

**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, March 15, 2016**

Mayor Tanaka called the Closed Session to order at 3:29 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CLOSED SESSION

- 1. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – EXISTING LITIGATION**
AUTHORITY: Government Code Section 54956.9(a), (d)(1)
NAME OF CASE: Zachary Slattery v. City of Coronado, et al.
San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2015-00012966-CU-PA-CTL
- 2. COMMUNICATIONS - ORAL: None.**

ADJOURN TO CLOSED SESSION 3:30 p.m.

The Closed Session reconvened at 3:44 p.m. Mayor Tanaka reported that Council gave direction to staff.

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 March 1, 2016.

MSUC (Woiwode/Sandke) moved to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the City Council/the City Council Acting as the Successor Agency of March 1, 2016, 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:**

Mayor Tanaka presented a City coin to Phil Hammett.

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

MSUC (Downey/Bailey) moved that the City Council approve the Consent Calendar Items 5a through 5i.

AYES: Bailey, Downey, Sandke, Woiwode, Tanaka
NAYS: None
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 Budgets for FY 2015-2016.** The City Council approved payment of City warrant Nos. 10111363 thru 10111627 and City of Coronado Acting as the Successor Agency to the Community Development Agency of the City of Coronado warrant No. 90005594. The City Council approved the warrants as certified by the City/Agency Treasurer.

5c. **Authorization for the City Manager to Execute a Repair Agreement for a Not-to-Exceed Amount of \$100,000 with Haaker Equipment Company for Repairs to the 2002 Wastewater/Storm Water Vactor 6-1R.** The City Council authorized the City Manager to execute the repair agreement that will restore Vactor 6-1R to full operational status.

5d. Authorization for the City Manager to Execute a Multi-Year Purchase Agreement for Third Party Workers' Compensation Administration with Keenan & Associates, for an Amount Not to Exceed \$113,000 in the First Year. The City Council authorized the City Manager to execute a multi-year purchase agreement with Keenan & Associates, who will provide third party workers' compensation claims administration including bill review, utilization review and medical management of the City's active cases.

5e. Authorize the City Manager to Enter into a Five-Year Agreement, for \$95,500 Annually, with the City of San Diego to Provide Fire Dispatch Services. The City Council authorized the City Manager to enter into a contract with the City of San Diego to provide fire dispatch services.

5f. Authorization to Transmit the 2016 Annual Housing Progress Report to the State Office of Housing and Community Development (HCD). The City Council authorized the transmission of the 2016 Annual Housing Report to HCD.

5g. Second Reading and Adoption of "An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Coronado, California, Amending Section 3.60.020 of Chapter 3.60 of Title 3 of the Coronado Municipal Code Regarding Unclaimed Property." The City Council adopted AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO, CALIFORNIA, AMENDING SECTION 3.60.020 OF CHAPTER 3.60 OF TITLE 3 OF THE CORONADO MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING UNCLAIMED PROPERTY. The Ordinance, having been placed on First Reading on March 1, 2016, was read by Title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by Council as Ordinance No. 2056. The City Clerk read the title of the adopted ordinance and announced that the vote at the introduction of the ordinance was unanimous.

5h. Second Reading and Adoption of "An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Coronado, California Adding Section 56.08.080 to Chapter 56.08 of Title 56 of the Coronado Municipal Code to Authorize the Removal of Bicycles Remaining on Public Property for Over 72 Hours." The City Council AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO, CALIFORNIA, ADDING SECTION 56.08.080 TO CHAPTER 56.08 OF TITLE 56 OF THE CORONADO MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING REMOVAL OF BICYCLES REMAINING ON PUBLIC PROPERTY FOR OVER 72 HOURS. The Ordinance, having been placed on First Reading on March 1, 2016, was read by Title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by Council as Ordinance No. 2057. The City Clerk read the title of the adopted ordinance and announced that the vote at the introduction of the ordinance was unanimous.

5i. Concurrence with Councilmembers Downey and Sandke Exchanging Appointments as City Council Representatives to South County Economic Development Council and Coronado MainStreet, Ltd, Respectively. The City Council approved the exchange of appointments.

6. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

- a. **Harold Myers** discussed why he believes Mr. Bailey wanted us to change our campaign ordinance at the last meeting. He has reviewed Mr. Bailey's campaign statement. Last November, Mr. Myers tried to advise Mr. Bailey regarding his campaign website and credit card contributions. All monetary contributions must be made by check. Our campaign regulations are aimed at making it very difficult to launder funds. In a small town where a few votes can make a big difference, it is important to have squeaky-clean campaign financing. He tried to explain that checks require signatures and are easy to audit. Credit cards lack the same transparency. Different card numbers can have the same bill-to account and signatures are not required. Mr. Bailey decided to take credit cards anyway. He has collected over \$5,000 by credit card based on transaction processing fees from strike.com, reported on his Form 460. They have a very simple pricing structure, which makes it very easy to calculate how much money he has received by credit cards. Since the last meeting, Mr. Bailey has changed his website and he no longer solicits credit card donations. What else does he need to do? He needs to return all campaign contributions made by credit card. He needs to show each refund as an individual expense on his Form 460 and he needs to acknowledge that all credit card contributions were improper and do not qualify as a contribution made in 2015. He made a big point of Coronado being the only one with a checks-only ordinance. In fact, Carlsbad just went through a very contentious election and modeled their checks-only regulation after Coronado's in 2003 so that they could see that they were being influenced by out-of-towners on the recent shopping mall vote. Our campaign regulations alert voters when outside interest groups try to influence our elections. More than half of the \$12,664 in contributions that Mr. Bailey has recorded is from out-of-town donors.
- b. **Rich Brady** owns a condo at The Shores in the closest building to the Del, separated only by the cul-de-sac at Avenida del Sol. Last summer, he attended the annual HOA meeting where the main discussion quickly evolved into a very strong opposition to the South Beach bathroom which is to be constructed on the beach at the west end of the cul-de-sac. Because he doesn't live there all the time, when the discussion got serious he thought it was a typical NIMBY vote by La Sierra residents who didn't want a bathroom built outside their building. He actually spoke in favor of it because a bathroom is needed somewhere on South Beach and he figured it was too late to fight the City with letters and lawyers. A month ago he received a request from the La Sierra HOA for a vote on a special financial assessment of every unit in the building in order to pay legal fees incurred by the HOA in opposition to the project. That got his attention. Subsequently, he called the building manager about it and he clarified the real opposition to the bathroom project by showing pictures of where it is to be built. After looking at the pictures and physically visiting the site himself, he was surprised to learn that the project is going to cost well over \$1 million that has already been voted on in favor by the City Council. At this point, the only delay is the City's response to the objections raised in the EIR by the La Sierra HOA, with construction possibly to begin next fall. Adding to his initial surprise, the day he visited the site the project location

- was under water. And, as it turns out, it was under water on all the other days subsequent to his initial visit with the stairs that used to go down to the beach half buried in sand. Just last week he noticed that all the palm trees planted along the Paseo walkway along the beach, except one, have fallen because of the erosion and now a bulldozer spends hours there every day moving sand around to protect even more of the shore from disappearing as well as to protect the Paseo walkway. Thinking he must be misinformed, he called the City Engineer, Ed Walton, for the straight scoop. It is exactly where it is supposed to be. If what he is saying is true, if the City builds the thing where it is proposed to go it is \$1 million and it will be fluid, sewage spills will occur, and he thinks the City needs to look at it again.
- c. **Laura Crenshaw** announced that the 91st Coronado Flower Show will the 16 and 17 of April. Next year, it won't be the third weekend in April as Easter falls that weekend so it will be the second weekend in April in 2017. She encouraged everyone to come to the show and to participate.
 - d. **Phil Hammett** reported that on April 16, the Coronado Chamber of Commerce will be hosting its 31st Annual Salute to the Military. That is one of the most significant things our City does to show its recognition of and appreciation for the military. Tables are still available and a table purchase includes four military guests who sit and enjoy the evening free of charge. The honored guest and speaker for the ball will be Alvin Townley, a best-selling author of Defiant: The POWs Who Endured Vietnam's Most Infamous Prison, the Women Who Fought for Them, and the One Who Never Returned.
 - e. **Wayne Strickland** spoke on behalf of the Coronado/San Diego Bridge Collaborative for Suicide Prevention. They have an analysis provided by the Medical Examiner's Office, which shows that November is the most popular month for suicides; April is the slowest. Every other year someone from Coronado ends up jumping from the Bridge. We have 13 suicides that happened last year. Over the last four years, the suicide rates have increased 50% from the bridge. We cannot determine how many times people tried to jump and didn't but as we all know that bridge is closed many, many times and you have to go the other way. That is another benefit of getting nets or whatever we get from Caltrans. It seems like males age 19 are the most common age of the victims. The good news is that the active duty and veteran status of jumpers is only 9%. While we wait for the Council and Collaborative, we would like to get Caltrans to change some signs at mid-span and have our mantra, which was developed by a mental health worker, in Spanish and in English, say, "Have faith that things will change. Have faith that things will get better. Have faith that this will soon pass." We hope that can be done in the center of the bridge. We are making progress toward the \$15,000 for the study and have \$5,000 raised. They have 900 people in their group that are interested in this and there is a witness group of over 100 members. They will be speaking before the San Diego City Council. Port Commissioner Bonnelli requested that they speak at the next monthly meeting and they are having discussions with Supervisor Greg Cox's office. They are creating a public service announcement with San Diego State University. Over 35 individuals have been scheduled to be interviewed for films. They are applying for a community grant. They won't give up.

- f. **Sue Gillingham, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce**, commented on Item 11b. On behalf of the Chamber of Commerce, she voiced support of the current configuration of the loading zones in the Block 4 alley. While we are sympathetic to the inconveniences posed by sharing a mixed use alley, they are supportive of the City's compromise which resulted in specified loading areas for commercial deliveries while allowing reasonable access to garage parking. Alleys are narrow streets, specifically set aside as infrastructure. They include such messy eyesores as loading docks, electrical conduits and waste collections – all the items you don't want to see on your main streets. As time goes by, alleys evolved to keep up with economic and demographic conditions. In Coronado's case, this has included the growth of the number of personal vehicles per dwelling and the number of deliveries necessary for our businesses to thrive. The El Cordova Hotel is one such business that has existed since 1930. The surrounding shops and restaurants have created one of Coronado's most vibrant blocks. In addition to Block 4, there are about a dozen other mixed use blocks with commercial businesses fronting on Orange Avenue and residential lots fronting on C and D Avenues. The daily dance of deliveries, residential parking, utility access, and trash trucks occurs on all of these alleys. Unfortunately for the Oxford Park residents, Block 4 has perhaps the most traffic because 75% of the alley is commercial rather than just 50%, including the mini trucks who must access the US Post Office loading dock next door to the Oxford. She has spoken with the majority of the business owners and managers who utilize the loading zones. They are unanimous in their support of the current design. Additionally, they have all asked their vendors to refrain from arriving before 8 a.m., to service multiple restaurants with one trip, and utilize the Brigantine parking lot in the mornings along with the loading zones on Adella, Orange and B Avenues. She has personally observed morning deliveries occurring in these loading zones while deliveries were also being conducted in the alley. In the six times she sampled, she only saw one residential vehicle entering the alley to access their parking spot. At no time did she see the alley blocked or trucks sitting with their engines on. To summarize, the Chamber wants to thank the City for designing a compromise that allows our businesses to receive deliveries while respecting the parking needs of the adjacent residences.
- g. **Councilmember Bailey** stated he was just accused in public of violating the law, which is a pretty serious accusation. We are approaching what is known as the Silly Season when politics start entering the discussion more so than usual. He wanted to provide some context for the public. Prior to beginning his campaign, he consulted with outside legal counsel to go over the City's campaign finance laws to determine whether or not it was permissible to receive contributions electronically. It was his outside legal counsel's opinion that it was; however, the City's ordinance is fairly ambiguous. One of the terms is not defined. So he brought forward a request to consider updating the ordinance to define this term. The Council decided not to define it as the timing was not appropriate so he respected the Council decision, although he disagreed with it, and he removed the option to contribute electronically from his campaign website. Ironically, the charge that credit card contributions are not traceable was just disproven by the

statement here today showing that they were, in fact, traceable. All the filings were made in accordance with state law and that is how the speaker was able to determine that contributions were made electronically.

