solution and will be counterproductive to the steps already taken to direct traffic onto these streets. Please also keep in mind the official name of the study is the Third and Fourth Streets study. Proponents of the study refer to it as the traffic calming study. This serves to manipulate the psychology of the audience. Calming is a good thing. How could anything in a calming study be wrong? This is exactly what is intended and meant to make you think less critically of the recommendations in the study. He does not want lights. He does not want more traffic in our neighborhoods. He wants his family to be safe and his neighborhood to be quiet. If you direct staff today to pursue any of the recommendations in the study, please also direct them to apply the following principles: work

with Caltrans to design the lights so that they let pedestrians and the cars of residents transit Third and Fourth safely and design them so that traffic from Third and Fourth are not redirected into our neighborhoods.

Phil Monroe commented that he can't believe that the Council was presented a professional summary of traffic and you had a bunch of data points as one single number like the time it takes to go from Fourth to the Hotel Del is six minutes. He has 90 data points and the Council should be presented a control chart that shows the average, the upper, and lower control limits so that the Council has an idea of what the variation is there. That is just not six minutes. It varies by four minutes in the summer, it varies by the time of day, and to have that show up as six minutes is just not a professional presentation. They referred to Grape and Hawthorn. It does move fast once you get on Grape. But look at the queue to get to Grape. That queue to get to Grape is sometimes a quarter mile or a half-mile. The last two times he came from the airport the taxi driver got over on the right hand lane and went down Harbor so he didn't have to wait to get on Grape. He thinks that is a fallacious summary to be presented to the Council. Finally, they talk about sequencing lights coming off the base coming down Fourth. What they forget about is the traffic that comes down First, goes over Orange and then turns left and goes down to B. What is going to happen? All of Fourth Street goes, the sequence changes, B Street goes red and what happens? First Street traffic comes and goes and they fill the queue up all the way back to Orange Avenue. Do you need a computer to tell you that is going to happen? Then it goes green at Orange for Fourth and guess what? The lanes are all full. It is a tough story.

Mona Kelley pointed out that nobody has addressed the EPA of the noise and the pollution that these cars will create stopping and going. In 1994, some residents of Third and Fourth Street sued Caltrans and the City of Coronado. They won. It was based on the noise that the cars were creating based on EPA standards. This is public record. She appreciates all the studies but it is so simple. It is a state highway. The Highway Patrol cars are idled at the tollbooth. They can monitor that state highway for the speed. She is not in favor of the traffic lights because it will just pollute our neighborhoods and that is what she is concerned about.

Candy Tyler is against the traffic lights. She referred to the statements that were made about flooding and diversion. At the corner of Fifth and Pomona, on any given afternoon, she welcomes you to come and sit in her front yard because the traffic is backed up nine, ten, twelve cars deep. If there are any incidents on the bridge, it is a parking lot in front of her house. If you put traffic lights on Third and Fourth, it will make it worse. She has been accused of being one of those people who say "not in my backyard." All of Coronado is her backyard and it is everyone's backyard and we need to protect it. Keep it on Third and Fourth and get it out of here as fast as you can.

Nigel Barker commented that we heard how traffic lights improve safety. We can look at two state highways, Orange and Third and Fourth Street as a combination, and compare Orange Avenue with its eight sets of traffic lights between First and Pomona and compare it with the two traffic lights on Third and Fourth. He got the data from the annual traffic reports, 2009-2012, and also some correspondence on 2013 and 2014. If you look at this data, you will find that Orange, in those six years, saw 338 accidents. On Third and Fourth combined, there were 244 accidents. There are 39% more accidents on Orange with its eight sets of traffic lights than there are on Third and Fourth. That simple data isn't really the easy answer either because if you look at traffic density, we know that Third and Fourth is much higher. East of Orange, Third and Fourth have

two and a half times the traffic density of Orange. West of Orange it is 20% greater. He did a little bit of factoring to try to get some sort of average. When you do that normalized against traffic density what you find is you had greater than twice the chance of being in an accident on Orange than you did on Third and Fourth over those six years. There are accidents and then there are accidents and we have heard about injury accidents. He only had data for 2013 for injury accidents. When you look at 2013, there were 41 injury accidents on Orange and 30 injury accidents on Third and Fourth. Again, that is 37% more and when you normalize you get the same result. You were two and a quarter times more likely to be injured in an accident on Orange in 2013 than you were on Third and Fourth. That doesn't tell you the level of injury. We have heard about deaths on these streets. Between 2004 and 2012, there were nine fatalities in Coronado. The locations of four of them show three on the Strand and one on Glorietta. Traffic lights really have not improved traffic safety where they have been placed.

Pat Cantelme voiced his support for a light at the very least at Fourth Street and Alameda where the base exits mainly based on the fact that the amount of traffic noise created by the vehicle noise constantly braking and accelerating is problematic. There is a great deal of noise caused by that and he believes that a smoother flow of traffic caused by a light that would, during the peak hours such as shift change, give preference to those vehicles exiting east onto Fourth Street would reduce the overall noise for the residents that do live in that area. That is a very high volume area for traffic. Based on the reports that we have seen, he does believe that is a place where it really does make sense to install a traffic light.

David Fairbank spoke about the folks on Third and Fourth Street who were complaining about the speeding and the traffic on Third and Fourth and you folks responded to that by commissioning this study for traffic calming. As a result of the study, from our Police Department and all, we have learned that speeding is not really the problem. It is the congestion and the crossing that is the problem. If you ask the wrong question, you are going to get the wrong answer. We asked for a traffic calming study and that is what we got, which is traffic lights and narrowed lanes and bulbouts and it will slow traffic down. It will make it more congested and you will get side effects of it as leakage around the edge into the adjacent streets, the increased noise, the increased pollution. You sort of get what you asked for. Perhaps we should have asked a better question. The better question would be crossing for pedestrians along the Third and Fourth corridor and can we do this without lights. It is a difficult question but it is the question that is now being posed to the Council because democracy is raising its ugly head here and we don't want the traffic lights. He hopes the Council will be responsive to that. It is a difficult question but should the Council accept the traffic report of the committee? Of course it should. Should the Council accept all their recommendations? That is a tough one. As the report is sent onto staff that should be done with some direction based on the values of the community. The values of the community are we need safe pedestrian crossings and we are learning that we really don't want the traffic signals. That is not the route we want to take. If you ask the right question, you are more likely to come up with the right answer.

Valerie Barker raised three issues with the Council. First of all, although calls for the synchronized lights on Third and Fourth are based on a desire for safety, there is no empirical evidence that supports the value of those lights, especially when you examine what happens with lights on Orange Avenue where there are many more accidents and less traffic. The second thing she wanted to mention is that as a community, obviously, we want to facilitate crossing on Third and Fourth Streets and make them safer. She did share with a Council member, some months ago, a Federal

Highway Commission study regarding the value for crossings, showed diminished accidents and less injuries because of those. We also have one of those on Bear Boulevard in south San Diego. Please support that idea. It seems to work. Third, she would like to ask, respectfully, if the Council members would consider directing some pointed questions to the CTC. It seems to her that the study they commissioned was so narrow in its parameters that the findings were totally unsurprising. She would ask why it is that the commissioners, knowing every year that this City produces a traffic report, didn't consider the wider picture and consider what is already happening in the town instead of focusing something in a vacuum essentially. Therefore, she would suggest to the Council that Caltrans will be studying those traffic reports very carefully and they will be studying what Chief Froomin has said about the traffic accidents in this town, one of them being, as someone said, that often speed is unrelated to the number of accidents that take place. That is not to say that we like speed but we have to be realistic and look at the empirical evidence instead of coming from a knee jerk position.

