



**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 December 16, 2014.

**MSUC (Sandke/Bailey) moved to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the City Council/the City Council Acting as the Successor Agency of December 16, 2014, as submitted. The minutes were so approved. The reading of the minutes in their entirety was unanimously waived.**

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

**4. CEREMONIAL PRESENTATIONS:** None.

**5. CONSENT CALENDAR:** The City Council approved, adopted and/or accepted as one item of business Consent Agenda Items 5a through 5g with the addition of Items 11d and 11e.

Councilmember Bailey suggested the addition of Items 11b, 11d and 11e.

Councilmember Downey asked Roger Miller, Director of Golf and Recreation, a question about Item 11e. It talked about trying to free up some of the rooms that aren't used, the smaller rooms, not the Nautilus Room or the larger rooms. Could Mr. Miller explain if he has a concrete proposal for a club in Coronado wanting to use it three times a year and there being no charge? How would that work in terms of changing the charges for those underutilized rooms?

Mr. Miller explained that for the underutilized rooms, staff would just be looking to reduce the cost on some of those rooms and market those during the week. A lot of the charges on some of the rooms are going to stay the same but staff would just look to market those. For some of those, to market the different categories would depend on whether they are non-profit status or a Coronado group and those would be offered resident rates or a discounted rate.

Ms. Downey understands that. The City has several service clubs that are very small but they still have to pay a room rental rate whether they are non-profit, Coronado based, etc. She is trying to figure out, based on this proposal, if they want to rent one of these rooms, e.g., the Sand Dollar Room, if it will be a decrease from what the current charge would be. She couldn't tell what the proposed fee would be.

Mr. Miller doesn't think the Sand Dollar Room was covered in this proposal. There won't be any change. The only changes that would occur are to the rooms identified in the staff report.

Councilmember Sandke asked for two additions to Item 5g. On page 117, "Local Government Finance, C.1. "Support legislation which increases local revenues..." This will define that the revenue promoted is to be local and not state income. On page 131, "City Navy Relations, D. Oppose legislation that interferes with the city's land use authority to retain existing uses and to allow for reasonable expansion of structures within any landing zones." This clearly states our position on AICUZ overlay not impacting Coronado's zoning authority.

Council consensus was to include Mr. Sandke's additions.

Councilmember Woiwode requested the removal of Item 11b for a presentation.

**MSC (Woiwode/Sandke) moved that the City Council approve the Consent Calendar Items 5a through 5g with the addition of Item 11d - Consider Options and Provide Direction for Excess Liability Insurance Coverage and 11e - Receive and Consider Revisions to Various Policies and Fees for Recreation Facilities and Programs as Recommended by the Parks and Recreation Commission.**

<b>AYES:</b>	<b>Bailey, Downey, Sandke, Woiwode, Tanaka</b>
<b>NAYS:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>ABSTAINING:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>ABSENT:</b>	<b>None</b>

**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 Budgets for FY 2014-2015. The City Council approved payment of City warrant Nos. 10104558 thru 10104972 and City of Coronado Acting as the Successor Agency to the Community Development Agency of the City of Coronado warrant Nos. 90005569 thru 90005572. The City Council approved the warrants as certified by the City/Agency Treasurer.**

**5c. Award of a Professional Engineering Design Services Contract to Psomas for a Not-to-Exceed Amount of \$93,000 for the FY 2014/15 Country Club Area Storm Line Infiltration Project. The City Council authorized the City Manager to execute an agreement**

with Psomas for a not-to-exceed amount of \$93,000 for the design of the Fiscal Year 2014/15 Country Club Area Storm Line Infiltration project.

5d. Award of a Professional Engineering Design Services Contract to Psomas for a Not-to-Exceed Amount of \$50,000 for the FY 2014/15 Storm Drain Master Plan. The City Council authorized the City Manager to execute an agreement with Psomas for a not-to-exceed amount of \$50,000 for the design of the Fiscal Year 2014/15 Storm Drain Master Plan.

5e. Authorization to Prepare Construction Plans and Advertise the Repair of the Central Beach Restroom for Bid. The City Council authorized staff to prepare construction plans and advertise for bid the repair of the Central Beach Restroom.

5f. Authorization for the City Manager to Execute a One-Year Contract Renewal with JGC Government Relations for \$48,000 Plus Travel Expenses to Provide State Legislative Lobbying Services. The City Council authorized the City Manager to execute a one-year contract renewal with JGC Government Relations.

5g. Approval of the City of Coronado 2015 Legislative Policy Guidelines. The City Council accepted and adopted the City of Coronado Legislative Policy Guidelines for 2015.

6. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

a. **Doug St. Denis, Penny Duermeyer (Miss Fisher), and Carolyn Ayres (Lauren Bacall)** invited everyone to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Red Carpet Oscar Party on Sunday, February 22 at Nicky Rottens restaurant. The event is sponsored by the Coronado Island Film Festival, celebrating Hollywood's enduring 100 year love affair with Coronado. From 4:30 to 5:30 p.m., there will be red carpet arrivals and photo ops with the live Oscar broadcast at 5:30 on three giant screens. Get your tickets now! Tickets are available online at coronadoislandfilmfest.com or in person at the Coronado Historical Association Museum Store.

b. **Fern Nelson** began speaking about traffic issues but decided to wait until the agenda item was called.

c. **Councilmember Downey** announced that the Women's Club quarterly shredding event will take place this Saturday from 9 a.m. to 12 noon. The charge is \$7 per box or bag. People can come to the Union Bank parking lot where there will be a free electronic waste disposal as well.