- h. **Councilmember Downey** reported that she, Councilmember Woiwode and Councilmember Sandke spent last week at the San Diego Association of Governments' retreat. One of the reasons it was important that all of them, as representatives of SANDAG, attended is there was discussion, debate and an opportunity for public input in choosing a ballot initiative that will go on the November ballot. All voters in San Diego County will be asked to support what is known as a TransNet tax. As a tax, this would require a 2/3 vote. It is the continuation of the last two TransNet votes this county has taken. The first time was to increase the sales tax by one-quarter percent. The next time was another one-quarter percent and this is the last one-half percent of a one percent tax increase that was envisioned and authorized by the California legislature to help pay for infrastructure within San Diego County. The entire nation has been struggling with completing infrastructure all over the country and in the last 10 years quite a bit has been done. In San Diego County, because our population has been increasing the entire time, even during the housing crisis and downturn from loans and banking, our population keeps increasing. What that means is more individuals on our roadways and using our public transit system. This initiative is going to allow SANDAG to complete many of the highway projects that have been started; it allowed SANDAG to purchase the toll road that was originally a private toll road and lower toll costs for folks coming up as an alternative to the 805. People can go to the SANDAG website for more information. Available there is the list of projects that won't be finished if we don't pass the initiative. One of the initiatives that most people support is an addition of a whole new trolley line known as the Purple Line that will start down in the South Bay and bring individuals up into San Diego. She asked people to go to the website and provide comments.

7. CITY MANAGER/EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR:

7a. Update on Council Directed Actions and Citizen Inquiries. City Manager Blair King reported that in January the City Council asked staff to work with the City's lobbyist, Jonathan Clay, and pursue legislation to allow for speed cameras to be enacted in California. As of February 19, which was the deadline to introduce legislation, there was not a bill that was introduced to allow for speed cameras. Currently, speed cameras are not allowed either on local streets and roads or state highways. Mr. Clay had discovered that there were two major cities in California who were interested in using speed cameras on local streets and roads. These are the City of San Francisco and the City of San Jose. He also discovered, during his due diligence, that Southern California AAA was strongly opposed to such legislation.

Jonathan Clay, JGC Government Relations, provided additional comments. They looked for a vehicle to try to see what opportunities there might be. With the late January timing, the deadline had already passed for putting our own language into Leg Counsel, which is the first step in introducing a bill. They approached some of the other major cities that they knew had been exploring this and had also heard that the Chair of the Senate Transportation Committee was going

to carry the bill. Based on conversations with the Chief Consultant for the Senate Transportation and Housing Committee, who works for Senator Bell, they said that they had not pursued it because of the opposition from the auto clubs and conversations with the Governor's office. For those reasons, the Chair of the Committee opted not to do it. They also had some further conversations on the Assembly side with the Assembly Transportation Committee. One of the things they highlighted is, because this is a state highway and not a local street and road, Coronado would also likely engender opposition from the Highway Patrol and Highway Patrol unions. For a variety of reasons, no one ended up introducing a bill on this matter. The City could put its own language in and try to find an author to carry such legislation but the City Manager wanted him to walk the Council through the due diligence that was done in terms of trying to find at least a vehicle and also to understand where the potential pitfalls are in pursuing this type of legislation.

Mayor Tanaka summarized that it is fair to say that the idea of putting in this legislation has fairly powerful enemies and no one put in legislation probably because they saw that it was a fairly uphill struggle for this year.

Mr. Clay agreed and said that is historically why you haven't had any movement on speed cameras for local streets and roads. There is built-in opposition.

Mayor Tanaka continued by saying that the next step forward for Coronado, strategically, is to look for that same date in the next year and aim our efforts toward gathering intelligence to see if the climate is the same and what can be done to help.

Mr. Clay added that if the City wishes to introduce legislation on it and have it be the City's own sponsored bill with an author, the City should probably take action on something like that in November to try to give everyone enough time in the December time frame to start talking with members of the legislation delegation and members of the legislature so that we can get language into Leg Counsel for that January deadline and then be able to have a bill introduced by the February deadline. There is always the possibility that someone could get an amended bill.

Councilmember Sandke thanked Mr. Clay for his work on this. He asked if he had found any difference in the approach, particularly in terms of the Highway Patrol saying they don't want it on highways, and they don't really enforce our highway anyway, in terms of different approaches versus local streets and roads and opposing them on highways. Would we have an opportunity should, for example, our roadways no longer be state highways? Would that open a door for us?

Mr. Clay doesn't feel that it does. If it is a local street or road, it is probably more in the realm of possibility. Some of the comments from the committee staff, who typically are the ones who do the analysis of these bills, asked what other measures have happened at the local level to try to calm traffic, etc. The whole issue that it is a state highway complicates that. There aren't a lot of options for the City because of that. He doesn't want to say it gets easier if it is a local street and road because San Francisco and San Jose were exploring it for just local streets and roads and that didn't happen either. It seems more in the realm of the possible, though.

Mr. King reminded everyone that this is a non-agenda item and falls into the context of the City Manager providing a report on direction provided by the City Council.

8. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

8a. Public Hearing: Adoption of a Resolution Approving a One-Lot Tentative Parcel Map to Allow for Condominium Ownership of Three Residential Units for the Property Addressed as 770 F Avenue in the R-3 (Multiple Family Residential) Zone (PC 2015-21). Tricia Olsen, Associate Planner, gave the presentation.

Councilmember Downey asked a question about access into the units.

Ms. Olsen explained that there is access along the sides and from the garages.

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

MSUC (Bailey/Sandke) moved that the City Council adopt A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO APPROVING A ONE-LOT TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP TO ALLOW FOR CONDOMINIUM OWNERSHIP OF THREE RESIDENTIAL UNITS FOR THE PROPERTY ADDRESSED AS 770 F AVENUE, CORONADO, CALIFORNIA. The Resolution was read by title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by City Council as RESOLUTION NO. 8789.

Councilmember Downey explained to the public that although no one likes to see things that happen to historic properties, this is actually a success. They were able to save the front house. It gives the view and recognition that the City wants to have of that historical property. That is why she was curious to see how the entrances went around the back and that people have to walk around the house to get to the front entrances. This developer has complied with the City statutes and zoning and she will vote in support of the motion.

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

8b. Public Hearing: Adoption of a Resolution Approving a Two-Lot Tentative Parcel Map for the Property Addressed as 427 A Avenue in the R-1B (Single Family Residential) Zone (PC 2015-22). Tricia Olsen, Associate Planner, gave the presentation.

Mayor Tanaka opened the public hearing.

Steve Mullin, applicant, explained that he is asking for relief from conditions 8, 9, 18, 19, 20 and 24 on the proposed ordinance. This is not a standard development. He is not tearing anything down or putting anything up so there won't be any traffic in the alley or anything being built. He is trying to preserve the historical asset that is his house. The Planning Commission raised the

issue of Adella Lane as the City's responsibility. He spoke about the specifics of what he is asking for.

Councilmember Downey asked if these requests were raised with the Planning Commission.

Mr. Mullin didn't raise anything at the Planning Commission because he didn't think it was a negotiable kind of thing and when two of the Commissioners raised the issue, City staff talked them down.

Floyd Ross used to live in this house. He supports the applicant wholeheartedly.

City Attorney Johanna Canlas commented that because these are items that were not discussed with staff earlier on, it may be beneficial for the Council to consider continuing the public hearing to a date certain so that staff can look at some of the issues.

Mayor Tanaka added that the Council may adjudicate this itself. That is his preference.

Mayor Tanaka closed the public hearing.

Mayor Tanaka wouldn't ordinarily be interested in negotiating these items because they go through a pretty long process. One of the things that makes this property and this situation different in his opinion is because all we are talking about is the parcel map split. There is no new construction going on. Many of the conditions that the applicant is debating are all tied to new construction. It is a reasonable request to not charge the applicant to redo an alley that doesn't need to be redone because there is no construction going on. The same is true of the front sidewalk. In the future, if one or both of the owners propose new construction, all of these conditions will start to come up and they will have to trigger it. He is comfortable removing 8 and 9 and as far as 18, 19 and 20 he doesn't see why we have to order the removal of trees. He will not support removing condition 24. Even though no new construction is going on, the owner is getting a benefit and the benefit is the ability to sell two lots instead of one and that is why there is a housing fee. This process is the same for everyone. Everyone should follow the same rules. He doesn't see any merit for exempting that rule. He is happy to exempt the other five because this is, in fact, atypical.

MSUC (Downey/Sandke) moved that the City Council adopt A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO APPROVING A TWO-LOT TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP FOR THE PROPERTY ADDRESSED AS 427 A AVENUE, CORONADO, CALIFORNIA. The Resolution was read by title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by City Council as RESOLUTION NO. 8790. The Resolution reflects the removal of conditions 8, 9, 18, 19, 20. Condition 24 is retained.

Councilmember Downey agrees wholeheartedly with Mayor Tanaka's analysis. Condition 24 is actually the cost of getting a new lot designated so that you can sell it. It doesn't matter what you are doing. That has to be done. We are doing that. We are taking one parcel and allowing it to be sold as two and that is what triggers that cost.

Councilmember Woiwode can see why 8 and 9 wound up in here since it is part of the process but he doesn't know why 18 wound up in there.

Cliff Maurer, Director of Public Services, explained that when there is a redevelopment and parcel split staff takes the opportunity to improve our parkways to the standards we want in the City. At Mr. Mullin's residence there are palms, which are not approved street trees. Had this been a redevelopment, the palms would be removed and shade trees would be put in their place with a proper irrigation system to support those as once they are placed they become City-owned street trees.

Councilmember Sandke thought there might have been some encumbrance to the public right-of-way for people that use the parking spots adjacent to the property.

Mr. Maurer did not think that was part of this.

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

8c. Public Hearing: Adoption of a Resolution Implementing the Annual Indexed Adjustments to Police, EMS/Ambulance and Development-Related User Fees, and to the Wastewater Capacity Fees for Fiscal Year 2016-17. Tom Ritter, Assistant City Manager, gave the presentation.

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

MSUC (Sandke/Woiwode) moved that the City Council adopt A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO ADOPTING THE FISCAL YEAR 2016-17 SCHEDULES OF POLICE, EMS/AMBULANCE FEES, DEVELOPMENT USER FEES, AND WASTEWATER CAPACITY FEES TO BE CHARGED BY VARIOUS CITY DEPARTMENTS AND REPEALING PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED AND/OR CONFLICTING FEES FOR SUCH SERVICES. The Resolution was read by title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by City Council as RESOLUTION NO. 8791.

AYES:	Bailey, Downey, Sandke, Woiwode, Tanaka
NAYS:	None
ABSTAINING:	None
ABSENT:	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. Mayor Tanaka asked Councilmembers to submit their reports in writing.

11b. Review of Commercial Loading Zones in the Alley Adjacent to the El Cordova Hotel and Oxford Park Complex (Block 4). Blair King, City Manager, prefaced the report. City Attorney Johanna Canlas added that for those Council members who were not present at the time this was originally heard, there is a blue sheet item that has the staff report and the minutes available. Jim Newton, Principal Engineer, gave the presentation.

Councilmember Bailey referred to the letter from Tina Pivonka dating back to last year when this item first came up for consideration. She had cited access as their primary concern or at least a big concern. She also mentioned several units as being especially difficult for consistent access. These are Unit 1, Unit 6, Unit 7, Unit 8. Mr. Newton mentioned that several calls that came in specifically spoke to having accessibility issues. Did we ask which garages were still having those issues?