Michael Schmid wanted to voice his opposition to all the traffic lights. He could not find a study anywhere that linked traffic safety and calming to having traffic signals. The biggest thing, as we started this whole process, was the safety and reducing speed. What we seemed to get out of it was raising the speed limit to 30 mph. He thinks that the best thing that could be done would be to try to reexamine getting Caltrans to either lower the speed limit or make them responsible for calming the traffic with their resources.

John Campbell has been following this for the last couple of years. Tonight he heard these studies and these recommendations but he never heard what the goal of this whole thing is. He knows that seems to be a concern of a lot of the residents. He also noticed that there was a recommendation for a traffic light outside his bedroom window. In the morning, it is bumper to bumper going into the base. He accepts the traffic going in and out of the base. He is just not sure what the goal is of this. There are laws about speed limits and ordinances about noise. To do all these traffic lights and add all this unknown to the City of Coronado is a step in the wrong direction.

Mayor Tanaka asked what Mr. Campbell thought about the proposals concerning cul-de-sacs that would be near his house.

Mr. Campbell saw the study and saw that it takes 50 or 80 feet to cross the street. The kids walk in the crosswalk and he has never seen a near accident. The only near accident he saw was when they do the annual bike ride around town and he saw them shooting up H and turning onto Third without even stopping. Putting a light on F and Third and H and Third outside his house...he doesn't think it would make a difference.

Councilmember Bailey asked a question about his kids crossing Fourth Street. He asked what kind of gaps they experience when they are crossing the street. Are there significant gaps?

Mr. Campbell responded that there aren't the same gaps crossing Fourth as Third because Third has the Orange Avenue light, as the study pointed out. But coming down Fourth, you have people stopping, going, stopping, going, at the four-way stop sign at Alameda so there is not a consistent gap. The kids go to Palm and Fourth where the crosswalk is and even though there is not a pedestrian walking sign there they will stand there and the people will eventually stop and they will get to cross. That is a little tricky spot for them in the morning but coming back after school there is no light needed because it is bumper to bumper. They go to the crosswalk and the cars are

stopped anyway all the way back to H and I and then they cross and come back. The other concern is that his in-laws live on the 400 block of B. They grew up crossing there and sometimes they would cross B and Fourth but you have to be smart and you have to walk over to Orange to cross, especially if you are a pedestrian. If there is a traffic light on Fourth, past Orange, his concern is people racing to try to get through that light.

Scott Seggerman pointed out that Ms. Wilson referenced data and public input representing over 125 people that had attended her meeting. He pointed out that represents less than one half of one percent of the residents of Coronado. Therefore, 99 1/2 % or more of the residents of Coronado had zero input into her statistics. He complimented Mr. Sandke on his observation that per her findings, if people were to choose B Avenue as a route to get to the Hotel Del, and save 30 seconds to do so, wouldn't that, in effect turn B Avenue into another Orange Avenue? In relation to that, he hasn't traveled the entire street of B but he has a close friend who owns a house there. He drove down the street yesterday and just between Fifth and Fourth on B he believes there are between 16 and 18 residences. He only counted 5 yards that did not have a 'no traffic lights' sign in their yard. He doesn't know what it is like between Third and Fourth. We have a wonderful town and one of the most charming aspects of this town is the guarded cross walks that we provide for the school children at Third and Fourth during rush hour so they can get to school safely. It is a wonderful thing. It is far more warm and enchanting than traffic lights ever will be and he thinks it is a lot safer. He would encourage the City to stay with those. It is a cheaper alternative to putting traffic lights in. He spoke to the person who spoke who lives near Fourth and Alameda. He lives on Alameda. He wouldn't be against a light there but he would request that the City strongly consider having that an all stop outside of rush hour. If you want to put a traffic light there with green and yellow and red, please limit that to rush hour. He referred to Jim Newhall who has an email that has been reproduced. He points out what has been done in Santa Barbara for underpass and overpass tunnels. Please read that recommendation to consider a tunnel if you really want pedestrian and bicycle traffic across Fourth.

Morgan Miller lives near Fourth and E. He thinks everyone has learned a lot through this process. He voted in favor of the lights but he really is not against the lights. He really liked the idea of the light just at Alameda and Fourth and just at certain times because our situation is very dependent on when that traffic is. He is against the cost of lights and he thinks that there are a lot of costs beyond money that are associated with lights and that is what we are hearing from the public. The lights may solve one problem but they may cause three other problems. He thinks that the problem really is crossing. He, too, would like to reference Jim Newhall's email. He doesn't know the cost of putting a tunnel under a road but if you didn't have a cost associated with it and that weren't a factor that would be an awesome way to alleviate the whole problem. You wouldn't need these lights because the real problem is crossing these roads during certain times when the traffic is extremely busy so he does like the Santa Barbara and Jim Newhall's idea. You could just put the one light at Fourth and Alameda because the stop sign is ineffective and there is no gap to cross. That is why you see the difference between Third and Fourth.

Michael Channick has a very strong concern about the deceptive nature of lights on Fourth, particularly, in protecting our children. He thinks they will give the children a false sense of security, particularly as was just mentioned, when people come off that base and they know if they can get through the light at B after they leave Orange they are off the island. He thinks people will go through that stop sign or through that traffic light, particularly as it goes from yellow to red,

and he thinks there are going to be kids who are just going to be heading out there because they want to get home. He thinks that is something we need to think about very carefully.

Brad Gerbel thanked Ms. Wilson and F & P for their report. They put a lot of work into it and there are some good things in it. He doesn't think anyone has mentioned that there are really good things in that report. He thinks it would be great if we did raised crosswalks on Third and Fourth. He thinks it would be great if we did a light on Fourth and Alameda that was a red and green light during the busy time of the day and a flashing red light on all sides for the rest of the day. He also thinks speed tables on Third and Fourth would be a wonderful thing. They are raceways. It would be wonderful if cars had to slow down a little bit. He doesn't think the whole report should be thrown away as there are good things in it. He is opposed to the lights but all of those other things are great.

Toni McGowan thinks we have all learned a lot together. We have been talking about this for a couple of years. She certainly doesn't know everything but she does know that everyone here has worked hard. All in all, she would like to say is that what people forget is that Third and Fourth Streets is a neighborhood. To say something like the cars should just get in and out as fast as they can is so disrespectful. She lives on that street. It is not just a state highway. It is a residential district. One of the problems about crossing at the light on Orange is that it has an F rating. For anyone to direct children there and say that this is where you should cross is irresponsible for adults to do. Those are things that need to be fixed. She doesn't have a position on the lights. She never has. We are at the point now where if we have to throw out some of it then we can do that but we all have a responsibility to do something. To leave it as it is now is not leaving a good future for our children. She understands the position of the B Avenue residents. We can't do nothing anymore. The volume won't allow that and we are just going to get more. She hopes that when the Council makes its considerations, it remembers that first of all it needs to represent her safety as much as B Avenue. She pays the same amount of taxes and she deserves the Council's representation as well. She'd like the Council to think about the creative aspects in that study that are good and that add some beauty to our neighborhood, some safety to our cars. She has the bulbout. Her car has not been hit since it was put it. It really is protective. We need our cars parked there. Everyone wants our cars to stop parking there so they can see to jet across but the cars protect the homes there. She trusts the Council with this. They worked hard to get it to the Council so that the Council can piece it out and wrestle it out and come up with something that does work for everybody. She totally believes in the creativity of human beings. She wants everyone to remember that Third and Fourth Streets are a neighborhood and they want to be recognized just like every other one.