7. CITY MANAGER/EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: No report.

8. PUBLIC HEARINGS: None.

9. ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS: None.

10. COMMISSION AND COMMITTEE REPORTS: None.

11. CITY COUNCIL BUSINESS:

**11a. Council Reports on Inter-Agency Committee and Board Assignments.**

**Councilmember Bailey** will submit his report in writing.

**Councilmember Downey** attended a SANDAG Board meeting and participated in the vote for the new vice chair who will then rotate up to be the Chair of SANDAG. She voted no. It was a close vote. At this time, the Board has voted to have Supervisor Roberts become the vice chair and then eventual chair. In the past, we have never had a county supervisor in that position because it was felt that they speak for the County and the SANDAG chair is supposed to speak for all of the governments. She and at least five other cities voted no.

**Councilmember Sandke** attended the County Wastewater Metro JPA meeting.

**Councilmember Woiwode** reported on meetings of the SAFE Coalition; ROTC commissioning on *USS Midway* museum; SANDAG Regional Planning; Representative Peters; Employee breakfast hosted by the Executive Team; and Bike the Lights.

**Mayor Tanaka** attended the Holiday Parade put on by the Chamber of Commerce; was part of a fashion show that the Rotarians hosted; attended the Chamber Sundowner; met with Charles Black who is working on a project called "Discovery Point"; met with Joe Gabaldon from Time Warner; swore in the Board of Directors at the Senior Center.

**11b. Presentation of Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for the Year Ending June 30, 2014.** City Manager Blair King introduced the item. Director of Administrative Services Leslie Suelter provided a presentation as did J'on Dennis, Lance Soll Lunghard audit manager.

Councilmember Woiwode commented that unmodified opinion and testing for material weaknesses were mentioned. He would like to get an idea of the significance of the fact that it is an unmodified opinion and that there were no material weaknesses. What would be examples of material weaknesses that you might find in an audit?

Mr. Dennis responded that the most common material weakness that they find in audits is segregation of duties. A city might not have the levels either approval or initiation of processes and that allows for a city to be dependent on certain individuals and, therefore, that increases the risk for errors to happen or fraud to take place or things not to be caught in the regular process of an accounting system. That is the most common material weakness that they find. Another common material weakness is just competency of accounting staff not understanding the accounting standards that are out there, making the proper adjustments or recording the proper activity for the year. Those are probably the two most common material weaknesses.

Mr. Woiwode asked if those would be reflected in a modified opinion if problems were found there or does a modified opinion refer to something else.

Mr. Dennis responded that it could. It could lead to that. It depends on the extent of the actual material weakness. The modified opinion really identifies a specific area, for example, capital assets. We can say that we are going to issue a modified opinion on capital assets but the financial

statements as a whole have an unmodified opinion. So, a modified opinion just identifies the areas that the auditors were not 100% comfortable with.

Mr. Woiwode commented that the auditors didn't find any of that in any of the City's processes. The reference to GASBI 68, how will that be manifest next time around? What it says in the presentation is the addition of unfunded liability. Is there any guess at this point as to how big a deal that is? Is that not something that was looked into in this audit?

Mr. Dennis explained that Coronado is under CalPERS and they understand that CalPERS is going to issue a report for every city as to what that unfunded liability will be. Just to be clear, it will be the net position liability. What that means is that you will have your unfunded liability in comparison to any market value of assets that you have and the difference between those two will be your net pension liability. Your net pension liability will be the amount that will be reflected on your statement of net position for the City. It would just be a guess until the actuarial report from CalPERS is received.

Mr. Woiwode continued by saying that there is a note in here referring to litigation and it is the litigation between the City and the Department of Finance. He believes it is Note 12. The contested amount is identified in the note and is \$35,124,964. That is not included in the assets that the City reported and that were audited. Is that correct?

Mr. Dennis believes that there should be \$31 million included as a receivable on the Statement of Net Position this year. The \$35 million also includes any accrued interest up to that point.

Councilmember Downey returned to the discussion of what we would expect in the future. Everyone keeps using the term 'unfunded liability' and she doesn't like that because it is not an explanation but is just a term. She understands that CalPERS will tell each city how much it has, how much, given their projections for the city's employees and what their costs are going to be, at some point in the future the city will be responsible to pay. The term 'unfunded' is what drives her crazy because it is not yet due either. She is going to trust that when we put that in our next audit report if we use the word unfunded that we clarify that it is also not yet substantiated obligations either. It is actuarially assumed future obligations and actuarially assumed future liabilities based on current interest rates, etc. Will they be equally explained?

Mr. Dennis responded that they will. The term will be the 'net pension liability' rather than unfunded.