Mr. Newton would need to go back to see if that could be identified through the call log records. He thinks most of those were to PD so he would need to coordinate with them on that.

Councilmember Downey thinks that we will hear from the public that the other reason this was done was to figure out the noise and deal with some of the noise from the trucks. The placement does seem to have helped in some instances but maybe not in every single unit. Can Mr. Newton clarify for the record what the noise ordinance time is for trucks to be able to start unloading legally in this alley?

Mr. Newton believes that the noise ordinance says that 7 a.m. is the time.

Councilmember Sandke thought he read somewhere that there was a requirement or request to paint red curb or the red fire safety line down that alley. He noticed in the photos that has not been done. Did we decide not to do that or that it just was not appropriate for that alley?

Mr. Newton explained that part of the initial request, when there were conversations with the Fire Department, was for safety, for accessibility. One of the proposals from the residents, when they approached the Fire Department, was looking at some of the other alleys in town and why we don't implement fire lane striping in this particular alley. In this case, staff felt that because of the mixed-use nature of this alley that it might not be the best approach.

Mr. Sandke referred to the earlier comment that there are about 12 other mixed-use alleys. Do we use the red striping in any of those?

Mr. Newton believes that the majority do not have that striping. There might be one or two blocks but he is not positive.

Mayor Tanaka invited public comment.

Patricia Faircloth, Oxford Park resident, commented that blocking of the garages is still happening. Trucks still park behind Units 1, 2 and 3 and they block access. She feels that the City Council should not use what they perceive a lack of calls to the police as a determining factor. She has called three times in the last two months and one of those times she called back because the truck had already left and she didn't want to be the person who cried wolf. Her personal experiences have shown that the police usually don't come or they come out too late. Her last call was this morning at 6 a.m. when a big truck was parked, definitely blocking her garage. There was lots of noise. The police did come out, and this was the only time she has ever had the police come out or they have come out, and he ended up backing out of the alley which made a lot of noise. If she had known that the number of calls to the police was going to be relied on, she would have called every time there was a violation, even if she had no intent of leaving her garage but she didn't do that. She also wanted the City Council to realize that the staff's field observations have limited value and that they actually show continued violations by the drivers. Nineteen visits in one year is not a representative sample of 365 days, with 11 hours of commercial parking each day, 7 a.m. to 6 p.m., because that equals 4,015 hours, which gives a statistical sampling of 0.0047. The field observations actually do show two violations though. On 2/20/15, Zone 1, there is one truck and an additional truck parked behind it. On 3/3/15, the grease truck is parked south of the loading zone. That gives statistically 10% of the recorded observations given by the engineer as a violation. What is even more important here, though, is significantly only three visits were made during the busy months, the summer months. There were absolutely zero visits made in July. Staff didn't contact any of the residents before making that decision. She suggests temporarily banning the commercial parking in the area adjacent to Oxford Park Zones 1 and 2. Trucks can continue to park in Zone 3 behind Bruegger's, on Orange in front of the Brigantine, and in the Brigantine parking lot in the morning. If this is not enough, also consider adding another commercial zone on Orange behind the current zone and in front of the timeshare on Adella because there are no guest rooms on that side. Test for six months to see how that goes.

Mike Morton, President, Brigantine Corporation, operator of Miguel's and the Brigantine, recommended accepting the staff recommendation of keeping the loading zones as is. He believes this was a good compromise between the entire alley and having no parking whatsoever for deliveries. They work with all of their vendors. He made personal phone calls to all of their vendors and asked them to be respectful of the City ordinance and to come out after 7 a.m., specifically the grease pumping company, and since then, and he believes the residents would agree, they have been in compliance within the loading zone and they have been trying to come at later hours, altering their schedules in several hours to try to be respectful. He respectfully asked for Council approval of the staff recommendation.

Rita Sarich, Coronado MainStreet, commented that the Board of Coronado MainStreet supports the staff recommendation. Perhaps it is not a perfect solution but in this busy mixed-use alley, it serves the important needs of the businesses and it doesn't lose any on-site parking.

Tina Pivonka, Unit 1, commented that they did meet with Mike Morton and the El Cordova group in January. They did talk about a lot of issues and she knows that Mr. Morton has made some calls. She does ask why Shamrock was there at 6 a.m. this morning with two guys offloading from the back and the side, banging their boxes, talking at 6 a.m. If Shamrock had been notified and if the truckers were complying that wouldn't have happened this morning. It still is happening. She

suggests that the Council take a look. Yes, the grease truck has started to come later but now he is parking in the front, in front of the dumpsters, illegally. She sent pictures of that last week. There has been discussion in the past that the hotel was there first and that the hotel pays all of these taxes. The situation has changed. The community has gotten bigger. The trucks are bigger. Miguel's expanded. There are many more deliveries. There is more trash. There is more noise. The trucks are still noisy, polluting and blocking their access. What can be done because there does need to be a balance for the interests of the residents, with the commercial, with the visitors? As they have had to live with this for over a year and it is better but it is still not satisfactory. She would propose that if the two spots were just banished for six months to see what happens that the trucks would do just fine with the commercial loading on Orange that is there that has always been there. They are now parking on the street on Adella, early in the morning, not before 7 but doing the big truck loading. It is working fine. They still have Bruegger's and they are using the Brigantine restaurant. They use that back alley because it is there. That front area – there were no observations by staff of the front area on Orange to see how often that was open while those trucks were being used. She asked that the City continue with the experimentation and see about taking those two spots out for six months to see how much trouble there is. She will submit that there is not going to be that much trouble. In the event that the City wants to maintain the status quo, they ask that the City please repaint the "keep clear" lines and the yellow that is there because they are almost gone and she doesn't know how easily they could be seen. The no parking sign was right there and was violated by Shamrock. If they could at least have the lettering repainted, at a very minimum, but she did suggest that the City go for the residents this time and see how it goes.

Betty Galbo showed the log of all the calls she has made. Since then there have been more. She wishes the Council had been there this morning to see this fellow helping them back out. She asked why they were backing out. Why didn't they just go straight through the alley? He responded that they were trying to make a fast get away. They were young kids driving these trucks. He jockeyed back and forth. Her day did not go well. The notifications that Mike Morton gave obviously are not effective because this was to alert the suppliers not to come before 7 a.m. They do. One came this morning and it was horrible. It has become a nightmare, especially for her, because the City has demarcated a 60' area directly behind her unit. These trucks are 5' from her bedroom. She saw the mail truck just "wail" down, passing a delivery truck on his left. She gets the brunt of all the deliveries. She knows this is a balancing act. This is about health and safety versus money. As far as Mr. Walton's recommendation, it is not working. That was based on incomplete information. She asked that the City remove the demarcation from behind her unit.

Jerry Davee, one of the owners of the El Cordova Hotel since 1974, went through the process with the City Engineer and staff in 2014. Staff very thoroughly reviewed all of the options that were available to accommodate the needs of the Oxford Park condominium owners to get into their garages. That is what this was all about – accessibility. We have added onto that since that time with noise, pollution, quality of life, and a lot of other things. He is willing to address those although the issue was whether or not you could get into your garage and that has been solved. There is not one person who cannot get into their garage. These trucks are not out there 11 hours a day. They deliver in the morning and they are gone. They come at various times but there is traffic going up and down this alley all day long and it has nothing to do with the El Cordova. We need to have the deliveries of food and supplies to our tenants and to the hotel in order to operate. That is the purpose of an alley. It is not to put traffic out on Orange Avenue as has now been

suggested that we are going to park in loading zones in front of the Brigantine. What would they do? Deliver their goods through the hotel entrance and then around through the lobby? We went through that when we did this in 2014 and the City Engineer came up with a reasonable plan at that time. It allowed accessibility. The worst thing that happens now is if there is a truck they may have to back or jockey to get into that garage location. They have observed all this. The City Engineer's office has observed it. The Police Department has observed it. In all this time, there have been two or three accessibility calls made since 2014 in November. That is over 400 days. And we've had three calls? If you have complaints that have been suppressed that is not their fault. We aren't dealing with something that wasn't called in. It apparently wasn't something that was thought to be very monumental at the time. What this has gotten down to is really a noise issue. And what it has gotten down to is the point where now we have had to have a cease and desist order against Betty Galbo from coming into our lobby and yelling at our manager, yelling at our staff and disrupting our guests. We didn't want to do this but it has come to that. We have accommodated every single request that she has complained about – the air conditioning units are too loud in the back side of our units – they were replaced. We are still working on replacing some of them with a newer kind. She has complained about the grease trap. You have to take this stuff out. It is a health and safety issue. There is no other way. We aren't going to put that out on Adella and it isn't going to be put out on Orange Avenue. The alley is the only way to accommodate things that are necessary in order for a hotel operation like theirs and the restaurants that are in it to operate. He understands sensibility to noise. If you live on an alley, you are going to have to accept the noise that comes with it.

Bella, Unit 3 resident, where the first loading zone is, commented that not only do they not use the loading zones very well they also just aren't very useful at all. She hears noises every morning for an hour to two hours before she has to wake up for school. It is very annoying. When the cars and the trucks are passing, they leave around one inch when they are passing. That is probably not the safest thing. We don't use the A/C in our house, which means we have to leave the windows open in the mornings and deal with the noise even louder. It doesn't make much difference when you close the windows. She has seen plenty of different trucks go outside of alleys that are used commercially. She has seen them park outside the alley and not disturb anyone. She doesn't see why it is that big of a difference to move these places.

Marc Potash, President, RAR Hospitality, the management company that manages the hotel, thanked staff for the recommendation and the Council for addressing this again. We appreciate that there is a balance that has to go on between the residents and business. One of the things that has made Coronado flourish is the community feel and the small village feel but we also have some very vibrant small businesses. His responsibility, as the hotel operator, is to ensure that there is a good balance between the business needs and the needs of the residents. Unfortunately, there has been some back and forth and one of the reasons that they appreciate this situation with the loading zones is it really is a compromise. It was an accessibility issue and has suddenly become a much larger issue that really hadn't come much to their attention. Unfortunately, the ownership did have to issue this cease and desist letter that was something that they didn't want to do but did become a harassment issue for their team members, which became a safety issue. At the end of the day, there are two things. It is a compromise. Everyone is not going to be happy in a compromise but everyone is getting some to give another bit. What they are looking for is the reasonable balance, which is what staff is recommending – to continue with the loading zones as

they are. They are working with the vendors. Not every vendor is perfect. When there are enforcement issues, we appreciate the efforts with the police, with whom they have a great relationship. At the end of the day, he wants to make sure we all understand that this is a compromise and we are working in our best interests and with the residents. We are working to do what is in the best interest of the City, of the residents, and of the business.

Mark Francois, General Manager, El Cordova Hotel, commented that this is a difficult issue for everyone. They work tirelessly to maintain a state of peace and calm and try to consider the needs of everyone here. The truth of the matter is that eliminating the first two loading zones grossly inhibits the business from being able to operate. In addition to creating logistical nightmares, you are posing potential safety concerns for the vendors providing their goods and services to our businesses. We work with our neighbors. We have made ourselves available to our neighbors to address their concerns individually. In previous meetings they have acknowledged that it has improved dramatically. We would ask that the City Council, today, support the staff recommendation, allow our businesses to operate and contribute to the community meaningfully as we have for over 80 years, and continue the compromise as is.