Betsy McKee began by saying that they have had a pretty idyllic life in many ways but they have worked hard for it. From a young age they taught their kids that crossing Third and Fourth Streets was completely off limits. If they had activities which required crossing these streets they had two choices – cross at the light on Orange Avenue or ride their bike, with a helmet, on the bike path under the bridge. This was non-negotiable. Now, 20 years later, we are faced with the possibility of traffic lights at Third and Fourth Streets at B Avenue. City engineering staff has stated that if lights are constructed, we can expect an increase of conservatively 1,400 additional vehicles. Why would you consider diverting heavy commuter traffic to a pedestrian-friendly residential street where many families with young children bike and walk to parks and local schools? We have already experienced a dramatic increase in truck traffic since the Pomona roundabout, which many large vehicles cannot negotiate. Since the inception of GPS which directs drivers to turn left on B

Avenue, we have had an increase in traffic. Diverting Third and Fourth Street corridor traffic onto less traveled streets is a bad idea. Those of us who are opposed to traffic lights have been vilified by those with opposing views. Her skin has thickened over the past months. She is comfortable being called a NIMBY. You'd be one too if your street was under siege.

Jonathan Dabbaeri has heard that the traffic lights will divert traffic onto B Avenue until the street is so burdened that it no longer makes sense for a driver to divert onto B Avenue. He does not want to see B Avenue become so burdened that it is no longer a useful way for people to get across town. He wants it to be restricted to those people who are using it as a residential area. The statement that as more cars use B fewer cars will use B because it will take longer to get past the stop signs made no sense to him. It is an oxymoron. The lights will divert people onto B until it is too busy and people won't go there anymore.

Kirstin Hedzinski commented that every car that enters into Coronado passes her house, her sister's house, and her mother's house. If she thought that traffic would get any worse by this program, she couldn't even imagine it. If she felt lights would work, she would be the first one to accept them but she doesn't see how making a roundabout in front of the hospital is going to improve anything. She doesn't see how lights stopping the traffic so she can have stop and go traffic every morning at 5 and 6 and 7 a.m. is going to improve anything. She is only speaking for her small corridor. She is not speaking on the other side of Orange. She is only speaking about from the toll plaza to Orange. Like Mrs. McKee, she raised two children at that location and accepted traffic there when she moved in. Her rule is the same as for Mrs. McKee. That is a state freeway. You do not cross that road. It is not safe to cross a freeway. You can go to Orange, which was her less preferred. Her children went to Sacred Heart and she made them go through Tideland Park on their bikes and go the only safe way that she believes is possible. Most of the traffic accidents on A, B and C going across Third and Fourth are caused by people who think they can shoot across Fourth Avenue which is an impossibility and Mr. Sandke was exactly right. If you prevented people from crossing Fourth off of those couplets, you would solve most of the problem. A, B and C should only allow left turns off the island. You would solve that problem. She considers it a small price to pay to walk up to Orange Avenue for a fairly safe crossing. Adding stoplights won't make it any safer. She agrees with the gentleman who said that if you do that people are going to shoot those lights to get off the island even faster and it will just create another impossible situation on Third and Fourth.

Mr. Bailey asked her what route she takes to go home.

Ms. Hedzinski goes around that corner. She has concerns about the bus stopping there and what the bulbout is going to do to the traffic and the people getting on and off there. That is also a problem. The people trying to cross there, lots of times, are people getting off the bus there. She has mixed feelings about the whole thing. She leaves her house at 6 a.m. as she has to be at work at 6:30 a.m. She does see the base traffic coming on every day. Some days it is really easy to merge onto Third coming off of there and some days it is bumper to bumper and she literally has to roll her window down to ask to let her get across. Her only way off the island is to go to Orange, make the left turn, and make the left turn off the island. She is happy to do that.

Fern Nelson appreciates everyone's work. She had the opinion in the past that sometimes the people whose homes were close to the affected areas were looked at a little more skeptically than the others and she wanted to emphasize that she knows that the City looked at everyone's views

equally. She is against street lights for a lot of reasons she has said before. She has not been a huge fan of the F & P study for a number of reasons that have been stated, one of which was that there would be no additional cars down B and then our own engineer said that there would be 1,400 cars down B so it does give one a little pause. She has also been concerned because the very nature of the F & P study was to study Third and Fourth. That totally dismissed the rest of the island and we are certainly a community. We are all in this together. She thinks we have worked fairly well together. She would prefer to see the Council not send this through to look at further. She really would hate to waste what she would call waste engineering studies looking at this. She is a little confused as to why we don't see what Caltrans will allow first in terms of speed tables, etc. as opposed to this way which she supposed had to be done. She really doesn't see us spending more money to engineer things that we are all going to argue about later. If we could possibly come up with some other solutions. She loves the underpass idea. Or let's have some more creative ideas. All we had were turnabouts and signal lights. She thinks our community is worthy of a lot more than that.

Steve Brower thanked everyone for the hard work that has gone into the study. He wanted to speak to the safety situation east of Orange on Third and Fourth and, specifically, to the one item Councilmember Sandke brought up about the change at Pomona at Third. The engineer stated at the second of the feedback sessions and the surveys related to it that the particular change had no objections to it. He thinks, when we think about the safety of the weave, we live here and we see the people cutting across Third to make the left at B. He thinks that the closure, irrespective of whether a light goes in, would be a very important safety enhancement. Secondly, he wanted to speak to the two questions that all of us have on that part of the island. Those are two concerns about speed and about safety. The AAA foundation for traffic safety did a number of studies on pedestrian safety and found that pedestrians face a 25% chance of severe injury if they are hit by a car driving 25 mph. When the car is going 39 mph, the risk of severe injury rises to 75%. There is an imperative for calming and better speeds east of Orange. There is also an imperative for a safe crossing of Third and Fourth north and south across the island.

Jack Monger drew the Council's attention to a couple of items in the packet that included some petitions, one in particular from the Fight the Lights which has over 300 Coronado residents in opposition to the lights. He also thought it was rather interesting that there are other petitions in here supporting the lights. It is good that there are people from as far away as Auburn, Fresno, Mesa AZ, London, etc. who all have signed in support of the lights. He thinks there is some good and some bad in this plan. He wouldn't just classify it as all good or all bad. One of the items he would like to comment on is the lights. If the light is put in at Alameda and if the Navy cooperates with the idea of synchronizing their lights that light could be positive. If not, it ought to be reconsidered as it might not have the effect that the consultants are hoping for. One thing he believes that Coronadans know is that stop lights encourage scattering. All you have to do is look at Fourth Street to see what happens when those lights are red at Orange and the cars are sitting there for a few minutes. The temptation to hang a quick right and go over to Fifth or to go around and cut up an alley is all there and it happens all the time. That is one of the biggest concerns that those of us who are opposing the lights have about the impact of locating similar lights in other sections on Third and Fourth Streets. He heard the consultant make a recommendation of taking the crosswalk off of G so that people could walk a couple of blocks to a light so that people could cross more safely. That is the very same suggestion he would offer with regard to B. Do not allow crossing there. Request that pedestrians walk up to Orange, particularly those that are visiting our City and are staying over on First Street and don't know that, although it may be the most direct

route, it is not the safest. He closed by saying that he does not think the enemy here tonight is the people who disagree with each other; the people who have raised a lot of questions and made a lot of accusations of people being selfish or NIMBY's or anything. The enemy is traffic and he hopes we can stay focused on that. That is always going to be a challenge in Coronado. As the Council looks at the recommendations, he hopes it will ask if those really do benefit Coronadans. If they don't have an adverse impact then maybe they are good suggestions but if they do and they just push the problem off into another neighborhood and another side street, then that is not a good thing.

Bob Bruce would be opposed to lights. He guesses the idea is to slow down traffic and make that a little bit safer but also have safe crossings for pedestrians and bicycles. He did like the idea of maybe doing underground tunnels at two different spots, perhaps B and F, just for pedestrians and bicycles so that you could get underneath and go across Third and Fourth safely that way. As far as maybe slowing traffic down, he thought about maybe boosting the City budget a little bit and give out hundreds of tickets and just start giving tickets out and that will slow people down a little bit. He knows it is a problem. If you did stop lights at B and at F, you are going to impact people that live there severely because a lot of people have their values and their net worth in their homes and when those streets have stop lights there, they are going to be used as cross streets and they are going to become very busy and the values of those homes will drop dramatically. We need to keep that in mind for those people that do live there and those are your residents that live in Coronado and are most affected by this.