Mayor Tanaka is delighted and proud at how positive this report and this audit are. He thinks he speaks for the whole Council when he says that the pride of the Council is in this Finance Department maintaining such perfect records and the accounting that our public expects and demands of us. It really is a thrill to see that the Financial Department for the City of Coronado has been able to maintain that highest level of accounting standard for the City. He is very happy to see that this audit is so positive.

Councilmember Sandke agrees that it is an outstanding job. The property tax increases and TOT increases are great. Revenues are up and expenses are down. Any business would be proud to say that and for citizens to know that the City is run smartly is a great testament to the folks that work for the City. He pointed out a little bit about the sales tax. That saw a significant raise in the

intervening year. TOT makes up \$12 million of our revenue. Sales tax makes up just \$3 million but not so long ago it was just \$2 million. Most of that is coming from the larger restaurants and hotels and that kind of thing but that also affects little businesses. It is important for that revenue to be supported. The audit points out that the CTID efforts directly contribute to the revenues that those businesses are receiving on the upswing. He commended the CTID and found it nice that the audit folks recognized that. Mr. Woiwode talked about the \$30+ million resting with the state. The City has had a couple of recent court victories that have gone our way and we are hoping, in the end, to prevail over that. Finally, the workers' compensation and liability claims, which are almost \$3 million, surprised him as a newcomer to the City. He spent some time talking with Ms. Suelter and some others and found that the City is working diligently to keep these claims honest and as low as possible. The long-term debt caught his eye on the five-year trend. It went from \$8 million to \$3 million to \$1,400. He tried to find out why that was and learned that we still have copier leases. Since copier leases are our only long-term debt, he thinks we are doing well. He thanked LSL for its hard work on this.

Councilmember Downey commended and thanked the Council members who worked to help craft the budget and approve the budget in the last two years. It gives her an incredible amount of satisfaction to say that in her time on the Council and now since she has been gone, we have always had a net positive and we have added to our General Fund. She thanked everyone.

**MSUC (Downey/Bailey) moved that the City Council receive and file the City of Coronado CAFR for the year ending June 30, 2014.**

<b>AYES:</b>	<b>Bailey, Downey, Sandke, Woiwode, Tanaka</b>
<b>NAYS:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>ABSTAINING:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>ABSENT:</b>	<b>None</b>

**11c. Provide Direction in Response to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Reaction to Installing Pedestrian/Bicycle Improvements at the Intersections of Third and Fourth Streets and B Avenue.**

Councilmember Downey reported that she does not own property in this immediate vicinity but if the discussion moves to include the area near Third and D, she will need to recuse herself.

Councilmember Bailey recused himself as he owns property in the vicinity.

City Manager Blair King made opening remarks. Director of Public Services and Engineering Cliff Maurer made the presentation. Shortly into Mr. Maurer's presentation, Councilmember Downey recused herself.

Councilmember Sandke noticed that not included in this is prohibiting left turns off of Third onto A, B and C in the afternoon rush hour. Was there any thought given to those additional remedies or was there a little broader look in terms of these initial improvements that staff considered?

Mr. Maurer explained that it is his understanding that in the past the City had a complete restriction of turns onto A, B and C and the consequence was intolerable to the City.

Mr. Sandke doesn't dispute that it would require some changes in the median and number of left turn lanes that would be required to accommodate on Orange between Third and Fourth but at this first broad brush stroke he is just hoping for a little bit bigger thinking.

Mayor Tanaka added that there was a voter initiative against this as well.

Mr. Maurer thinks that right now staff was looking for a total solution. He doesn't know that if we did that it would address getting across Third and B. It might help with getting across Fourth. As Mr. King said, staff put forth the three next available options. One is to prepare an encroachment permit package for pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements. That would result in a formal response from Caltrans. The second would be separate from the Fehr and Peers report to do a study just for these two intersections and address that. The third would be to wait for the Third and Fourth Street Corridor study to be completed. It is in its final draft. It is under review right now. Staff has engaged with the public and this intersection, and specific options for this intersection, have been requested. Staff has asked for non-scientific, public input and it is across the board. There is no consensus with any answer or solution that the majority would agree with. It is almost split 50/50.

Councilmember Woiwode asked about the chart that showed the distance to Orange Avenue and the distance down to the cut through under the bridge. It is 750' to Orange, one direction. That is .15 mile. If you look at that as someone crossing at B and their option is to go 750' up to Orange, cross the street and then 750' back down to get to the point they could get to by walking 48', that is the decision we are contemplating here. What decision will they make given that choice?

Mayor Tanaka pointed out that Mr. Woiwode made a request on May 20, 2014. That request was made in light of a bicycle injury that happened. It was made in light of the fact that we have had difficulty getting Caltrans to take some of our suggestions, particularly the HAWK suggestion, seriously. We are at a point now where we have given Caltrans a chance to see if they felt a little differently in light of that particular bicycle event. It would be his opinion that they don't seem to be behaving any differently than they always have in terms of they look at what their traffic manual says you can do and they say you can't do that because it is a three lane highway in each direction so again the Council, after the public comments, is going to consider those three last options. Those three options do not mean that the Council can't create a fourth option but these three are the things that staff has asked Council to consider.