Mayor Tanaka is ambivalent. He thinks we are here because this is an example of extremely poor zoning. Ordinarily you wouldn't put these two uses next to each other. Ordinarily you wouldn't have the commercial side's use come so close to the alley. If we could start from scratch, we would have done this much differently. It is inevitable that, from time to time, you have to deal with unintended consequences. We have dense residential on one side of an alley and we have dense commercial on the other. It is absolutely fair to say that what we did 12 or 14 months ago was absolutely a compromise. We have two competing interests that want the alley to be used a certain way and he voted for the compromise and very much believes that we said to try something that is in the middle that gives the commercial side loading zones but that we put them in areas where they are less likely to block garages. Obviously, someone not being able to use his or her garage in a useful way was something we were going to have to deal with and we did. He is ambivalent because, in the end, it is clear that the compromise still favors the commercial side. The commercial side gets the commercial loading parking they need very close to their businesses and obviously that is a narrow alley. When you look at various pictures, even when the trucks are parked properly, it is not like they are neatly tucked away. It still creates enough room to move but is not something he would want to drive by. Quite frankly, it is obvious to him that the residential side of this alley doesn't feel well served by the compromise. If they don't feel well served by it, he has to give some pause and think about whether this is the best solution forward. If he takes everyone's self-interest out of this and asks what the best use of this alley is, to him it is rather obvious that the best use of an alley is that cars can move in and out of it safely, with relative ease and so on. In his opinion, at least on first glance, the best use of this alley is not impeding it with really large trucks. We are going to have to figure out everyone's needs but objectively if he heard that an alley between two residential blocks had consistently the same blockage problem, he would not look kindly on whoever was doing the blocking. Ordinarily he would side with the residents. If he was in the same shoes as Oxford Park residents, he is sure he would be frustrated too. So he is ambivalent. He wants to find a solution that both sides can embrace and he was happy that we gave the compromise a shot but he is not entirely convinced that the compromise worked and he is not entirely convinced that it is our best solution forward. He is very much interested in hearing what the rest of the Council has to say. He thinks he is

swayed by the idea that if we removed the loading zones those trucks would find a place to park so he is not entirely convinced that this is all or nothing. One speaker said that we gave a 12-month trial to this solution to see if it would work. Maybe it is fair to say that we should give some other solution a try for 12 months. Should we test the theory that trucks would find loading elsewhere because there are other loading zones and there are some that aren't being used like the one right at the end of the alley? Necessity is the mother of invention.

Councilmember Downey has a different perspective. As someone who lived in the 300 block of D, she was one of those people that lived on a block that was all residential on their side of the alley and commercial that didn't have any parking. As she understands it, the compromise has done two things. It has given more opportunity for more people to get in and out of their garages but because of that, the trucks now, instead of being anywhere in the alley they want to be, are concentrating in areas so more noise is going to specific homes than would have gone when the trucks were dispersed. Although we do have some complaints, and she doesn't deny them, it appears they are the location in the alley that is the best way to get them away from people trying to ingress and egress in their units. She thinks that did work. She thinks it solved the original problem. Maybe we need to ask ourselves if the second issue, the noise issue, can be addressed. She asked staff, because this has been an ongoing question, as to what our noise ordinance says when noises can happen. The Shamrock truck that was there at 6 a.m. was obviously violating our noise ordinances. She appreciates the police not wanting to issue tickets to everyone if they didn't know but she has talked to one of the owners of the businesses and all of the owners that delivered were notified that they needed to comply with the Coronado zoning code. She thinks what we need to do is just make a decision, as a Council, just like we asked our police to seriously enforce speeding on Third and Fourth, that, all over town, we need to seriously enforce the noise ordinance. It is not just in this alley. It is everywhere. Her suggestion is to leave the zones where they are. It is a compromise that works. She thinks we seriously make a statement about enforcement of noise. She would ask the businesses that have contractors to issue, in writing, to every single contractor, what the noise ordinance says so that whether you are new or not you were supposed to get that passed down and you showed up with your truck. If you show up before 6, you will get a ticket. It is only going to happen once in every business and then that will get passed down to every driver. That is kind of harsh and she recognizes that but she was sitting at her house when her next door neighbor was redoing their home and EDCO showed up at 6 a.m. with a dumpster. That is the solution we should be talking about. The real problem we are having is noise in that alley and it is the same in every alley all over town.

Councilmember Bailey is pleased to hear that the compromise the Council moved forward on last time around has at least made the situation a little better, albeit far from perfect. It has improved the situation somewhat. No matter what we do, though, the access is never going to be great. Accessibility is never going to be perfect here because of how narrow the alley is. Even if we were to remove the commercial loading zones, if we aren't actually enforcing people not parking in those commercial loading zones, then the accessibility will remain the exact same as it is today. There was a statement made that the current compromise doesn't remove any parking spots from our streets when in fact it does. If we have residents that are no longer using their garage, then they are parked on the streets. He is open to considering other alternatives but at the very, very least, if we were to move forward with the status quo, we need increased enforcement in this area.

If it wouldn't improve accessibility, at the very least it should help with the noise issues. He would really like to see City staff step up in that regard, especially for the early morning noise.

Councilmember Sandke thinks Ms. Downey laid it out very nicely. He was surprised to learn that the vote for this was 3-2. The goal was to preserve the parking for the residents, accommodate commercial parking, and accommodate visitor parking. The plan that came out of the Council achieved those goals relative to our strategic plan and what we need to have happen in our downtown. The hotel folks spoke very eloquently to their commercial needs and their efforts to work with their vendors, which clearly are not 100%. He thinks some opportunities exist with the vendors to force a little better behavior from there. He applauds his colleagues speaking about additional enforcement. He also found himself very much in line with former Councilmember Ovrom's opinion on this. You are serving an awful lot of businesses and not just the El Cordova and the Brigantine. He doesn't think you can eliminate commercial traffic in this alley and he doesn't think you should eliminate these spots. We should do the enforcement piece and do a little bit more effort with the vendors to work with them to be good neighbors. When he walked the alley with Ms. Galbo, they saw some opportunities for signage. There may be some other opportunities for red curbs in that alley that might be helpful. He would be supportive of the staff recommendation along with some incumbency upon the vendors and commercial businesses to be more respectful of the residents.

Councilmember Woiwode reiterated that when the Council talked about this the last time, it was about access to the garages and that was the basis of the recommendation. He is pleased to hear that has improved. It is frustrating to see drivers disrespectful of the rules that have been set. We are going to have a lot of traffic in this alley whether we remove those spots or not. It really seems important to him that the businesses do all they can to make sure that those spaces are properly used and that we don't have trucks stacking behind the space and Mr. Sandke's suggestion that you don't open the door before 7 a.m. will help make the point to the drivers. It seems to him that putting the burden on the police is going to be hit or miss but where we really could have constant enforcement is from the businesses themselves making sure there aren't any violations in that alley. Trucks are going to use that alley whether they park to unload or not. It is going to be a noisy alley and nothing we do, including moving loading zones, is going to keep that from occurring. We absolutely should be able to make this solution work since it looks to him like the only problems have been those who didn't respect the spaces that we lined out. That brings up another point. We need to restripe and make those markings much more visible. He is supportive of continuing with the process. He would really like to see the businesses take ownership for enforcement and he would like the City to help out by restriping the place.

MS (Downey/Sandke) moved that the City Council approve maintaining the existing loading zones in the alley but we additionally request the owners of the businesses, in writing, to notify all of the contractors or delivery people as to what the hours are for noise reduction in Coronado and not to deliver before those start. The Council directs that the police enforce that as soon as they are notified and that the markings are repainted.

Ms. Downey asked if there is any reason we couldn't put a sign up limiting hours for loading and unloading. She would like the sign to reflect the noise ordinance hours.

Ms. Canlas commented that the City's noise ordinance precludes loading and unloading from the hours of 10 p.m. to 7 a.m.

Mr. King added that the issue of signage came up a year ago when this was discussed. At the time one of the conflicts was that it is tight. Staff will put the signage up as it can to advise people.

MSC (Downey/Sandke) moved that the City Council approve maintaining the existing loading zones in the alley but we additionally request the owners of the businesses, in writing, to notify all of the contractors or delivery people as to what the hours are for noise reduction in Coronado and not to deliver before those start. The Council directs that the police enforce that as soon as they are notified and that the markings are repainted. Loading hour restrictions are to be marked on, in or near the spots.

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

11c. Gateway Vision Plan Design Concepts and Direction. City Manager Blair King gave a brief introduction. Councilmember Bailey, subcommittee member, added introductory remarks. Cliff Maurer, Public Services & Engineering Director, gave the presentation.

Councilmember Sandke commented that one of the things they talked about through the campaign was pedestrian and bicycle rampage up to the wing to incorporate the wing in a more useful manner. He is not sure if this is too early in the process to ask if that has been a consideration or if it is still in play.

Mr. Maurer responded by saying that would not be taken out of play. That was discussed in the earlier public meetings and with the consultant earlier. It certainly could be done. The one objection to that was that the wing structure was too far east of where we need the pedestrians and cyclists to cross.

Mayor Tanaka invited public comment.

David Fairbank commented that looking at the improved proposal there is a certain ambivalence as to the pedestrian crossing at Fourth Street and Glorietta. One is to put a wall up so you cannot cross. Another is to put an island in the middle so you can cross and he would presume putting in a cross walk of some sort. Not included in the proposal is part of the proposal that is in the second option, which is the roundabout, which is the pedestrian overpass. That pedestrian overpass is very vague. He would suggest that if the pedestrian overpass idea is still alive, which he thinks it is, that it be included in the scope of work for our consultant to consider the feasibility so that when

it comes back to whether we want to build such a thing, we know what it is we are talking about, where it goes and what the engineering problems are we would have to face. He is not advocating for it. In fact, once we get to see what it really is, he might be opposed to it. He thinks we should know what it is we are talking about.

Bonnie Carpenter was on the traffic committee some 35 years ago and it appears that there has been no perceivable change other than more vehicles and bicycles. When residents, tourists and workers come into Coronado, they see a falling apart, paint peeling, old dirty toll plaza, dead tree, and a Caltrans parking lot. They used to see the old blue port-a-potty until the residents complained. For the past month, she has seen a pillow and some metal objects at the entrance of the bridge by the Golf Course. She doesn't see that the powers that be are those who are responsible to keep our roadways clear and in good working condition really care for our fine City's appearance and where they are coming and going. If there is money to replace perfectly good sidewalks like Second Street and Orange Avenue, it is going on now as well as a number of other previous replacements, she hopes there will be sufficient funds to allocate for the refurbishment and beautification of the entrance to Coronado. It is time for a change and a new look for Coronado.

Michael Schmid stated that his biggest concern with what he is hearing is that there is going to be money spent to beautify which is all good but he wants to make sure there is enough money left to actually calm traffic and make the City safer while it is beautiful. He is wondering how this project fits in with the security station there operated by CHP for bridge security and if that is closing down and if that affects this whole project and also how possible relinquishment would affect this project.

Toni McGowan is good with any of the options but she has spent a lot of time at the toll plaza. The truth is it is an orphaned building. It has a lot of jurisdictions but no one is taking ownership of it. Whatever happens, it would be nice if we could make that a useful space. The electricians are there. CHP is there. She thinks that making use of it would be good. It would be a nice place for a museum or something that is tourist drawing and where people would want to stop and spend a little time instead of it just being a byway. With all the options that are there, if it looks like we are just going to be redoing it, making it a place that has some love where people want to stop is going to be important or it is just going to end up as an orphan again.

David Greer mentioned the idea of looking into it for a transit center, a place where people can park before they come to Coronado to get some information. The 904 bus could take people from there to other points in Coronado. There is space there to use it more appropriately and make it work for us.

Rita Sarich, Coronado MainStreet, is so excited that this project has been resurrected. We have been working on this for years. She read the motion from the MainStreet Board, "MainStreet supports the retention and restoration of the wing as part of the City's entrance project. We feel that the wing is worthy of preservation as a historic architectural structure and it is an integral part of the bridge's original design. We are also mindful of the project's scale as the area is adjacent to a residential neighborhood. We support the addition of traffic calming elements that are practical and aesthetically pleasing. We further support the addition of responsible water

conscious landscaping through the S curve which was omitted last time and the S curve corridor to minimize the amount of asphalt. We appreciate the Council's efforts to initiate this very important project as quickly as possible as the renovation of our City's entrance has been on the MainStreet agenda as well as the City's for years. From a practical standpoint, working with the existing structure we feel is the most cost effective and, therefore, the most expedient solution."