Jan Cook spoke in opposition to the stop light at Alameda and Fourth. The people are very good about alternating going through there. There is no problem getting across. They stop to let you go. One of the reasons for it is supposedly it breaks the traffic up on Fourth if you have a light there. If you have a light and the traffic is stopped on Alameda, the traffic is going to stack up on Alameda. Those people either turn left or right to go to Fourth to go out so you aren't going to have much of a break anyway and if the traffic is heavy, the people on Fourth stop and let people cross.

Tom Slattery can see the intersection of Third and B from his bedroom window. He is awoken every morning by screeching motorcycles and braking vehicles as they come roaring off of the Bridge. Let's not pretend that the traffic is not a major problem in this City. What makes Coronado so desirable is the very thing that makes it somewhat of a challenge and that is the Bridge. Property values were a fifth of what they are today before the Bridge was there. That is what made the property values rise the way they did because the island suddenly became accessible and we have now got four and a half times more traffic coming over that Bridge than its designers and builders ever anticipated. That is preposterous. We don't live in Mayberry. This is not the village hall. The City Council members are elected representatives in a 21st century city that has tens of thousands of inhabitants. People want to throw statistics about how 125 people is meaningful but it is not. We can dismiss all of those numbers as meaningless. What the Council is being asked to do is the worst thing it can ever be asked to do and that is lead. Obviously, people don't want the lights. He doesn't want the lights in some sense. It would be much nicer if they were not necessary. He accepts the need for the lights and that is what everyone in here needs to do. If not the lights, then whatever the next most appropriate level of action should be is necessary. After 50 years of nothing, do something. The CTC and City staff has recommended that the Council adopt this plan in most of its meaningful components. Listen to the experts rather than the people speaking from their emotions.

Darlene Lovell-Parker wants to just give a perspective from someone who owns a piece of property, as small as it may be, right on the corner of F and Third. She leaves her house every day between 7:30 and 8:30 a.m. Her husband goes out for a walk at 5:30 a.m. She heard from the study and the CTC that their major concern was the crossings and people being able to pass across on Third and Fourth. When you have bumper to bumper traffic, you don't have a problem crossing. There are times when they block the intersections but more signage saying not to block the intersections would be great. That is the easy part. There are times when you don't have that ability and there is constant traffic going through. She is thankful for the City-paid crossing guard for the kids. It is a neighborhood. Whether it is 50 years later or 90 years later, it is still a neighborhood. That doesn't change and they don't want it to change. Do we need a light there? No. Does she need sailors to be racing to work because they are late? No. They go on base in an orderly fashion and it is at a specific time. Does she need a light to stop them? No. That just means that it will elongate the time of traffic on our streets. Her whole block has signs except for a couple that say no lights. She asked the Council to really look at this before making a decision. The bulbout works.

Brian Wamsley thanked Ms. Wilson for her honesty and clarifying that almost their entire tasking was directed at Third and Fourth Street and according to the pie chart she showed there was actually very little input from the potentially mostly adversely affected neighborhoods. He wanted to add his voice to that of his fellow Coronado citizens who agree that the CTC recommendation for traffic lights is horribly misguided and offers little beyond an empty pledge. Quoting from the CTC's own report, they use words like they are sensitive to the situation and they also make mostly rush hour only turn restrictions to address his neighbors' other concerns. His neighborhood, south of Fourth, is already struggling with conditions running counter to what he believes all members of the City Council have dedicated themselves to and that is protecting our village atmosphere. There is little to no street parking now. His neighbors tell him about the tour buses that go up and down our street, the commercial trucks going up and down the street, and now there is a proposal for traffic lights and these lights practically shout out, "Hey, why get stuck on Orange Avenue when you can divert through this beautiful tree lined avenue?" His neighbor tells him that he has actually chatted with the restaurant delivery folks. They report that they can't wait for traffic lights. The existing and proposed signs prohibiting southbound turns during the morning rush hour will not protect his neighborhood from the dramatically increased non-rush hour traffic and the evening northbound traffic seeking to exit the island. The assertions regarding the existing stop signs and all the fancy computer modeling are, at best, non-persuasive and they defy common sense. Secondly, he wanted to thank Councilmember Bailey for recently reemphasizing that this is hopefully not an all or nothing situation and that the CTC made other recommendations that deserve the City's careful attention. It is his sincere hope that while the folly of traffic lights and their well known adverse consequences will not come to fruition, it his equally sincere hope that other roadwork, engineering solutions, crossing guards, police department presence, and other appropriate solutions can be brought to bear to increase the safety and quality of life for our neighbors who live on Third and Fourth Street but that we all share on an almost daily basis. Ultimately, he would hope for an integrated solution that includes projects such as the gateway, and getting help from the state and federal government that we require and he thinks that we deserve.

Cordell Parker feels that everything has been said but he would like to add a thought about force protection on a military base. They can slow traffic as long as they want. When they are waving

cars on and they aren't taking the little scanner and scanning ID cards that is a second to get on base. If they scan that adds ten seconds to every car and there are 20,000 cars coming on. They can affect all kinds of traffic.

Quelene Slattery would be doing any future victims of car accidents, either pedestrians or cyclists, a disservice if she didn't get up here. She didn't want to speak and feels like she is in a room full of very angry and animated people and this is extremely uncomfortable for her. She promised herself that she would not stay in the shadows and that she would do everything she could to send the message to everyone to hopefully prevent any more accidents, any more deaths like the gentleman that was killed or any more injuries like the one her son sustained. A lot of people in this room find this very amusing. She doesn't find anything amusing about it at all. She appreciates the show of hands at the beginning of the comment period. She wants to be clear that is the pulse of the room and not the pulse of the community. Most of the people in this room, probably if you took a show of hands, don't have children at home that they need to be home serving dinner to this evening. There is a large number of people in the community who have children at home and can't be here to voice their opinions today. Please keep them in mind. There are a lot of very callous attitudes, too. She has been attacked and vilified and called an irresponsible mother because she has a 16 year old son who was on his way to a job interview at a local business and was hit by a car. She has been attacked for numerous reasons as has her son. She has been attacked in the newspaper. She knows many of the Council members have as well. The reality is that these are children. We do our best to parent and teach our children but children make mistakes, as do adults. She has been called an irresponsible mother. Does that make the gentleman who was killed have an irresponsible mother, too? He wasn't wearing his helmet either. How about the vet in the wheelchair that she saw crossing the other day? Did he have an irresponsible mother? We are supposed to tell him thank you for your service but wheel your chair down to Orange Avenue, cross and then come back? How many people in this room have actually stood at the corner of Fourth and A? You can't even see the signal at Orange. The tourists who come off of the ferry and walk down B don't know there is a signal at Orange. And that signal has an F rating. She asked the Council to do what is right. It is about safety. It is not about what people want. The Council has to do what is right for safety.

Barb Anderson hears the big, mammoth trucks in the mornings and they drive right through the stop sign because they are heading for Alameda as they have to get to the base. They don't bother going down Orange or Third. They go through her residence at Ninth and I. They are like ants and are trying to get through our community any way they can. She thinks we need to invite the military to stop having these kids, one in every car. We need to go back and say to please carpool and please leave your vehicle over on the other side of the bridge. These guys will stay off the residences if you put a four-way stop sign at every intersection.

Patty Bingham commented that the problem is the commuter traffic. She loves the Navy. Her husband was in the Navy. Her daughter lives in San Francisco and takes a beautiful coach bus, with Wi-Fi, to Cupertino every day. They have bus stops all over the city. It is the future. We need to try to work with the Navy and see if we can do something like that. That would really help the traffic in Coronado and solve everyone's problems.