### **The Mayor invited public comment.**

Barbara DeMichelle encouraged the Council to, if there are only three options on the table, wait for the Third and Fourth Street Corridor study. In fact, even to have the Gateway project be a part of the big master plan for this area would be good. All of this is going to impact what happens at B and Third and Fourth. To comment on Mr. Woiwode's assessment of the distance there, she lives in the 500 block of B. The pedestrians that come down the street often are tourists who get off of the ferry. We have no directions at all for pedestrians visiting our community to take them from the ferry through our business district. She would encourage, as a part of this big picture, beyond just bikes, they can't see the light at B when they are walking. It is those that are unaware of where the pedestrian traffic should be going in the community that this is for. It would help the businesses on Orange if we directed the tourists that come in via First that the pedestrian path is down Orange Avenue. They would be visiting the restaurants rather than walking down her street

asking for band aids and asking where the Hotel is. We are sorely lacking in way finding in our community for pedestrians. She encouraged the City to develop a yellow brick road for pedestrians.

Lorraine Rooney commented that crosswalks and street lights give a false sense of security. In October of 1996, she was struck by a car as a pedestrian at the corner of Eighth and Orange. She was in a marked crosswalk. She was walking. She did not have a bicycle with her. The crosswalk was beautifully painted white. The light was green. The white pedestrian marker was there. She walked across four lanes of traffic, past the center divide, past one lane of traffic and a vehicle made a left hand turn and took her onto the hood of his car. Her health has never been the same since. If she could have gotten off of the asphalt, she could have thrown a baseball and hit the Coronado Police Department. The officer who came to help her walked to the location. There have been multiple other individuals hit in crosswalks in Coronado. We had a death in front of the Hotel Del in a marked crosswalk. We had four people at one point struck in the crosswalk in front of the Hotel Del. Before she was struck, she used to ride her bicycle 50 miles on the weekend with AYH. Everyone living in Coronado knows where you can ride a bicycle in Coronado. It is the tourists coming from outside who don't know the particulars of Coronado. Having been a bicyclist and having been hit, she was not hit at all regarding a bicycle. She was a pedestrian. She is not a short person or a small person. The driver just did not see her. He did not do it purposefully and he was not drunk. He was a doctor and he was driving on his way to work.

When tourists come to this community by bicycle, they come in two directions – from the ferry and from the Strand. That is the connection that we need to make for bicyclists. There are no public schools in the southeast quadrant. There is a hill between B and Orange Avenue. You cannot see over that hill when you are trying to cross. The people on Cabrillo have said no to a bike path. The people on H have said no to a bike path. We do not want our street listed on a map showing bicyclists where to go. This particular tourist map that is disseminated to tourists is highly making the City liable for injuries. This map shows pedestrians that they can cross Third and Fourth on B Avenue. If they pick this up at the Ferry Landing, it gives them a very false sense of security. She does not care to see anyone hit nor does she care to see the City of Coronado have any liability because of misplaced crosswalks.

Claudia Holman commented that she wants the best possible solutions to safety problems. If the intersections at B on Third and Fourth are considered safety problems for crossing pedestrians, traffic and bicyclists, then the safest solution would be to prohibit a crossing here and make it totally illegal. Any possible contact between a pedestrian and a bicyclist with state highway traffic, regardless of if there is a stop light at that intersection, is an opportunity for a serious accident. People who have lived in this town long enough already know this and avoid crossing there. It is just not that hard to avoid. You walk two blocks. This is a learned wisdom by residents in that area. That should give the City Council some pause in their considerations to enable a crossing. Pedestrian lights and stop lights have their own set of problems and no one claims that they are a safety solution or alleviate accidents. Please consider the safety problems that increased traffic down B Avenue would have. There would be a ripple effect of bicycle and pedestrian encounters with that increased traffic all the way down B. As school kids are zipping along to school on the weekdays, on their way across B Avenue, crossing over B with their helmets on but their straps unfastened. Her concern here is mostly for kids on bikes. We all know that they have blinders on. They don't watch carefully at intersections and they generally think that they are immortal. They are, in a word, not very careful. Why would we willingly create more points of contact for them

with our state highway traffic as it is diverted down B Avenue? That idea is not in the best interest for anyone, especially our children.

Russ McKee has always been concerned about the dangers of pedestrian crossings at Third and Fourth. Pedestrian safety at these intersections has always been a debate in Coronado but it seems like nothing has ever really been done about it. We need to act sooner than later to prevent another serious accident such as the bicycle accident that occurred at Fourth and B last March or April. He is not convinced that a traffic signal, a HAWK light or any other device will make these intersections for pedestrians or bicycles. Signalized intersections require engineering studies at great expense, involve a one to two year build out and a cost of between \$175,000 and \$300,000 per signal, according to Caltrans. Meanwhile, pedestrian lives continue to be put at risk. Third and Fourth Streets are Coronado's crosstown expressways. Pedestrian crossings at these dangerous intersections should be prohibited, not facilitated. If pedestrian safety is truly the reason for this study, he believes the best way to protect pedestrians is to restrict crossings from A, B and C across Third and Fourth. Redirect them to Orange Avenue where safe signalized crossings can be made. Contrary to earlier information received from the City, Caltrans has stated that, "...restricting pedestrian access across a highway at intersections controlled by the Department is legal and we have done so at many locations throughout the state." He would encourage the City to apply for the necessary permits to place barricades and to redirect signage to divert pedestrians to Orange Avenue from Avenues A, B and C. This process could be completed quickly, at a fraction of the cost of alternative measures, and can prevent the next accident that will otherwise occur while we study alternative solutions.