David McDonald wanted to say with all of the money that we are proposing to spend on beautifying this area he is very surprised that we are not all looking into the option of getting cars from the neighborhoods of First, Second and Third and the Tidelands area, including Tidelands Park, the hotel, the Hospital and those areas for people that come over and all they want to do is get back over the bridge but they can't get to it from that area without going through our neighborhoods, whether that is First, Second, Third, Orange, A, B and C and impacting those neighborhoods when all they want to do is get on Fourth and go over the bridge. He can't believe we can't come up with an idea to build something to get people back onto that bridge from the Tidelands area. He appreciates the effort to beautify that area which many people believe is an eyesore and has been for many years; however, let's start looking and making decisions about the infrastructure in our City to accommodate all of the cars that come over the bridge every single day and all they want to do is get back over the bridge. We need to find a solution to get those cars from that area back onto the bridge without impacting the rest of the City.

Mike Donovan thinks that the plan that the subcommittee put together with City staff is a logical way to move forward. The grand plan is going to be a waste of time because it is just too much money. He thinks that the way this is headed is right. He put in a plug for preserving the wing. It is part of the original structure of the bridge from an artistic standpoint. It kind of represents the 1960s and 1970s when the bridge was built. If we do tear it down, we will be sorry we did down the line. He would really recommend keeping it. He did see one picture or sketch of having, in big letters, on top of the wing, 'Welcome to Coronado.' He would highly vote against that.

Susan Anderson was one of the non-artistic people who applied and put in one of the very first examples of what was wrong with Coronado. She was part of that initial group of real estate people. She was thrilled when she was asked to put her thoughts together. She went to every subsequent meeting of the group that was put together to come up with the six different options and that is what she thought was going to be discussed today. She likes the idea of moving forward with this. She thinks it is well past time. If our money is losing value, we should take action now. One of the things she is concerned about is that it should be taken in context with the traffic issues we are facing. Slowing down the traffic coming off that bridge is the single most important thing. Beautification certainly but safety second and part of it should be the access of pedestrians across that. She disagrees with Mike and Rita about the wing. She thinks it should be torn down and thrown away. She thinks there was a problem with the structure itself in terms of getting the traffic on because of the placement of the posts in the wing itself. She loved the roundabout option because that slowed the traffic down. Plantings should be environmentally useful and thoughtful.

Danny Zaragoza never even understood why it looked like it did when it was a tollbooth. It was disappointing to see very small turnouts at the meetings for something that is so important for the City. It is such an important piece of our property and our City. He sees a roundabout because the focus is slowing down traffic. In every meeting that was key. The other possibility that he

sees there is reconnecting Glorietta for pedestrians. It is not an easy thing to do but it is really not that difficult to do and it was discussed more in depth at the meetings. The wing only works its purpose as what it was for – a toll plaza. That is why it either stays as it is or it goes because something else is happening. The CHP does not need to be there for any reason.

Charles Crehore hopes that whatever we do we keep in mind about maintaining it. Every time he drives through there he can't understand why it is allowed to look the way it is right now. There is trash, weeds, garbage, peeling paint – it looks like you are entering a ghetto. He has no idea why it hasn't been cleaned up. He hopes that whatever is put in there will be maintained better than what has been maintained there now.

Kim Schmid loves the idea of the roundabout as long as it would incorporate both Third and Fourth. We could make that a really beautiful area to have that be calming as you go on and as you are coming off.

Fern Nelson thinks all of these ideas are wonderful. We just need to get moving on it. There are so many things that need to come together. We do need to have cohesion on this. We have all agreed that we need traffic calming. We definitely need a pedestrian crossing. She likes the idea of the traffic from Tideland's having a nice way to get onto Fourth and the bridge. Beautifying, of course, in the area as it always does look bad. As far as the wing goes, she is not a fan of the wing. She didn't even realize that it was a real wing until one of the meetings. You can only tell it is a wing from the air. She doesn't think most people that go through there realize that this is supposed to be a wing of a plane. She likes the roundabout idea and if we want to have a tribute to our aviators that could be built in with the roundabout.

Councilmember Bailey reiterated that there is broad dissatisfaction with the appearance of the toll plaza. This is a really good opportunity to deploy some solutions to help with traffic calming. When we were first going down this path three years ago, he showed up at the public workshop where that drawing was presented and we only had two people from the public there and one person was there by mistake. As far as the public outreach this time around, he attended both public workshops and there were between 40 and 60 people at each of them. There were hundreds of people who participated through a website where the different options were presented and the results of that survey are included in the staff report. This time around, there has been a lot more public outreach and a lot more public involvement. While he was hoping that there would be some real big master plan that everyone seemed to get behind, there really wasn't. All in all he thinks that a lot of people really liked the roundabout idea. That was his first choice as well until he saw the price tag. The preserve and improve approach is much more feasible from an engineering standpoint and the funding is also available. It is very likely to have the public's support. In addition to that, we can still receive a lot of the same benefits of a roundabout if the preserve and improve approach were to deflect traffic out even further than it currently is today. He thinks there are still some benefits that we can have, similar to the roundabout concept, and we can incorporate that into the preserve and improve approach. Under the current recommendation to move forward with that CHP building would possibly be on the table. We wouldn't necessarily say not to touch it but we are also not saying we have to get rid of it. It is something that is on the table. As far as the connectivity for pedestrians along Glorietta that is still also on the table. The pedestrian bridge would also still be an option. What the recommendation does is create a framework and the City

can color within these lines for a certain budget. That is what this whole exercise has been. He is happy to move forward with it as it is. He does want to be clear for the public that although this is a great opportunity to improve the aesthetics of the entrance to our City, he knows all the Council members and he would agree that this is a great opportunity to improve the traffic calming elements.

Councilmember Woiwode began by saying that when we took this on the reason we took it on is because we felt that the landscaping project didn't do enough in the traffic calming area and it didn't solve some of the systemic problems that we thought this project could solve. So we have made that part of it a priority throughout our discussions. The point Mr. Bailey made about deflection of the lanes accomplishing much of what the roundabout would do is entirely on point. We specifically discussed that as we were looking at various options. There are other things that are traffic-calming measures that we have said we want to do on the rest of Third and Fourth and our expectation is that those things would come into this project as well. For instance, it may be appropriate to have a speed table as you exit the bridge. That is one of the kinds of things we ought to be looking at. Whether or not the wing stays – visually it is a very strong traffic-calming element. It is a barrier. If we take that out, we have to put in something that has the same kind of calming effect psychologically to slow drivers down as well as physically to require them to make some maneuvers. All those are the kinds of things we want to talk about and that would be talked about in the context of an environmental study. The point, at this stage, is for us to create a project. That is what the feedback from these public workshops indicates. He is delighted that there was so much interest and so much online interest and that is a testimony to the point that Mr. Bailey made in looking at it last time around when no one showed up. The consultant did a really good job with public outreach. We do think we have some understanding of what the public wants to accomplish. We have an identified source of funds, which fits this task perfectly, which is the bridge toll funds. There is nothing more germane to the purpose of those bridge toll funds than trying to calm traffic in and out of Coronado. We would like to go forward with it and we would like to keep it in a scale that is doable, both in terms of political will and also financially.

Mayor Tanaka referred to page 178 of the staff report where it mentions that we got to a point where we put a subcommittee together in November 2013. On November 5, 2013, we had a plan we could have voted to move forward on, funded and proceeded with. We chose not to. He remembers uttering that the plan before the Council at that time was a "B." One of the reasons they didn't move forward with it was because Mr. Woiwode and Mr. Bailey said that we could do better. When we talk about how our money has less purchasing power, he would also say that it is also our fault that we let it go. We didn't hold ourselves accountable to having a quicker timeline. Hopefully what we bought with that time is a better design, a better plan and he thinks that is what the Council needs to decide today. One thing that is really clear for him is that people are divided over the wing. If nothing else, we should put something to a vote. The easiest thing to put to a vote is whether the City should continue to plan around retaining that wing structure as part of a future gateway project. One reason he thinks it would be wise to move forward with some kind of a vote is because we don't really know what our citizens want and why not get the feedback. We are not handicapping ourselves because three years later we don't have a plan. We don't know to what extent preserve and improve existing would be that wing or what we would want to do with that. At least finding out if the public wanted to keep it and also what the vote turn out is would be telling. All of us agree that we wish that the entryway to our City, no matter

what it is, was maintained better. We all have to acknowledge, though, that it is not an accident. The reason that area is not maintained well is because it is grossly unsafe. It is no accident that the state doesn't have great plans for cleaning that area up and maintaining it. He thinks we all need to think about that. It is certainly a challenge to keep that wing structure maintained properly and the physical plant maintained properly. He thinks we do have time to put that in as part of preserve and improve. He is sure that, to whatever extent the City of Coronado would be willing to take the lead, he has more confidence in our commitment to maintain cleanliness and good upkeep in that area. That is also a good question about the wing structure. It has lasted this long. One can presume that it is probably in good enough shape to last another some number of decades but we don't know for sure. What he does know is that it isn't easy to just shut that area down and do maintenance. The only time we could shut it down and do maintenance would be 2 or 3 a.m. and he is just guessing. Also, we have that unique geographic isolation that if and when we do shut the bridge down we are creating some problems for people getting in and out of Coronado, particularly if there is an emergency. All of that brings him back to whether or not we want to keep the wing structure. Is it wise to keep a structure that we are forever going to have a challenge maintaining? He is certainly for letting the voters decide that instead of the Council or if there are three or more members who just want to move forward and get something done to beautify that area, then maybe we just want to take the risk and bet on the wing now. He would rather put it to a vote and then have firmer marching orders.

Mr. Woiwode commented that he and Mr. Bailey had this discussion with staff several times. The way they proposed to resolve it is that they are proposing that wing structure removal be one of the options studied in this next phase because there are environmental consequences of removing it or of retaining it, there are cost consequences of removing or retaining, and there are traffic-calming issues associated with removing or retaining. They didn't feel they had all the answers to those questions to be able to make that decision at this point. That is why they want it to be part of the next phase.

Mayor Tanaka would rather, to some extent, find out what the public wants to do and then work on the engineering. He feels like we are drifting. The only thing we would be deciding on if we went with preserve and improve is that we are all agreeing that we didn't like the price tags of the other items and that is reasonable and fair but he still doesn't feel like we have a vision that could be easily described if asked. This is definitely just punting it to the next council because we haven't really provided a vision other than we are going to focus on that same place that we started in 2013. He is willing to move forward with the recommendation but he is just not excited about it.

Councilmember Downey attended some of the workshops as a civilian resident who was interested. She has to say that she really, really agrees with Mr. Bailey in that she liked the roundabout. She thought that was a nice way to enter Coronado. She also didn't realize it was a wing when she came to Coronado 22 years ago. She agrees that we are split in this town. She has heard 50/50 about who likes the wing and who doesn't. One of the things we don't like isn't so much the wing structure but it is the way the building and the fencing, when you come into town, is maintained. She didn't hear any discussion about that. Part of the problem is trying to figure out who has the legal authority over that building. At this point, we don't know. One of the issues she heard is people wanted to know if we could do something about that fence. She asked if that was discussed at all.

Mr. Bailey responded that the specific element was not but it was not precluded either. It was simply a matter of whether we wanted to preserve and improve this area.

Ms. Downey would be very interested in that if that is in this option. There are two things that we can do. We seem to be much better at getting things done than Caltrans does in terms of cleaning, repairing, painting. She would be interested in seeing what we could do to that, if we have to keep the building, to make it look prettier or put a prettier fence around it, etc. The way the fence is now allows all kinds of garbage to be left there.

Mayor Tanaka commented that this is a wish list. He assumes there is no objection to Ms. Downey's argument of trying to improve aesthetics any way we can, including plans with fencing.

Mr. Bailey thinks that would be the expectation in moving forward with preserve and improve.