Susan Blanco is against the lights. She has been before the Council before to say the same thing. There are children crossing on F and to invite cars on the street with children is not safe. She likes the idea of having some kind of other metering to calm traffic. She likes the drainage dips. They

slow traffic down. She likes the raised pedestrian crossings. She likes the automatic lights at the crossings, too. She knows we have brought that up before about the HAWK lights but what about the ones that just come on, the ones you press or are in the street. She thinks you could get them through. She knows Caltrans has been an issue. She thinks the City could work with them or with the state legislature. She also thinks that civilian control at Alameda and Fourth would also work. She knows there was some discussion about lights at Fourth and Alameda but if you have someone there just during that time of traffic, just as we have the guards at the time of traffic, why do you need anyone or anything at any other time. There has been mention of having the platooning of cars using the signal lights like Hawthorn and Grape but Hawthorn and Grape have signal lights at every intersection. If that is what you are recommending, she is really against that, too. She loves the gateway project. She thinks it is a great idea. Those are ways to have access to both sides of the corridor without having signal lights. You know how we have the bridge where we narrow it down depending on the traffic? She thinks if we have one of those arrow lights on Third or Fourth you could narrow it down to where you only have two lanes which narrows traffic without having to do a lot of anything else other than that arrow that says not to go any further in that lane. She thinks that is a fabulous idea. They were doing construction on Third and Fourth and it narrowed the lanes and slowed down the traffic.

Doug Brandt commented that the basic thing he is concerned with is what happens next. He went through all the documents and there were at least ten quotes concerning CEQA. He wants CEQA to be part of this process. He thinks not many people truly understand what that means but the main contention he has with respect to this is that going forward, the City needs to look at the environmental impacts to our community. That means noise and all kinds of different pollution studies and things like that. To short circuit that in a cynical way, which he knows many towns do to just get it by and sneak it through, is not the way this should go. You are interested in what we have been talking about. There are ideas here that are going to go forward. He wants it to be done in a transparent, open way and use CEQA. Coming forward, too, he would like to know who is going to be the advocate for the people in these rooms as things evolve. How is this going to happen? He is against the traffic lights.

Mike Donovan is neither angry nor a bully and he just wanted to give his opinion on Third and Fourth Street. He believes calling Third and Fourth Streets residential streets is a non-starter. We need to be realistic. Third and Fourth Streets have not been residential streets since the bridge was built. You don't have 90,000 plus cars going down streets like that every day and call it anything but a highway. He thinks the key thing that we should be talking about here is the safety of trying to cross the street with pedestrians and bicycles. You don't need stop lights to be able to do that. He has heard a handful or more of other alternatives to safely get people across Third and Fourth. He has heard people say that they are able to get across Third and Fourth now with no changes whatsoever but we can certainly improve. Caltrans' view of Third and Fourth is the mission is to get cars on and off those streets as efficiently as possible. Get them to the base in the morning and get them off in the evening. Calling those residential streets with that many cars going up and down those streets is not right. He is an advocate of focusing on the safety aspect of how to cross Third and Fourth but we don't need stop lights to slow the traffic down, cause more congestion. It just is not going to work.

Tim Smith feels it was a bit harsh to hear the speaker say that it is not a residential street. That is clearly a very odd thing to say. A lot of us live on Third and Fourth Streets. Must he be the only one to address the elephant in the room? This is a non-problem. He is from England. They have

speed limits for a reason. The people observe them. It is not a choice. Where he is from people simply obey the law. He knows people may find that hard to imagine. The reason they obey the law is they get very healthy fines if they do not. Anyone who has been to England or travels as much as he does will know that is true. Please do not put traffic lights outside his house because there are other means to deal with this problem. We have to enforce the law. We have to enforce the noise laws. Will we look the Navy in the eye and tell them to take responsibility for some of your people, for some of their actions? Will someone back him up on that?

Kim Schmid takes a little offense to the statement that it is not a neighborhood. Third and Fourth Street corridors are still neighborhoods. Yes, she chose to buy a house on Fourth Street and yes, she thought the speed limit was 25 mph. The average speed in front of her house, as shown in the reports, is 39 mph. That was always her drive and her passion with this report – to calm the traffic so that the speeds could be 25 mph. Yes, she is very concerned for her children. Her main concern is to calm the traffic and get the speeds down and then people would be more courteous and would be more apt to be able to cross if people were going slower. If people could drive respectfully on her corridor from Orange to the Bridge, it would be an entirely different world. But everyone has been taught to drive like it is a highway there. That it is allowed to be 40 mph without getting a ticket and so people don't stop. Her husband is in a wheelchair and when he crosses the street, people honk at him if they have to hit their brakes for a man in a wheelchair. The attitude of the people who are driving that street in front of her house is appalling. Between 1 p.m. and 7 p.m. she cannot back out of her driveway because there is no space, people are rude, they won't stop, they won't slow down. There are so many issues and they are all based around speed. If the speeds would slow down and people's attitudes would come to look at that as a residential street, which it is, then she thinks that so many of these problems with crossing and safety and bicycles and whatever would solve themselves.

Councilmember Downey stated that she will be recusing herself. The way we have structured the meeting today there are several groups of recommendations. Two of the recommendations that the Council will be considering would require her to recuse herself and so, under California law, what we are doing is we are basically segmenting those two areas so she will leave the dais and the Council can talk about the two. The two issues are one of the recommendations was to put that "stay clear" on the roadway on Fourth and D. She personally doesn't think painting that on the street has anything to do with the value of a house she owned where she raised her children but someone in the State of California thinks it might raise the value or decrease the value of her house so she has to step out for that and, to avoid anyone suing the City because there was a conflict of interest when we discussed it, she will be leaving the room just for that discussion. The second one is the recommendations for the speed table that is on Third near D Avenue. Again, they think somehow that will raise or decrease the value as she owns a house on D between Third and Fourth. She will recuse herself. The Council will talk about those and do whatever they want to do and then she will come back to do the rest of the discussion going forward.

Mayor Tanaka explained that the State of California presumes that we have a conflict financially if we live within 500 feet of an improvement. In this case, Ms. Downey has property within 500 feet of two of the recommendations so we will go only to those two. He asked the Council to refer to page 193, Items H and I are the two items. Item H is a suggestion that there be a speed table on Third Street west of D Avenue. Does anyone have a problem with that? Council consensus was to keep that in the mix for something to look at. Does anyone have anything stronger in terms of what they want to do with Item H? Item I is "Keep Clear" pavement markings at Third Street and

C, Fourth Street and D. We have already done “Keep Clear” at Orange and Second. He feels like those are working. He can’t imagine we would have a problem with Item I. Does anyone have a problem with I? Council consensus was to keep that in the mix of things that we want looked at and worked on in the future.

Mr. Sandke asked if we need a separate motion to move those forward.

MSUC (Sandke/Bailey) moved that the City Council direct staff to commence with further study of Item H – Speed table on Third west of D Avenue and Item I – “Keep Clear” pavement markings at Third Street and C Avenue; and Fourth Street and D Avenue.

AYES:	Bailey, Sandke, Woiwode, Tanaka
NAYS:	None
ABSTAINING:	None
ABSENT:	None
RECUSED:	Downey

Councilmember Downey returned to the dais.