Bill Kennedy is quite a veteran of Third and Fourth Street corridor commuting. The previous comments really addressed a lot of safety issues. We are all interested in safety issues. He wanted to raise a couple of points, constructively, in support that would fit well into the item 2 approach. The first is adding a little bit more technical to what he sees as a safety issue at Third and B, particularly if there is a signaled intersection there. You can't really see that intersection until you are upon it. While you are in the left two lanes you are much more concerned about the car in front of you than you are in looking down the road at an intersection. He doesn't think that putting a crosswalk there or a light there will overcome those built-in problems that we have with that section of roadway. In an effort to add more pedestrian safety, we may be creating different safety problems. He is really not in favor of that solution at all for that reason. His second issue is at Third and B as well. If there is a signalized intersection there, that would be the first opportunity for oncoming traffic off the bridge into the City and their first opportunity to turn left. That would depend on how the whole signal system would be constructed. If it permitted a left turn, he could see that we would certainly see more increased traffic down B. He thinks there are seasoned commuters that have found their way to navigate through the City and usually end up on Pomona to get across the City. He thinks this was discussed at the Transportation Commission meeting. He agrees with that. However, that concept really doesn't address visitors, tourists and other commercial visitors to our island that may not be that savvy about how to navigate the City. He brings this up as an issue. It would be another reason why he would be against it. He thanked the Council for clarifying the status of the study and how we should be looking at this. In closing, he would be firmly in support of going with Step 2.

Brian Evans thinks this seems pretty clear. The one course of action that was mentioned was closing the intersection to pedestrians and there were cons to that. He sees two easy fixes. It can be made to address bicycles as well and the not likely to use can be managed through enforcement.

Those are two inherently dangerous intersections and to have any type of infrastructure in place to attempt to facilitate an easier crossing will still have problems. It is going to have to be the .15 miles to get up to the intersection. Under crossings and overcrossings have so many throw away courses of action. He wouldn't want to see a light there if he lived there. There is a lot of opposition to lights from people in the area.

Fern Nelson is glad that there was a speaker who was not from B Avenue. The people from B do not want a traffic light but it is not clear whether a traffic light is good at all. Why has B been picked? She does know that it is a diverter street but that was decided years and years and years ago. She is data driven and would like to see the data that shows that now it still is and should be designated a collector street. Also, she has not seen any data that addresses where the traffic is going to end up diverted to if we put a stop light there. Where are those cars going to go? How is that going to change the traffic pattern that goes past the schools in those areas? She has been following the consultant's studies and they have presented minimal data to back up their approach. Also, one of their plans had seven different stop lights in their consulting plan and how we just go to two stop lights at Third and Fourth and B is concerning to her. In terms of not having anyone cross at all, she thinks that is the only solution that is reasonable. She understands the bicyclists have an interest in crossing there but bicyclists of all groups have an easy opportunity to go to Orange. She thinks that pedestrians should have no option to cross a state highway. It is just too fast and nothing we do is going to make it any better. In terms of speed, we have talked again about ticketing. Where is the ticketing for the cars? Where is the ticketing for the bicyclists and why can't we have ticketing for pedestrians that are going to cross. We just make it illegal and give the people that are crossing there tickets. If we put signage there so that the tourists don't go down those streets, that will be excellent and they will pass the businesses. Bicyclists almost never stop at stop signs and she does not see them getting tickets as well. She does feel that we are somewhat unfairly picking on Fourth and B and not looking at all of the other options and safety first would mean no pedestrians and no bicyclists cross Third or Fourth. Walk the extra two blocks.

Beth Good is outside walking or biking every day. She does not see a lot of residents going across B on Fourth or Third. She walks over to the Animal Care Facility about four times per week and she always goes down to Orange and she sees people going down to Orange to cross all the time. The people that she does see crossing B are the tourists. They do not understand that you shouldn't be crossing Fourth and Third and B Avenue. She has had many tourists come to her and ask her where they can safely cross and they are in those surrey four-seat bicycles that are being talked about. She would like to have the ferry and the Ferry Landing area give directions on how to safely go down Orange Avenue. There should be specific instructions that say not to cross on B or A or C because those are the people that are constantly taking their life in their hands when they do that. She notices when she is walking that there is a "no pedestrian crossing" sign at Fourth going across Orange and she would like one of those at A, B and C going across Fourth and Third. As others have said, just make it illegal to be crossing there. Most bicyclists are out for exercise and they do not go on B. They are going on the path underneath the bridge and over by the Naval Base. She doesn't think that they are really using going across B for exercise or their bike routes.