Mr. Woiwode commented that what they did when they left the Council meeting with the charge to work on this was to open the aperture fully and to say we are going to consider these grand plans. There were six different options that emerged from all of that. The stage we are at in this process is that we have enough information that...there is no project at this point. There is nothing on which to start an EIR. There is nothing to stick up on the wall and show people what it would look like. We haven't done that yet because we had to decide how much of the grand ideas we wanted to incorporate in what was brought forward to the Council. Our goal, at this point, is to get direction from the Council that it wants to commit to something. If it wants the roundabout, then that is a different direction than we are recommending but maybe that is the way the Council wants to go. If it is to do the best we can with the preserve and improve, then all of those things that you are talking about would, of course, be a part of the process. We did not attempt to design this. That is why there is no picture. We are trying to converge on direction to staff so that they can put in that level of detail so that we can have those discussions.

Ms. Downey is kind of disappointed. She was ready to do something grand like the roundabout which obviously costs a lot of money and we would have to look at other options to help fund it. Our residents told us to do something and to fix this. This is too big an issue to just say to go out and spend money because it might lose a little bit of value. She agrees that it would be nice to get some input from the public but one of our problems is that it has gotten a little bit harder to put an advisory vote on the ballot because of the Supreme Court ruling that anything cities put on ballots requires CEQA. It isn't impossible but she is just putting that out there for consideration.

Councilmember Sandke thinks this comes down to four elements. They are traffic calming, connectivity, beautification, and an expression of community pride, which he thinks is glaringly absent in this entry to our City. The subcommittee has come forward with a pragmatic, achievable way forward. He agrees with the comment that whatever we build we had better keep pretty. When it comes to the wing, he believes that an adaptive reuse is a wonderful way forward with it. He thinks the view from the top of that wing would be monumental for the Bay and give us a chance to use some ramping and ways to provide some of that connectivity, both from the Tidelands side and from the Golf Course side. In terms of the remarks about making traffic easier to get from Tidelands onto the bridge, he sees some elements of positivity in there; however, he thinks the unintended consequences of traffic avoiding the Fourth Street departure in the

afternoons might woefully ease any wins on that particular item. Mr. Greer's comments about a park and ride or another comment about a visitor center reuse for that building or another building sounds very interesting to him. In terms of traffic calming on the roundabout, he has driven roundabouts from Zagreb to Tijuana and none of them are calm. He is nervous about the traffic calming elements of that roundabout going forward but he remains open minded. He would be comfortable moving forward with the recommendation. He looks forward to seeing a little more detail on what happens but without moving the ball forward, he doesn't think we ever get to the goal line.

Mayor Tanaka heard some comments about being in favor of the roundabout and he assumes the recommendation before the Council is more about political and financial reality. He asked if there is some part of the subcommittee that would like to gamble and see if the public wants to support the roundabout or something else. He likes that they are being prudent and he doesn't think it would be wrong for the City to move forward with that. In terms of giving the public some chance to weigh in, there is nothing lost if you like a plan and want to see if the public wants to support it. If they don't, then what is before the Council today would be the default. He doesn't see any disadvantage to us potentially throwing out the grandiose and seeing if that is how we fix how ugly our entryway is. If we go with the preserve and improve, his prediction is that in 10 and 20 years from now we are going to hear the same complaints. He asked if either Mr. Bailey or Mr. Woiwode have any interest in changing that recommendation to something bolder.

Mr. Woiwode would want to understand the process Mayor Tanaka is advocating. Is he saying that we would develop it enough that we could do an EIR and at that point take it to the voters? That is what would be required.

Ms. Canlas agreed that for a Council-sponsored initiative it would be a project that requires CEQA.

Mayor Tanaka asked if, based on what the work product has already been, she can give him an estimate of what she thinks the environmental stuff would be to put something on the ballot. Are we talking 12 months, longer, more like 24?

Ms. Canlas would say anywhere from 18 to 24 months, depending on the level of comments and how we would respond to those comments.

Mayor Tanaka feels that maybe it is a job worth doing well. That is what we have done with the turn restriction stuff. We don't like that it takes that long or the cost and expense.

Mr. Bailey responded that he and Mr. Woiwode were discussing just that. If there is an opportunity to go for a home run, this is probably the best time to do it; however, given the financial restrictions we will likely face, given the sticker shock we will likely face, given that we really want to get the public's buy-in on this, it probably makes sense to go to the voters and that wouldn't realistically happen until 2018. What is that going to do for our purchasing power? He thinks they both wanted something grander out of this. In some ways he shares Mayor Tanaka's disappointment in what they are providing today because at the end of the day it just kind of looks like an amplified version of RBF's original proposal. While RBF's original proposal wasn't a home run, it was something better than the status quo. If we are going to take a shot at a home run, we all need to realize that

the risk is the public won't be behind it, that our purchasing power will continue to diminish, and that four years from now we will find ourselves in the exact same spot with a lot less money to spend. This isn't just about beautification but is about improving the traffic calming elements and enhancing the traffic calming elements. How he sees this project going forward would be to move forward with this recommendation, knowing it is an amplified version of RBF's original design, and incorporate some of the changes that Ms. Downey was specifying, knowing that can be done within a reasonable timeframe. It wouldn't necessarily require a vote of the people. We already know we have their support to improve it. He wouldn't mind going to the public this time around for an advisory vote on the wing structure to give us some additional guidance but he thinks there are substantial risks in going for a home run and most of them come down to financial and just time.

Mayor Tanaka commented that in 1988 Coronado voters had a chance to vote for moving ahead on cut and cover or not. They voted no. Ten years later they were asked whether they wanted to pursue a bored tunnel concept and they voted yes. Then in 2010, they were asked to check in on the tunnel idea and they said no. In the end that was valuable data. A lot of people could tell you that the worse the traffic problem is, the more likely the public is to take the risk. We are at a crossroads here. We can pursue what he thinks is modest gains. It is not a risk to put something together, give the voters a look at it, and for them to say no. He thinks that is a better use of the toll money to try to come up with a grander solution that fixes more problems rather than a solution that is more feasible, within our budget, and just maintains the status quo. His point is we have given the tunnel a try and he doesn't think anyone is going to give that a try in the next decade. Maybe this is the time to not move forward with preserve and improve existing but to continue to plumb a better, bolder solution. We have to do the environmental anyway. He wanted to give the subcommittee one more chance because if we move forward with their recommendation the turning point is we are taking bold off the table.

Mr. Bailey asked the City Attorney if there is any way we can phrase this to simply be an advisory vote to get the public's pulse on whether or not a roundabout concept is something they would want to get behind so that we wouldn't have to wait so long.

Ms. Canlas responded that there is a Supreme Court case that says that council-sponsored ballot initiatives are subject to CEQA. Absent further review, she is going to go to the conservative side and say that CEQA would be required.

Mr. Woiwode commented that as much as he would like to see something grand there and as much as he believes that if the City were really motivated to do it, now would be the time to do so, he would rather take the approach that our real objective here is the same as it was when we commissioned the Third and Fourth Street Traffic Study and that is to look at improving behavior of motorists along those roads. He doesn't think we need a roundabout to do that. He thinks we can accomplish all of the things that we can in the way of traffic calming without going to that grand a view. And he believes that is kind of urgent. He believes that we ought to take a step that does what we can do now. It is possible that in 20 years that someone may want to tear out what we build and put in a roundabout. Everything will be different at that time. Certainly the traffic will not be less. He thinks we have a concept that can play functionally and can look good and he would like to see the City go forward with it and he would like to see us marry it up with the other

traffic calming measures up and down Third and have something real that changes the fundamental functions of the system.

Mr. Sandke referred to Mayor Tanaka's remarks. He seemed to indicate that there would be some additional problem solved or we could get a better product if we went with the roundabout versus the traffic calming measures that can be part of the preserve and improve. What problems is he thinking could be better solved by the roundabout other than the fact that it is prettier?

Mayor Tanaka responded that the number one thing a roundabout could theoretically do conceptually is to allow for a certain amount of cyclical movement and so those people near Tidelands, theoretically, could potentially get over to the other side of town. Maybe what the environmental shows is that, with that volume of traffic, it wouldn't work. One of the reasons the tunnel failed, he thinks, is because people no longer thought it was realistic to receive an appropriation of \$500 million. Maybe, even though the sticker shock number of \$66 million is there, the public is willing to move down that road for the sake of long-term peace. Most people who were advocates of the tunnel would have told you with a straight face that there was no way for it to happen without Congress paying for most of it. He thinks this is a dollar amount that we could theoretically get to. The question is whether the public wants to pursue it. Do we, as a Council, want to give it a little more time and a little more study? Mr. Woiwode makes a very good point that we can cut that all off at the pass and deal with what is in front of us. If we don't really feel strongly about taking a risk, then maybe we would be foolish to.

Mr. Sandke doesn't dismiss the beauty of reclaiming 14 acres of green space. People talk about no one making any more Coronado. This is a chance for us to make more Coronado and it is a price that maybe people would be willing to bear. We don't, as a community, generally think that big. He doesn't dismiss the fact that doing something bold would be fantastic for our community but he wants to do something.

Mayor Tanaka added that Caltrans offering us money is not necessarily the right enticement to talk about relinquishment. That is something that will be debated a little later. If we move forward with this, do all of the planning so that we can give a very clear picture to the public of what the project looks like, what it will cost and what its limitations are, if the public did green light that and say to go for it, then there might be a much stronger purpose for talking to Caltrans about relinquishment.

Ms. Downey appreciates Mayor Tanaka's going down this route. Her thought was that any of the good things that we could actually do to improve traffic in just improving the status quo and moving the lanes over and doing everything else would lead to us doing CEQA. She doesn't think we are saving anything by really using that option as we should if that is the option we end up going when we get a vote. We aren't saving that much time. The stuff we could do without CEQA, we could do now. It would not cost \$1 million to put new plantings in, have a cleaning crew go out. She doesn't want to suggest that we shouldn't do anything until we get this in front of the voters in two years. We could decide we will ask our City Manager to put together a task force as to what our current wonderful grounds staff could do to make it better. It is not an either or. We could actually make it look prettier while we are working to get a vote from the people on what direction they want. Someone said that the City has abandoned Third and Fourth and the

City has never done anything of any significance to try to fix the problem. Although she doesn't agree with that, she doesn't think we have done anything that made a big difference. She does think we have to take that or we are saying no and that Third and Fourth were designed to be a highway through our City and we are okay with that. This is our chance to ask the voters if that is what they are saying. She is behind that. She recognizes it will take a CEQA effort and the community deciding they want to step up and do it. Then at least we know.

Mr. Bailey spoke about the survey results. There were 371 responses to the survey. Forty-six percent support a roundabout approach. Fourteen percent said they prefer the preserve and improve. A handful, 7%, recommended removing the structure, 4% a boulevard, etc. He brought that up because, as Ms. Downey was saying, we are going to have to do an EIR anyway. Perhaps, just like we are doing with the next agenda item when we are saying to go for a more comprehensive EIR study even though we might not ultimately pursue that on the ballot perhaps we take a similar approach with this.

Mayor Tanaka asked, with the work we have already done, whether the consultants had a good sense of whether or not the existing traffic volume could be handled by a roundabout. Were they confident that this is somehow feasible or did they not really plug the numbers in and just kind of architecturally put this together?

Mr. Woiwode understands that there was never an attempt to do that kind of an analysis and that a roundabout, with these kinds of volumes, is pretty hard to find.

Ms. Downey wanted to try to put in perspective the votes. Although it was only plurality that was the roundabout, there was actually 71% that wanted the grand idea. She agrees we would have to do a study to figure out what the appropriate one is. That is what stuck out with her.

Mayor Tanaka asked the Council to continue this item for one to two months to give the two subcommittee members one more chance to think. He doesn't think we are losing anything if we delay it another one to two months. He thinks we might lose a lot if we move forward with the recommendation and get remorse later. He thinks we will have a hard time recovering from that and being bold.