Mayor Tanaka referred to the comment that the Bridge went in in 1969. He thinks that is a fair place to start historically. Obviously before the Bridge, there was ferry service. People would line up on Orange Avenue all the way up to Orange and First. He has been told that people kind of enjoyed it. He has been told that when there was talk about putting a bridge in in the 1960s, many of Coronado’s best citizens didn’t want the Bridge and they weren’t real excited about the idea but we got it anyway and something we all can agree on is that when the Bridge came in, the Bridge and the traffic planning for Third and Fourth – Coronado has never been the same on those two streets. His story with Coronado goes back to 1983. He remembers Coronado the same way he has heard other people describe it. We have the Bridge on one side of town and NASNI on the other. Third and Fourth Streets each have three lanes. They each have a primary objective of moving people from the Bridge to the base or from the base to the Bridge. We have heard the number of, at our worst, the bridge gets 90,000 trips per day. He wants to be clear that 90,000 doesn’t mean 90,000 individual different drivers. It probably means to divide that by two. People who drive in drive out. Nonetheless, we have a huge number of cars that come in and out of Coronado every day and he likes to tell people that it is like our own Padre or Charger game and it happens every morning and every afternoon. Coronado is not like Jack Murphy stadium or Petco Park where there are many avenues of approach to get in and get out of an event like that. That is one big leg of the City of Coronado’s traffic grid and traffic plan – getting people in and out on Third and Fourth. Orange Avenue has four lanes of capacity and it intersects Third and Fourth. Orange Avenue hurts that little grid. Orange Avenue puts a stop right in the middle of the trip from the bridge to the base and the base to the bridge. All of us fit in there somewhere because we all take the bridge with some frequency each week or maybe even each day. As far as traffic planning goes, he has an obligation to support a traffic plan that efficiently moves people in and out of Coronado and does it at the safest speeds possible. Adding five traffic lights does not improve that traffic system. Adding five traffic lights degrades the system and makes it harder to move people in and out. Putting in five additional lights creates five new places for people to avoid a straight line in and out and instead to divert around and to create new problems where problems didn’t exist. Streets get certain designations or titles that are based on a circulatory

system. He is a big believer that if we put these lights in we are going to create hemorrhaging. We are going to start bleeding cars into areas where we don't have a concerted plan to move them out. He can't support these lights that are proposed in this plan. He understands the thinking behind it. He respects the motives behind it but he can't vote for a plan that he thinks is inferior to the current one so that is a dead issue to him.

The most important page in the Fehr and Peers report for him is page 10-8. When we saw the statistics that if you cut through town you save 30 seconds and then they calculated those times. That plan shows seven new lights and not five. This plan is dead because at the heart of it are the lights. He doesn't say that to hurt anyone's feelings or to impugn expertise. Lights, more of them, is not the answer for him. He has heard that this is built around creating a better opportunity to get 25 mph as an average speed and he wants that but he does not believe in this plan creating that. He believes that this plan is going to create people moving around many of the items that are put in and he believes that many of the non-light items that are proposed are depending conceptually on those lights going in. He can't support that.

He wants to talk briefly about the proposed light at Alameda and Fourth because he hears support for it. He stated that he uses that intersection a lot and it works. He also pointed out that there used to be a waver at that intersection that the Navy provided. They feel that puts their own personnel at risk and they won't do it. If they won't do it, that is fine, but he will say to keep the stop signs. Every time he tries to cross there he has no problem. He doesn't understand the metering concept there because there are already three stop lights on base metering that aren't synchronized. Something else he has noticed is that every time someone tells him lights are going to be synchronized, they are not. We only need to look at Orange Avenue to know that our lights aren't synchronized. He could promise that they are going to be synchronized for his remaining 14 months but we all know they are not. He doesn't know why. It isn't a lack of commitment. We would like to. We haven't made it happen. We have observed our own tendencies. Most people he knows don't try to use the light at Orange and Sixth or the light at Orange and Eighth. We all get a lot of complaints about Orange and Tenth but he thinks it has gotten a little better and people are using it more again. Those people who say that where we have put lights and where they exist that are not getting used or are often avoided – we are all probably guilty of that to some extent. Why, in good conscience, would he put in five more lights or maybe seven? Another thing he has to point out is if we put in any lights now, it is going to beget more lights. If we put lights in at Third and Fourth and B, Third and Fourth and F, we are probably going to get scenarios where we have to put in more nearby. That is what he learned about the Hawthorn and Grape couplet. There are lights everywhere. They have no choice but to put more lights in to create more safety. He does want to say that the situation we have isn't great. He is not bragging about the current situation we have. He doesn't know what the City has really done to make those streets safer but he also doesn't know how many things it can do to make it safer. If the greatest minds in 1969 thought it was going to be 24,000 Average Daily Trips (ADTs) and we have hit 90,000, he doesn't have any proposals for how to get the volume down. He is not going to look the Navy in the eye and say to carpool more. He wants them to but there is a reason those sailors do the same thing we do. We don't carpool a whole lot. As soon as you start carpooling more, he will try to chew out an admiral for no reason and say we should all carpool more. He believes in it but he cannot honestly look you in the eye and say he is going to lecture the Navy on that. We all have work to do on that.

The number one thing that he will always be disappointed in himself over is that he campaigned on more enforcement. He hasn't delivered more enforcement to the people. To everyone who said that is one of the tricks, he does think that is something we need to do. A very difficult decision that faces this Council and the next Council and so on is the easiest thing he could do is say to hire more police. But you can only put so many at a time and you can only write so many tickets so if we doubled the police budget would that really result in double the safety in Coronado? He doesn't think it would. We are going to have to talk about that some other time and figure out if our police staffing is adequate and what we can afford and what would another million dollars of new expenditure buy us and would it actually buy us any more safety.

The stretch of Orange Avenue to the bridge on Third and Fourth – that is the area we need to come up with something. He does not think the lights are the answer. We do need to keep working on finding some other solutions whether that is more crossing guards, more police – somehow we need to do a better job of correcting the freeway mentality. It is just not acceptable for any of us to think it is okay to just keep going 45 mph because you are a block away from the bridge. And there is a downhill slope there, too. There is a lot we need to do to try to try to figure out how to make this traffic grid we have safer. He thinks a lot of those recommendations assume lights going in. A lot of them assume one at Glorietta. He also pointed out that in 2004 our residents voted against the diverters on A, B and C. They voted 68% to not do that. Unless something has changed in the last 11 years that is the survey he cares about. He really doesn't care about the survey that is in the Fehr and Peers report. He appreciates that it is there but he has no confidence that it represents anything accurate. The 68% number from 2004 represents something accurate to him. That same year we voted on whether or not to open Glorietta and 56% said no. Maybe things have changed but the only survey he is going to look to is a vote of the public. If we want to do something radical, let's make sure the public wants to support something radical. This is a Hail Mary attempt. He likes Hail Mary attempts but no one caught the pass. It is too radical. Our citizenry would freak out if we implemented most of this. The only thing he thinks would be productive is to talk about the non-light options to see which of those we might be able to implement. To the City's credit, we have tried to implement bulbouts and things like that and we have not been met with any assistance from Caltrans. He hopes Complete Streets means something to them but he is not convinced that it means something to them yet.

Councilmember Bailey has followed this process for the last two years. He attended the workshops, read the report, heard the public's feedback, and reflected back on his experience having lived in the corridor at Fourth and J and Fourth and B. He is convinced that there is a combination of elements contained within this report that would significantly improve the safety of the corridor without negatively impacting the surrounding neighborhoods. He thinks that in an effort to help guide us there, it would be important to come up with some principles that we follow as we pick and choose which ones make the most sense. Some of those principles he jotted down were that commuter traffic is safest when it is contained on our major thoroughfares. Traffic on the major thoroughfares should be calmed to the greatest extent possible without violating that first principle. He can say, having lived on the eastern side of Orange, speed is a huge concern over there. Having lived on the western side of Orange, closer to the base, speed is not as much of a concern because the traffic hasn't really gotten going once it has left the base to gain a lot of speed. Closer to Orange and on the west side of Orange, it is more of a concern. The status quo for Third and Fourth Streets is unacceptable. We have gone too long without doing enough to help calm traffic in that area without diverting it to other streets. There are recommendations contained within this report that he would like the Council to consider that follow those three principles. He

doesn't want to throw the baby out with the bath water on this entire report but he does agree that he is against the signals. He would be able to entertain a discussion about a signal at Fourth and Alameda, provided that certain conditions were met if we were to move forward with that.