Martha Jay rides her bicycle a lot and walks a lot. She wouldn't think of crossing at B and Third and Fourth and she would like to agree with the people who say that a lot of this is tourists or people who choose to take their life in their hands. She thinks the tourists need to be redirected for a lot of reasons because they are looking for the beach and the Hotel and they would be happy to go down Orange Avenue to find both of those items. She thinks bicyclists ride under the bridge.

It is lovely. She would like to also say that you can't make this decision without making the bigger decision for the traffic calming measures at Third and Fourth. She doesn't see how you can make this decision without considering everything else that is coming down the pike on those same streets.

Toni McGowan thinks there have been some good ideas discussed today. She would like to bring up that Third and Fourth Streets are often thought of as an impediment to the rest of the City. The neighborhood group, TAF, believes they are a neighborhood, too. She hopes the Council will remember that Third and Fourth streets are not just the problem of the City but there are homes and residents and it is a neighborhood.

James Wamsley feels that this is a topic that affects all age group. He rode his bike to the City Council meeting. To increase traffic, if that is a decision that is made, on B Avenue, would no doubt increase incidences of cars versus people or cars versus bicycles. That is dangerous. He reiterated the point that a traffic light is counterintuitive to increasing safety in Coronado. He appreciates the Council's willingness at being filmed.

Mayor Tanaka stated he wants to be up front. To him, #3 is clearly the way to go for today. He is not happy with the way this process has gone. He thinks a number of the members of the public present are present because they are not happy with the way this process has gone. He apologized to the public. He does not think the City has been very clear about how we are going to structure this review, what we are going to get out of the review, and how wide a scope we would take. If Mayor Tanaka knew a few months ago what he knows now, he would have either not approved the second look that we have taken because the last thing he wants to do is confuse or alarm residents and he feels that the approach the Council has taken has not lent clarity to what is a very difficult and insoluble problem, the problem of traffic in Coronado. He has noticed that many speakers pointed out how long they have lived in Coronado. That is very appropriate because those who have lived in Coronado for several decades have seen this problem persist year after year, decade after decade, through different mayors and councils. A lot of smart people have served this City as citizens or as elected officials and none have been able to figure out how to fix the problem. One of the key elements of the traffic problem is that the City has a T grid that we bring in and bring out traffic on Third and Fourth and that they intersect at Orange Avenue. As long as we have that grid, we are going to continue to have these problems. He thinks that the way we have handled this as a City has created some confusion. He pointed out that #3 is the clear way to go as of today because if we do have a corridor study that is in the works and if we do have a process where that study is going to be reviewed by our Transportation Commission, as it should be, then that is the proper procedure and the proper process to follow. Having that Commission review the study and think about what next steps might be appropriate or maybe what next steps aren't appropriate. Sometimes the best thing is no action. He is not saying that is the course the City should take but whenever you study a project, you are required to consider the no build alternative. You are required to study whether or not taking action is, in fact, your best course of action. As we go through this process of looking at what trained professionals have said, having our citizen commissioners on the CTC review that study in concert with comments from the public, it will reach the City Council in due course.

He mentioned earlier that if he had it to do over again he might have voted differently because he has never been a big fan of the idea of adding more traffic signals but he wanted to give everyone the warning that when the Council members take an oath they do so saying that if something comes

to them as a Council that they are going to be objective. That is the oath he has taken and will honor. If various engineers and professionals come back with recommendations, he is not going to predetermine that he is voting for or against something. He is going to have to look at what they have put together, and their data and the public comments. He wants the public to be aware that is the process. There are going to be many opportunities for the public to share its concerns or support. As a City, the Council is not looking to take hasty action. It is looking to see what the report says, what the CTC says, receive public testimony and then, at some point, all of that will reach the Council for its deliberations.

One of the things that has been popping up in his mind is that he has the same concerns about pedestrians or bikes or cars crossing a state highway. He pointed out that there are some times of day where those crossings are made in a routine way and there are some times of day when a veteran resident of Coronado chooses not to cross at some of those intersections. One of the things that has to be deliberated on is what times of day the safety problems are present, how serious those safety problems are and then does the idea of closing pedestrian access at certain intersections make sense. If it is not safe to cross a state highway at one point, then some will argue that it shouldn't be safe to cross it at any point. That is a policy decision. Obviously there is an issue of fairness. Is it fair to say one intersection is not safe but another is? Some of the arguments he has heard today have valid points but there are also elements of their logic that need to be tested a little bit more rigorously. He heard the comment about enforcement and ticketing. He does agree, in a general sense, that more enforcement is needed. He does agree, in a general sense, that the more enforcement the City can provide, the more likely that is to calm traffic or to improve driver and bicyclist and pedestrian behavior but he pointed out that the City does not have unlimited resources. Every time we bring in more enforcement, it will help to the extent that we can do it but he doesn't think there is anyone who can say that enforcement can be provided on a 24 hour basis. He thinks that is just a limitation that, to some extent, we all have to accept. We are never going to have as much enforcement as we want. If you think about discussions about the border and whether or not we need more enforcement and stronger borders and so on, that is one of the elements of that debate. There is no politician who is ever going to say that they don't want more enforcement at the border but you can throw resources all day at a problem and that doesn't mean you are necessarily going to cure it. He says that as a little bit of a warning. In a general sense, he would like to see more enforcement. In a general sense he thinks it would be worth the City's tax dollars to consider that. He also does not want to give the impression that it is a silver bullet. If we increased police spending by 10%, he is not sure you'd see 10% more safety. You might. It might be worth thinking about but he thinks that is the panacea effect. He is not sure you are really going to get the increased safety that you would want to see, at least on a percentage basis. There is a process this will go through. It will go to the CTC next. Eventually it will reach the Council. The Council will honor its oath and whatever is presented will be considered objectively. He thanked everyone who came today and encouraged them to keep sharing their opinions.