Mr. Woiwode commented that if we were to go with a proposal for a roundabout or the cut and cover, understanding the time frame that goes with that, would he be interested in doing something like the 2012 plan now while the rest of this goes on because he thinks one of the messages he is hearing is we keep kicking this down the road.

Mayor Tanaka wants to give them both a little more time to decide. They can do a dual tracked approach if there is low hanging fruit they are ready to move forward on they can come back in one meeting. He would be happy to give more time to work with either the existing consultant or a different one to see if something is not feasible. If the roundabout is just not feasible, then we should stop there.

Mr. Bailey would prefer to come back within one month.

Mr. Woiwode thinks that one-month is quick.

Ms. Downey would be thrilled if they came back and said there is a dual track.

Council consensus was to continue this item for one to two months.

The City Council went into recess at 7:13 p.m.

The City Council reconvened at 7:27 p.m.

11d. Review of Proposed Ballot Options for Left-Turn Prohibitions from Westbound SR 75 (Third Street) onto A, B, and C Avenues. Blair King, City Manager, gave a brief introduction. Johanna Canlas, City Attorney, gave the presentation.

Councilmember Sandke noticed that there isn't a third option that says more or less what Mr. Bailey said that kind of kicked off this whole discussion. The time restrictions, simply to look at the rush hour in the afternoon – he understands you have to do the EIR to the most restrictive but he is not sure that we are doing the most prudent thing to have the least impact on our residents but at the same time achieve the safety goals we are after.

Mayor Tanaka asked if it wouldn't be too late to add a third option that would be the no turn restrictions like the first option but ones that are more time specific.

Ms. Canlas responded that it is not too late. She pointed out that at the time the Council discussed this, there was discussion as to what is the more impactful and how that can be reviewed through CEQA. The City is not married to anything yet. The Council can define the parameters on what is before it. She understood what Mr. Bailey's initial request was but there was a discussion at the Council level, two meetings ago, whether or not it would be all periods and then all impacts would be covered under the study. The rush hour could be an alternative to that one.

Mayor Tanaka asked if anyone was opposed to creating that third option and putting in some time restrictions. If we study closing it at all times, it won't be hard to roll it into that same environmental document.

Mr. Sandke added that even if you just change the language from via signage for all periods to via signage for specific periods and then let the study folks or the Council decide what specific periods it wants covered.

Mayor Tanaka commented that one of the things the Council decided at the last meeting was to have two tracks – one that is just built around the signage approach and then the other track is a permanent way. People can cheat on signs and then we have an enforcement issue. If we fully close the streets that is not an option. Mr. Sandke has raised a good point of there being a middle road between these two. All we are doing is trying to put options together that we can act on later. It might be better to just word out what he just said and then have three options to choose from instead of two.

Council consensus was to do that.

Mayor Tanaka asked Mr. Bailey, as he made the original suggestion, if he wanted to say 2-6 in the afternoon and something similar in the morning.

Councilmember Bailey responded by saying that 2-6 was part of the initial proposal but he believes that the reason we went with the approach of all hours was because that included specific hours and by having a more comprehensive extensive environmental review, we weren't necessarily short changing ourselves from exploring that option in the future. It would simply require changing the ballot language but we wouldn't have to go through an additional EIR later. He thinks adding that third option now might give the public more of an idea of the options that are on the table.

Mr. Sandke believes that there will be different impacts if you do it part of the day rather than the whole day. He would like that specifically spelled out. It makes it much more compelling to be able to answer.

Mayor Tanaka commented that we already have 5-8 in the morning. It is already on the books. We don't have to study that.

Ms. Canlas agreed. Should the Council decide not to move forward or should the ballot measure not pass that will remain as that is existing.

Mayor Tanaka asked if the Council is okay with the third option simply being the afternoon hours of 2-6.

Councilmember Woiwode asked if we are backing ourselves into a corner by being that specific. Would the study identify what the peak periods are and would it make more sense to stipulate that it would be peak periods.

Mr. King commented that if the Council were to go forward and say that for the purpose of CEQA evaluation it would like to evaluate a project which would permanently prevent left hand turns with a physical device that would be the project that would be analyzed. CEQA requires alternatives. Normally the one alternative is going to be the no project alternative, which will be existing conditions. In addition, though, the project could be evaluated with not physical barriers but with just signage and the project alternatives could be evaluated, rather than at all times, for specific times. That would be placed in there. Then when the document is brought back for certification, at that time, those analysis alternatives have been evaluated and the Council could make its final selection. At that time, the project it would like to go forward would put a ballot question before the public.

Mayor Tanaka would like to spell out 2-6. Things can always be changed later. He thinks that this process is flexible. We also know anecdotally that is when our rush hour period is.

Council consensus was to create the third option.

Mayor Tanaka invited public comment.

John Orlowski asked how restricting vehicle access to the 300 block of A, B, C Avenues prevents pedestrians and bicyclists from crossing Fourth Street along A, B and C Avenues. Four weeks have passed with no action taken regarding pedestrian safety and lives on Fourth Street along A, B and C Avenues; therefore, he again asks the City Council and now the City Manager to instruct the Director of Public Services to immediately erect no pedestrian crossing barriers with signs that direct the pedestrians and bicyclists to use the crosswalk on Fourth Street and Orange Avenue. The corner of Orange Avenue and Third Street already has such a pedestrian barrier. Why not Fourth Street along A, B and C Avenues? We are here today because of the location of the bridge. The bridge should have gone directly to North Island or to the Ferry Landing or perhaps a tunnel such as the one that links Oakland to Alameda would have worked. Instead, a previous state public body or agency made the mistake of allowing construction at the most illogical location possible for the bridge which now pours endless traffic through the center of Coronado. Almost 50 years since the bridge opened we are here and 50 years from now our descendants will be here talking about one thing – traffic – unless the City Council decides to implement a real, long-term traffic solution and not just move traffic from one street to another because the last time it closed A, B and C Avenues in 2013 you created gridlock and diverted over 3,500 motor vehicles onto D and E Avenues adjacent to our school sites putting more children at risk. The Council should strive toward a win/win scenario for all of Coronado rather than continuing with its current divisive tactics. Again, the Council should strive toward a win/win scenario for all of Coronado.

David Greer contacted Caltrans about this and they said that these requests have to come from the City itself. His idea is that we need another way to get traffic down the Strand besides going down Orange Avenue. This could be done by coming off the bridge, taking a right hand turn, going all the way under the bridge and come back up along the Golf Course, hit a roundabout, and you are on Glorietta Boulevard and you can get on Pomona or whatever. This scenario is the way the traffic flows in the afternoon anyway. Why not use that same advantage to help out with the increased traffic due to the Navy Campus? It might even solve the A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J left hand turn problem. He encouraged the City to make this request of Caltrans so that they can see if it is viable or not. He believes it is.

Jeff Farrell commented that it appears to him that the goal is to divert all traffic to Orange Avenue. If that is so, the City should do this for all the streets along Third since most of the traffic from A, B and C will avoid Orange and continue to D, E and F, etc. This happened in a similar fashion when A, B and C were closed several years ago along Fourth, effectively making those streets cul-de-sacs. The bulk of that traffic diverted to D and E. Eventually the City closed D as well due to the undue burden on D, which just pushed it to E and F. Eventually the plan was scrapped. Traffic, like water, will flow where there is the least resistance. Whatever mitigation of traffic incidents along this closure area prevent will just shift to the other side of Orange. Actually, he would imagine the incidents will increase on that side since these streets are already heavily burdened by traffic and will not only increase due to the increase in traffic diverted from the turns on A, B and C. He would recommend that the Council review the failed experiment along Fourth from years ago to help predict the future failure of this idea. Traffic in this City is awful; however, all of us have chosen to live here. That means we have all made the decision to tolerate traffic in our neighborhoods. He personally would love to see his street turned into a cul-de-sac but not at the

expense of his fellow neighbors and other City residents. He asked that the City look for other ways to calm traffic in our City without just transferring the burden from one group of residents to another. That said, he can't understand how this motion can be allowed to move forward and request that the Council reject it.

Mike Donovan asked what is going to happen with the alleys. If you cul-de-sac the streets, the alleys could still be used. He doesn't know if that should be in the narrative or part of the engineering study.

Michael Schmid supports the closing of these streets. He sees it firsthand every day as a pedestrian. Blocking crossing Third and Fourth by pedestrians to go up to Orange is not the answer. The answer is to start training every driver that Third and Fourth Street is part of Coronado. It is not a highway. It is not just an on ramp to the Base and part of that training, he believes, will come from meaningful solutions and he implores this body to start swinging for the fences, going for the home run, for these issues and to be leaders and not followers of whatever loud, vocal group says is going to change their lives. His life was changed when his son was struck by someone making a left turn off of A onto Fourth and not looking forward to where they were driving. He hopes that no one else goes through this. It is time for meaningful change.

Kim Schmid commented that just putting signs to restrict turning times is not going to work. That is already in effect on the alleys. They still turn from 2-6. The signs are not the answer. She spoke with Sergeant Harris. They do not have the manpower to enforce all the laws that are on the books. They don't have the manpower to enforce so many cars and the traffic that is here. Putting the signs out is going to do nothing. The person who spoke to putting up signs to stop people from crossing Fourth is not going to get us what we want. If there is a rabid dog in the living room, you don't just put up barriers to keep your children from the living room. You shoot the rabid dog. The point is that the traffic on Third and Fourth is the issue here. Allowing the traffic to still go 40 or 45 mph in 25 or 35 mph zones is the problem. The problem itself has to be addressed. These little Band-Aids are not helpful. She asked the City to go big.

Toni McGowan would like to get back to looking at the octopus instead of the different arms. All of the things we are talking about today are the same plan but we are trying to solve one here and one there. The City will talk about the entry. Can we talk about this comprehensively? Can we look at it all together with that plan and how that is going to work with what we might be doing with the City entry, with relinquishment if that happens? She feels like it is disconnected and we are making decisions. The Council may make this decision but then in a month, we are going to be talking about the entry again and we will have already made this decision. She is hoping we can look at it all as a comprehensive plan for at least a couple months' period of time.

Mayor Tanaka thinks the comments of the last speaker are good. Certainly you want to look at something that is orchestrated from a high level. He believes that what we are doing today is partially preserving our options for the future. Moving forward today doesn't mean that all three of these items will be put on the ballot. We don't know. What we do know is that we want to try to enable the possibility of doing more to exist. If we don't move forward and say yes to what is in front of us, then those options are off the table. Just as we had in our last discussion to talk about state law and environmental impact requirements and environmental studying, these things

can't be considered and the public can't vote on these things if we don't first plumb it out and figure out what the environmental documents are. Also, for the individuals who spoke from D and E Avenues, part of an environmental study is to actually use traffic engineers to predict what the impacts will be to D and E. In other words, you might find, even though you would rather have the City stop right now and not consider it, the City's job is to think about the entire picture and if the Council wants to move forward on this, any council is going to want to know what the predicted impact will be in terms of traffic counts on D and E. It is very fair to say that the last time we tested this the public rejected it. It is very fair to say that maybe the public will do the same thing but we don't know and this is about creating options for the public. In the end, the City Council can either trust its gut about what the public will support or we can tee an issue up for the public to decide themselves. With all due respect to the people who don't want this, from his point of view, this is about giving the public an option. The public can exercise its option to vote no and then that will be that. This option will be closed for years or maybe a decade or two. If the public is willing to reconsider its position or if the public does think that this is a reasonable next step to try to mitigate problems on Third and Fourth between A, B and C, then we are giving the public that option if they want to take it. For him, this is a no brainer to move forward with the three tracks. Two of them are clearly lesser options but that might be the wisdom of the next council. We are trying to preserve some of those options. The point was made that Mr. Bailey and Mr. Woiwode are going to come back one more time and we are not precluded from integrating all of these things into one plan. We wouldn't be people involved in elections if we didn't try to do something, if we didn't try to come up with new solutions. The public voting on something is going to give all of us, including every new Council member, marching orders. The public might say that its preference is to do nothing. If that is the case, it is a democracy and the public is going to get what it wants. If the public votes no on whatever is put forward in the future, then that Council's job is, to some extent hit a reset button or to hit Plan B and keep moving forward and trying to find something that either they will adopt themselves as a Council or will put to a vote to see if the shareholders want to move forward with the idea.