Councilmember Downey was recused because she lived on D Avenue, raised her children on D Avenue, had to cross Third and Fourth, had to try to get in and out of her alley during rush hour on the alley between D and Orange, and so she understood what the issues were. Now she lives on H near the schools and we have a different issue. She has experienced all sides of town and what it means. For the folks that don't understand why a light at Alameda and Fourth might help, the way platooning works, and the last time this came up she voted against putting a light at Alameda and Third and Fourth because the residents in the area said they didn't want it, but she tried to explain to them that there are some benefits. The way the platooning works, that light at Orange is the only reason she could ever get out of her alley behind D Avenue. It stopped the cars, whether it was rush hour or not. We all talk about it being great when it isn't rush hour but some of us actually have to go somewhere when it is rush hour and platooning actually causes the cars to stop in enough time. It is just like when it is a gridlock. It is the same concept. The cars are stopped so people can get through. The reason they are suggesting that we look at the Fourth and Alameda light is even without it coordinating on the base, once it gets past Alameda on Fourth, there will be enough time that it will get to wherever the next thing is. After that stop happens, then there is going to be space behind it. That is the platooning. People can cross. She will say that she agrees with the speakers that said we really don't have an issue crossing on that side of Orange. It is the other side.

Mayor Tanaka asked why do it.

Ms. Downey responded that if we aren't going to do the other ones, she doesn't know that we need to. She agrees that we have done nothing since 1969. The study listed all the things the City has tried to do and looked at and haven't done in Coronado to address traffic. That is fine. We don't want to do any of them but then every election people ask why nothing is done about traffic. If we do nothing today, the people will all be back here asking why nothing was done about traffic. She does think there are some good things in this report. The next step isn't to vote to institute them. At this point, all the CTC asked the Council to do is send some items on so the engineering work can be done. Caltrans has told us that they will not answer us for any of these until an engineering study has been done. There are two reasons for that. They have a lot of people that would like them to give their official opinion on things but they aren't going to waste their time unless they know someone is serious about it. If we are going to do CEQA on it, you have to have the engineering study to find out what the environmental consequences are. That is why the order is what it is. She agrees with Mr. Bailey that the Council should pick and choose and see what we want to move forward so we can at least do the engineering so Caltrans can at least tell us whether we can or not. She wants to send them something and make them say officially yes or no. She does think safety in the area from Orange to the bridge needs to be addressed somehow. This report gives us seven different ways to do it. If we aren't going to look at any of them, then we have resigned ourselves that we are never going to look at it. There are lots of great ideas coming through but a lot of them were looked at. The idea of underpasses and ways to go under Third and Fourth were actually studied. You all voted. Anyone who voted in the election that said they didn't want to finish the SR 75 study because someone said it was a tunnel study and that was all we were studying. That was not correct. There actually was some further engineering study work about going under Third and Fourth. To suggest that it won't be expensive – it will be hugely

expensive because of the water table and earthquake and all of that. When you are looking at what is a feasible thing, she thinks we should find the items in here that we like, send them on for engineering work so we can get Caltrans to give us an answer. She actually was willing to look at just seeing what the effects would be for a signal at B. She wanted a traffic study to tell her if it would send traffic down somewhere and how we would divert it. She agrees with Mayor Tanaka that there was a vote already that said that people didn't want diverters. That was then and it didn't have a light or any purpose. She would have liked to have seen those engineering studies and whether or not it could be done without diverting traffic because she doesn't want to divert traffic either. She doesn't want that leaving the corridor but she does want a safe way to cross Third and Fourth and she doesn't see any other way. If we decide we are not going to have a safe way to cross Third and Fourth that is okay but as she stated at the beginning of the meeting, at least half of the people in this town want the Council to find something to do. She is open to go through this to find areas that we are at least willing to send for some engineering work so we can get Caltrans' answer on things that could help us.

Mayor Tanaka referred to the list on page 93.

Councilmember Sandke isn't quite as pessimistic about the document. He applauds not just Fehr and Peers for their complete report but also the work of the CTC. The process has been one of the most laudable things that has come from this. There is a lot to like in this study except the lights. When he campaigned he did so on an incremental approach to handling the traffic situation on Third and Fourth and he continues to take that stance. He did not get here to preside over the urbanization of Third and Fourth. He doesn't want Grape and Hawthorn running through the center of his town. He recognizes that our small town ambience is indeed under assault and to those who think it is gone you don't need to look any further than late night TV to prove yourselves right. We are the envy of cities worldwide. Whatever we do we cannot be focusing on the Naval commuter. We have to focus on our residents. Contrary to Mr. Donovan's assertions, he does consider Third and Fourth Streets residential streets and he applauds several examples of trying to make that residential neighborhood back into what it was pre-bridge. The Avenue of Heroes flag program is fantastic and is doing what it can to make the place feel better. It is very troubling for him to think about these lights and to hear the consultant say that we have Bluetooth ways to measure traffic and we have studies that might be able to tell us about diversions but he is just not willing to bet his town on that. He hopes the folks who are really in favor of the lights understand that. He agrees that there are some things in the report that he would like to move forward with. They are the non-light alternatives. He recalls that the Navy used to have a crossing guard and he thinks the guard went away during sequestration.

Mayor Tanaka commented that there was a light in the works for Third and Fourth and Alameda. Before that discussion, there was a waver. When the Council voted not to put in those lights that had been planned, even with Caltrans approval, the Navy said that the waver wasn't a good idea anymore.

Mr. Sandke added that there have been a couple of references to pursuing legislative remedies for our problem. We do have a very unique situation with a state highway running through a residential neighborhood. He thinks that unique situation warrants some consideration at the state level for speed cameras. He would love to see those things. There are 139 communities throughout Maryland, Oregon, Washington, and Illinois that use them even as we speak. They have been prohibited in California but there may be a way to use those, particularly in the most dire part of

our problems from Orange to the bridge. He would like to see larger usage of crossing guards at particularly troublesome intersections and more times of day. He is intrigued by the pedestrian underpasses and recognizes the cost issues that Ms. Downey brought up. He would ask Caltrans what it would take to get a HAWK at B. We want one. Tell us what it would take to get one. If it means closing B on both sides of Fourth, it is something we might want to think about. A couple of people mentioned the need to pressure the Navy more. He does think a few admirals could be talked to and there might be a way to at least get some things going. One of the most compelling arguments he heard against the lights are some of the people who are most profoundly affected by the problem in this corridor, the Schmids. Both he and she shared their desire to not have traffic lights on their street. They are the ones most personally affected by them. The bottom line of the study brought several things to light. One was speed. We can work on that with the physical changes in the engineering of the street, which is the only way to make any change to the speed in the corridor. We are presented with some of those tonight. Another is safety. It has not been proven to him that the lights are the key to safety although he believes strongly in doing what we can to promote crossing. The signals are promoted more as crossing then they are as safety or traffic calming. He thinks we have other ways to accomplish those goals.