Councilmember Woiwode commented that there was a reference made to an email from Caltrans. The reference did not include all of the germane data. It talks about the fact that Caltrans has blocked pedestrian crossing at some streets in its jurisdiction. It also says that studying pedestrian patterns so that adequate facilities are provided for individuals to cross at key locations along the facility and it also says that the distance from A to Orange is excessive. What Caltrans is saying, without explicitly saying so, is that you can block pedestrian crossing at some places but you have to come up with a place somewhere for people to cross. A to Orange is too long a distance. We

know that intuitively. Of course, going the other direction under the bridge is an even longer distance. So the blocking of pedestrian crossings, first of all is nearly unenforceable, and secondly, is just going to keep on happening anyway and it doesn't do anything for bicycles. Bicycles are still authorized to use the roads just as other vehicles are. If he is on a bicycle, he is not going to ride on the sidewalk up to Orange to cross Third and Fourth. He is going to stay on B and wait for a break in the traffic. He does that regularly. He goes across town, from City Hall to the Landing, and crosses on B. There are three bus stops on Third that are east of Orange. There are three bus stops on Fourth that are east of Orange. All those people that get on the bus on one of those streets get off the bus at the other street. By and large, they are crossing in between Orange and Pomona. They are not going up to Orange to cross. There are some systemic problems here and just outlawing a particular behavior is non responsive. You can't legislate good behavior. There just is not enough enforcement to make people comply. The Mayor brought up time of day. That is very significant. Most hours it is not that difficult to cross those streets. It is only when the traffic is heavy that it is a particularly difficult thing to do. If we take some kind of a solution that tells people they can't cross and they get to the point and it is perfectly obvious to them that it is just fine, then what we have done is created lots more outlaws. There are some good ideas about wayfinding, helping the tourists out. He thinks that is all good. To the point made about the neighborhood feel, to the directive that Caltrans has and all jurisdictions are adopting about Complete Streets. Streets are to be used for all forms of transportation – pedestrian, bicycle and car. They are not to be used exclusively for one form of transportation, with some very limited exceptions. He feels like taking the approach that we are going to legislate that people don't put themselves in danger is not effective. He doesn't think we are being responsive to the charter that we set for ourselves. The reason we said we want to take this on, as a matter of urgency separate from the Third and Fourth Street traffic calming, is because we wanted to clarify that these are two different issues. One is safety in crossing east of Orange, separate from what happens with the traffic calming study which may go on for a long time and may or may not include traffic lights. He believes that if we jump to #3 we have given up what we thought was an urgent issue. We are making the statement that dealing with this from a safety standpoint is not as important to us. He would much rather see the City do #2 to go ahead and initiate a Project Study Report (PSR) and get a formal study that actually looks at the data and does some of the modeling that needs to be done to tell us what the consequences would be of taking action. That is his preference.

Mayor Tanaka asked Mr. Woiwode a couple of questions. He was happy to support what the Council did in May because that was another opportunity to try to have a constructive dialogue with Caltrans. In Caltrans' defense, maybe a really constructive dialogue on our terms as a city was not achievable. He was willing to give it a try. The City got the answer that most expected – Caltrans has rigid design standards, rigid protocols and they are not going to bend them even if the City thinks they deserve a second look. He is arguing that #3 is better than #2 because he really doubts that a second independent report is going to reach vastly different conclusions than a study we already have coming along will. He needs more convincing what the value is of doing a project study report. What do we think we are going to get out of that? His biggest concerns stem from the fact that we have all seen every one of these suggestions before and they are divisive and every one of these suggestions, to some extent, has a winner and a loser. This is the part he regrets. He does not want to have another big discussion about whether or not we are going to do x or y. He doesn't want to see another community-wide vote on whether we open or close street x or y. We have had those discussions. To some extent it is healthy to reexamine but we had these votes only ten years ago and he doesn't see how the community is going to benefit if we keep relitigating the

same points. Is Mr. Woiwode optimistic that if the City took #2 that somehow we would get something different?