Councilmember Woiwode thinks that Chairman Garahan did a good job of explaining how we got to where we are. We have set the stage for this. We, in the wake of the tunnel vote, asked the public what they wanted and we enshrined that in a mission for the CTC. They turned around and came up with an approach and hired a consultant to do exactly what we think the public told us they wanted done which was traffic calming, making the place more bike and pedestrian friendly. It is important that we recognize that this is what we asked for. We approved the statement of work that funded this study. He thinks Fehr and Peers and the CTC have done an excellent job of what they were charged to do. He agrees that he would want to go as far as we can without getting to traffic lights with one exception which is the one at Fourth and Alameda. The idea of whether or not cars are platooning up to that point is irrelevant. The fact remains that they stack up at that intersection and then they go. The traffic light builds in gaps. It can be set so that you don't have cars backed all the way from Orange up to the base. The problem with having them backed up to the base is that then they bleed over and we won't let them go on Alameda to turn left on Fifth, Sixth and Seventh. One of the consequences of not putting that light in is that we had them going over to Fifth, Sixth and Seventh and turning left to go past the schools. We put in no left turn signs. Now they go down I and J to turn left on Fifth, Sixth and Seventh to go past the schools. There should be timing in that light that requires that the queue can never get to the point where it comes up to I and J. That can be done with a light. It is very hard for a traffic waver to do that and the Navy even spoke to the City about that at the time. He is standing there under a lot of pressure to let cars go. They can see they have two or three blocks to go and sooner or later he lets them go, probably sooner than he should. The traffic light can do stuff that the waver can't do. The waver is not going to come back. Two of them got hit. That is why the Navy pulled them. Their lawyers said they couldn't put guys out there after they got it and the Navy made it clear that they weren't going to be coming back. There may be an additional precaution that needs to be taken to keep cars that are stopped at that light from turning right onto Alameda. That can be done. The idea of stacking the cars on the base instead of stacking them on Orange is in the interest of all of our residents. He sees no reason not to do that. He would like to see the City go ahead with that. He believes that also helps a great deal with some of the crossing issues downstream. The things that we see in the morning, if you are crossing Third and Fourth regularly during rush hours, you can get across Third. There is going to be a gap. The gap comes with the light change. It is pretty simple. He can cross Fourth when the traffic is so backed up that it is not

moving but that is not a desirable outcome because it is pushing traffic to the adjacent streets. He wants that gap to be built in by the traffic signal. He wants to go ahead with putting in the traffic signal at Fourth and Alameda.

The rest of this stuff that is traffic calming goes to the point raised by Ms. Schmid. He feels she was the most on point speaker tonight. We want the traffic east of Orange to go 25 mph. That is not going to happen with enforcement. It is not going to happen with traffic signals. It happens with engineered solutions and what is going to be the capstone is the toll plaza project. That will be the thing that makes all the rest of this stacking up in both directions coming onto the island, the big change and now we have calmer traffic from that point on. Getting off the island, you are not going to be speeding to the entrance to the bridge after the light changes at Orange because there is going to be stuff built in at the toll plaza that keeps that from happening. We want to set the stage for that. We want all the speed tables, whatever else we can put in between Orange and the toll plaza in anticipation of that next thing that is going to come to us. He would like to see us go forward with all the traffic calming ideas and he would like to see us go forward with the signal at Alameda and Fourth.

Mayor Tanaka concluded that it sounds like the Council wants to look at a light at Fourth and Alameda.

Mr. Sandke asked if that idea includes restrictions for right hand turns and the off time blinking red.

Mr. Woiwode commented that one of the things he didn't get to is Caltrans. Caltrans is going to say that you can't do that. We are going to give Caltrans a whole menu of things that they say you cannot do. That is what we are doing tonight. We are saying that we are going to study these things enough that we can hand them off to Caltrans and either they do a project study report and they come back with a result or they take our information and they act on it. We are attempting to force Caltrans' hand. This is not our decision. We are trying to tell them what we want to see. Yes, he agrees that we should include that.

Mayor Tanaka commented that the City will include its best wisdom but if the group says to pursue the light at Fourth and Alameda, let's also be realistic that the Council saying that might mean it becomes a permanent light. It might mean that it is always going to be there and he hears that we are ready to die on that hill.

Mr. Woiwode stated that we are not at that point. We are not making a forever decision tonight. We are making a decision on what we want to study further.

Mayor Tanaka reviewed the list and incorporated Council comments as follows:

- A. Traffic signal at Fourth Street and Alameda Boulevard. Restrictions on right hand turns; all way stop during off peak hours.
- B. Raised crosswalk with Rapid Flashing Beacon at H and I Avenues at Fourth Street.
- C. Modification to intersection of Palm Avenue and Third Street (cul-de-sac); option of keeping Palm open.
- D. Raised crosswalk with Rapid Flashing Beacon at I Avenue and Third Street.

- E. Modification to intersection of Palm Avenue and Fourth Street (cul-de-sac); option of keeping Palm open.
- F. H and Third Street: speed table and crosswalks.
- G. Third and Fourth Streets at F Avenue: speed table and crosswalks.
- J. Third and Fourth Streets at B Avenue: speed table and crosswalks; HAWK; Rapid Flashing Beacon.
- K. Modification to the intersection of Pomona Avenue and Third Street; still allow traffic to go through.
- L. Partial closure of A Avenue and Pomona Avenue to prohibit left turns onto A Avenue.
- M. Curb extensions (bulbouts) on Fourth Street at A and C Avenues and wherever feasible along the corridor.
- N. Modification to the intersection of Pomona Avenue and Glorietta Place.
- O. Speed tables – Fourth Street east of A Avenue and west of Glorietta Boulevard and on Pomona Avenue west of A Avenue.
- P. Traffic signal at Fourth Street and Glorietta Boulevard with cul-de-sac of Glorietta Boulevard south of Fourth Street. **Eliminated by the Council.**
- Q. Traffic circle (mini-roundabout) at Third Street and Glorietta Boulevard. **Eliminated by the Council.**
- R. Modification to intersection of Pomona Avenue at Fourth Street.

MSUC (Bailey/Downey) moved that the City Council receive the report and direct staff to commence with further study on the recommendations as directed.

AYES:	Bailey, Downey, Sandke, Woiwode, Tanaka
NAYS:	None
ABSTAINING:	None
ABSENT:	None

11c. Consideration of Appointment to Fill One Vacancy on the Street Tree Committee. Under Consent, Steven Kim Moreno was appointed to fill a vacancy on the Street Tree Committee.

11d. Consideration of Appointment to Fill Two Vacancies on the Parks and Recreation Commission. Mayor Tanaka explained the process to be used for the nomination.

Norman Funk introduced himself to the City Council and the public.

Akshay Sateesh introduced himself to the City Council and the public.

The City Clerk read the names and recorded the votes for the first round of voting as follows:

Norman C. Funk	five votes
Grace C Lowenburg	five votes
Akshay Sateesh	five votes

The City Clerk read the names and recorded the votes for the second round of voting as follows:

Norman C. Funk five votes
Grace C Lowenburg three votes
Akshay Sateesh five votes

MSUC (Tanaka/Bailey) moved that the City Council appoint Norman Funk and Akshay Sateesh to serve out the remainder of two terms on the Parks and Recreation Commission to expire January 31, 2017.

**AYES: Bailey, Downey, Sandke, Woiwode, Tanaka
NAYS: None
ABSTAINING: None
ABSENT: None**

11e. Receive 2015 Asset Management Plan and Consider Formalizing the City’s Strategy and Criteria for a Facilities Replacement Fund. Under Consent, the City Council: 1) received the 2015 Asset Management Plan; 2) affirmed the City Council’s December 6, 2011, direction that the \$8.6 million of future Community Development Agency (CDA) Loan Repayments be allocated to the Facilities Replacement/Refurbishment Fund 136; 3) confirmed Fund 136 will remain a perpetual component of the City’s annual budget; 4) directed staff to develop an index-based formula for annual General Fund contributions to the Facilities Replacement Fund; and 5) directed staff to develop and present specific criteria for expensing funds from the Facilities Replacement Fund.

11f. Receive Report and Provide Direction in Response to the Request to Install Left Turn Restrictions on A, B, and C Avenues, and Expand the Hours for Left Turns onto the 300 Block Alleys of A, B and C Avenues. This item was continued.

12. CITY ATTORNEY: No report.

13. COMMUNICATIONS - WRITTEN:

13a. Consideration of Request from Councilmember Downey that City Staff be Directed to Agendize a Discussion that the City Expand the Summer Shuttle Bus Service Year Round. Under Consent, the request was approved.

14. ADJOURNMENT: The Mayor adjourned the meeting at 9:11 p.m.

Approved: October 20, 2015



Casey Tanaka, Mayor
City of Coronado

Attest:



Mary L. Clifford
City Clerk