Mr. Woiwode feels that if we got to where we had a specific proposal and we had participation from people other than who live on B Avenue we might hear a lot of opinions. We did get some emails from people who wanted to see the City go ahead with something at these intersections. That is not to prejudge the outcome one way or the other. He is thinking that if we are asked if we have done all we can to address what we know to be a safety issue he is not confident that we have. He doesn't have a predisposition toward or against traffic signals, although he generally is not particularly anxious to see those if that is the only outcome, but on the other hand, if it is the recommendation and it is going to address the safety issue, he wants to hear what other options they may propose. The fact that everything we have gotten is in conversation but we don't have a proposal is what leads him to the point where we have gotten to almost the last chapter and #2 is the last chapter. Maybe it just comes down to the same thing that Mr. Maurer briefed us on. Maybe this is the only thing that Caltrans will allow and then we say we don't want to do it or we do want to do it but in any case we have something in particular to look at. What we have right now is a list of things and what we have gotten in conversation would be the reaction to those. He doesn't consider that a formal proposal.

Councilmember Sandke began by saying that one of the most important things he learned today was that Orange Avenue was a minor arterial. He did not know that. Maybe between Third and Fourth it should be considered a major arterial. He was surprised at how many people spoke about prohibiting any crossings at all at those intersections in general. He thinks Mr. Woiwode recognizes the problematic nature of that. He knows that the City is working on way finding and in the next couple of Council meetings we will see some initial draft proposals for some new way finding, recognizing the fact that most of the folks who do become problem crossers are folks who are not familiar with our town. The one problem crosser who ended up nearly killed was from Coronado. Doing important things for tourists is important but recognizing the needs of our citizens, even when they have lived here a long time and know what and where to go, we still have issues. He is of the opinion that the #3 position is the right one to take tonight. This is not because he doesn't feel there is a safety issue at that intersection. He thinks that safety is part of the circulation element that is being looked at in that broader study. He thinks that whole intersection, looked at as a whole of the traffic pattern, lends itself perfectly to us taking #3 tonight, perhaps with some added guidance moving forward, after the first draft review that we make sure that safety crossing at those intersections is highlighted.

He didn't run for office to urbanize his town. He was driving up Market Street thinking about these things and was stopped at every light on Market Street. He does not want to do that to Coronado. He thinks really smart people from this Fehr and Peers group have looked at a circulation element and have come up with what engineers think is the best thing for our town. Incrementally, in that report, at least in the draft version he has seen, there are some good ideas and presented tonight have been some fantastic ideas that he hopes we get considered. He would love to see the City look at additional left turning opportunities between Third and Fourth on Orange to accommodate that additional traffic that might be diverted from prohibiting left turns, not with barricades, but with time restrictions. He thinks that the timing nature of the dangers of these intersections have a lot of times when it is just not a problem at all to get across.

With respect to the neighborhood comments, Coronado has a neighborhood feel in most of its streets and the efforts of the folks in the TAF group and, he hopes, the efforts of the folks around this table will be cognizant of the fact that if we can reclaim some of the neighborhood feel of the folks that live on Third and Fourth and between those streets we should do that but we should not do that at the expense of another neighborhood. Diversion is not a solution. There are some traffic calming measures that he thinks the City will be able to move forward with and the Fehr and Peers study offers an awful lot of ideas, not a concrete roadmap, but ideas for the Council to hash through and we would certainly have the opportunity to pick and choose those that we feel are the best fit for our community and he thinks that at this juncture in the process, knowing that the Fehr and Peers study also has safety in mind, he would be in favor of moving forward with #3.

Mayor Tanaka asked the City Attorney a question. If there were to be a 2-1 vote, would that be sufficient to carry or do we need three affirmative votes to move forward.

City Attorney Johanna Canlas explained that this is not a resolution and is just direction so a majority of the quorum, which is two, will suffice.

**MSC (Sandke/Tanaka) moved that the City Council move forward with Option #3, Wait for Third/Fourth Street Corridor Study to be Completed with the added caveat that as we move forward with the consultant that safety at the intersections of Third and Fourth and B be incorporated into their study if it is not already.**

Mayor Tanaka assumes that is part of the study.

Mr. Sandke added that is why he is comfortable moving forward with #3 but he did not look at the RFP and has only seen the draft a cursory time.

<b>AYES:</b>	<b>Sandke, Tanaka</b>
<b>NAYS:</b>	<b>Woiwode</b>
<b>ABSTAINING:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>ABSENT:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>RECUSED:</b>	<b>Bailey, Downey</b>

**11d. Consider Options and Provide Direction for Excess Liability Insurance Coverage. Under Consent, the City Council directed the City Manager to explore and report back with regard to options and alternatives for liability insurance coverage.**

**11e. Receive and Consider Revisions to Various Policies and Fees for Recreation Facilities and Programs as Recommended by the Parks and Recreation Commission. Under Consent, the City Council reviewed draft changes to Recreation Department fees and policies and scheduled a Public Hearing for a future meeting for action.**

**12. CITY ATTORNEY: No report.**

**13. COMMUNICATIONS - WRITTEN: None.**

14. **ADJOURNMENT:** The Mayor adjourned the meeting in honor of VADM Ed Martin at 6:03 p.m.

Approved: January 20, 2015



---

Casey Tanaka, Mayor  
City of Coronado

Attest:



---

Mary L. Clifford  
City Clerk