Councilmember Downey will say, in full disclosure that the last time we had turn restrictions she lived on the 300 block of D. All the traffic that couldn't go on A, B and C was diverted to her street. She did not, as a private citizen, vote to restrict traffic on D because she understood that all that was going to do was send it down E. She was hoping we could address it. She is skeptical of what the results will be because, as Mr. Bailey has predicted, he thinks it won't be as bad because now we have two lanes that can turn on Orange. But we won't know until the study is done. Once the study comes up, she will have to recuse herself because of the location of property she owns. But in terms of studying it so we will know the answers to that question – did our gambit to put two turn lanes on Orange take all that excess traffic so it can stop on A, B and C and continue on Orange? Maybe that is the answer and we are all okay with it. She is willing to put it to the study session to let the EIR go through and actually have facts for this or a future Council and the public to decide. How that gets incorporated into whether or not we do a bigger, more permanent solution for the whole entryway will have to let the studies show. She doesn't see a problem in at least studying this because there is a big difference with the two lanes on Orange that weren't there. It was only half a lane when it happened in 2004. She thinks it is different enough and there is enough concern about protecting Fourth and making it safer that she would be willing to support it but she does like having all three of these options go forward. She reminded everyone that when you do an EIR instead of an EIS, we are going to have to choose the preferred alternative so the

Council will have to pick one of those three options to have the thorough analysis in the EIR. It is not like we can take all three of them all the way through to the end and then pick the best one.

Councilmember Bailey heard the comment that the last time we did this it was a failed experiment. That is pretty strong language but it is spot on. It was a failed experiment. We got it wrong but part of the reason we got it wrong last time was because we didn't go through the same process that we are going through right now. That was a disservice to the public and to the people on D and E. He knows that the Council at that time wasn't intending to do that but if we could go back in time and do this all over again, we would be doing this exercise before we put up those barricades so that we would have real data that we could implement some type of mitigating solution so that traffic wouldn't be pushed up onto D and E but perhaps could have been accommodated by those two left turn lanes on Orange Avenue. He agrees with both Mayor Tanaka and Councilmember Downey that there is no harm in studying this. The public deserves real data. The Council deserves real data. He knows that this Council won't take any action that would exacerbate the problems on other streets without trying to mitigate those. He thinks there is no harm in moving forward with those three proposals.

Councilmember Sandke remains convinced that a specific look at this is important. We are kind of boxing ourselves in, though, in terms of turn restrictions only. He thinks A Avenue one-way east bound or northbound, whatever it would be, would go a long way to alleviating the horrible turning actions that take place every day at the bottom of Fourth. He would like to shoot the rabid dog if he could. He feels tremendously burdened as an elected official to try to reclaim this residential neighborhood. He feels tremendously sad for the people who put up with the positioning of the bridge and a lot of stuff went into that decision, most of it driven by how high the bridge needed to be in a short amount of time so that the Navy could still accomplish its operational goals. And there was room to put it in. However, that is all water under the bridge. He would move forward with the recommendation and it is an intractable problem maybe more solvable by the addition of the double traffic lanes and he looks forward to learning more. He does have a question as far as timing goes. He thinks we were under the impression that there was no way this study was going to be done in time for the November election. Is that still the case?

Ms. Canlas responded that it is. The same timeline of 18 to 24 months is in effect depending on how many comments we get.

Mr. Sandke commented that short of paying whatever a special election costs, it is going to be 2018 before we get to talk about this again.

Councilmember Woiwode is supportive.

Mayor Tanaka asked Ms. Canlas about the question on alleys. He remembers that when he made his statement he had mentioned alleys. He assumes that anything we do environmentally will also include closing those alleys either via the signage which is already there but if cul-de-sac is the move, we can cul-de-sac the alleys off as well.

Ms. Canlas commented that at this point there are already turn restrictions applied to the alleys. One of the things that is different from the letter streets versus the alleys is that they were not subject to the vote.

Mayor Tanaka understands that but at the end of the road, if cul-de-sacs is the way to go and, if at the end of the road we put something on the ballot that asks whether these streets be cul-de-sac'd it is correct that it would be silly to leave the alleys open. We have to at least include that possibility. We could pull it away later but he doesn't want us to be in a position where we want to add it and our timing was bad.

Mr. King understands that the direction would be, if the City goes forward, it would want to study the closure of the alleys as well.

Mr. Bailey used to live in that area. He has met with several of the neighbors and they shared a pretty deep concern with cul-de-sacing that area. That would be so restrictive of their access that they might not be supportive of this. They were hoping Mr. Bailey would communicate to the rest of the Council that they would like to see at least one of the options would be restricting southbound traffic but leaving northbound going forward. His reading of this environmental review would allow us to go down that road after we get that report back but we wouldn't necessarily have to spell that out as an option now because it would be less extensive than what is being proposed.

Ms. Canlas reiterated, as was pointed out by the City Manager and Councilmember Downey, that there will be alternatives but it is going to come back to the Council and the Council will have to identify what the preferred alternative is so that is the one that is going to be moved forward and have more review and analysis.

Mr. Bailey asked if we would have to include that specific option in this for it to be addressed.

Ms. Canlas asked Mr. Bailey to repeat it so that she could take note of it and incorporate it in whatever project description we convey to the consultants.

Mr. Bailey stated that it would be a physical barricade that would restrict left turns from Third Street onto the 300 blocks of A, B and C while still allowing traffic to turn left from the 300 block of A, B and C onto Third Street.

Mayor Tanaka understands but is only reflecting back to that being done the last time and the failed experiment. Impatient people just turned illegally in the wrong lane of traffic and we have an enforcement issue. The purpose of fully cul-de-sacing would be to eliminate our need to park police officers there but he thinks Mr. Bailey's point is still valid and we should study it. We haven't made a prescriptive decision. We are just saying we want these things included and at a later date the Council will pick a preferred alternative.

MSUC (Bailey/Downey) moved that the City Council go forward with the EIR on the three options discussed. Those options will include looking at whether or not alleys are restricted and will include looking at whether

or not there will be permanent barriers for only half of a street as a potential.

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

11e. Review of AB 2075 (Atkins) to Relinquish State Highway Route 75 to the Cities of Coronado, Imperial Beach, and San Diego. Blair King, City Manager, gave the presentation. Deanna Spehn, Assemblymember Atkins' Chief of Staff, provided additional remarks.

Councilmember Bailey referred to Mr. King's comment that we don't, at present, have any idea of what the true cost would be associated with relinquishment, whether it be increase in liability costs or maintenance costs. What kind of direction would Mr. King need from the Council to actually go about obtaining that information and what would be the steps in obtaining that?

Mr. King responded that Caltrans has offered that, if the Council were to request, they would prepare a version or a project study report or a transportation system analysis and evaluation to indicate what the condition of the road is and what they believe are the costs required to place the road in good condition. Parallel to that, once the City has that information, it would be easier for City staff to judge what additional maintenance costs or management costs are associated with the right-of-way. In the other project study report that is available that was conducted for the City of Imperial Beach, there are future costs for maintenance that are estimated that were also thrown into the kitty by Caltrans. If the Council were interested, he would suggest that it ask to ask Caltrans to initiate a transportation evaluation or project study report.

Councilmember Downey talked about trying to get an estimate on the additional risk costs. One of the things that comes with this is that we all get the Nixle reports on the accidents that are on the Strand or accidents that are on Third and Fourth and even though we have insurance that covers all of that, we also have a certain amount of deductible or co-pay that the City is going to pay. Every time there is an accident and we get sued, it is going to cost a certain amount of money. She has not kept track on the number of accidents on Third and Fourth (SR 75) or the Strand. Is it possible that, at some point, we could get a rough idea of the number of accidents so we could put some kind of idea on how much the cost of risk would be assuming?

Mr. King responded by saying that the annual traffic report has the number of accidents that occur within the year identified by location. He would be hesitant to speculate if there would be additional cost. He can talk about how our insurance coverage works now. Currently, Coronado is a member of a risk management pool, a JPA. We have a self-insured retention amount, which is the equivalent to a deductible. We pay our self-insured retention and then enter into the pool. The pool typically has two categories of costs. We are in a fairly large pool now. The one is the pooled cost, which are shared jointly by the pool and then the other are the reinsurance costs. Typically, our contribution to the pool and reinsurance is based on loss history. One could speculate that if accidents were to occur, our loss history would go up and with our loss history going up our insurance costs could increase.

Ms. Downey is trying to figure out what the loss retention is that the City is on the hook for with respect to every single lawsuit that we would have to be defending before our insurance kicks in.

Mr. King feels that is a decision that the Council can make but that could be \$50,000, \$100,000, and, again, the self-insured retention is usually a judgment business decision based upon the cost for the pooled and the reinsurance.

Ms. Downey asked what it is right now.

Mr. King believes it is \$50,000.

Ms. Downey is trying to figure out the line that was drawn on the map. Apparently what we are talking about ends before we get to our toll plaza. It might be easier if we owned the rights there instead of Caltrans. Are those off the table because that is something Caltrans does not want to allow?

Ms. Spehn responded that the definition of where the state route begins and ends was provided to them by Caltrans and went through legislative counsel at the state. There is a legal definition of the parameters of the state highway.

Mayor Tanaka asked if the bridge is part of SR 75.

Ms. Spehn does not know that answer. She believes it would be but the state isn't relinquishing it back to itself.

Mayor Tanaka understands the state's position of not wanting to relinquish the bridge. We are focusing on the technicality. Right now, as the state highway system exists, if you are on the 5 and you choose to go over the bridge to Coronado, when you start going on the bridge you start entering SR 75. We are kind of saying that isn't it convenient that in this plan in front of the Council the state is still going to say that the bridge is something, it is part of SR 75 so that would just terminate kind of subjectively at this point.

Ms. Spehn explained that the way the relinquishment law works is you can only relinquish back within a city limit or a county limit. You don't get to relinquish another persons' property, in this case, the state's property to Coronado.

Mayor Tanaka is not sure he entirely agrees with how that was worded but he understands what Ms. Spehn is saying.

Ms. Downey forgot that the staff report includes a division of the Streets and Highway Code that defines SR 75 as going from I 5 and it goes all the way to the next time you get to I 5. Regardless of whether it is 75 or not, Ms. Spehn is saying that Caltrans doesn't want to give up anything past Glorietta, so that Glorietta to the bridge is not an option. If we were going to go back and say that we would take it as long as we got the toll plaza...

Ms. Spehn responded that is the case because it is not within your jurisdiction. It is not within the boundaries of the City of Coronado.

Mr. King referred to an illustration that was prepared in 2013 by Caltrans. At that time, Caltrans showed what they believed the limit to relinquishment was. In informal conversations, there has been an indication to him that if the City were to want to take up through the maintenance yard, Caltrans would be acceptable to that.

Ms. Spehn added that is all part of the negotiations between a city and Caltrans that takes place. That document that Imperial Beach has is the result of their negotiations with Caltrans. A lot of things can be done across a negotiating table.

Councilmember Woiwode commented that the legislation is necessary as a part of the relinquishment process. Is that correct? And this bill is happening basically because Imperial Beach wants that legislation. Is that correct?

Ms. Spehn responded that legislation is required. Caltrans cannot, on its own, grant relinquishment. It has to go through the legislative body and it has to go to the Governor's desk. There are two ways that you can do a relinquishment bill. The way that Assemblymember Atkins opted to do it is that each city, each jurisdiction, would have to request that the relinquishment process be initiated. It is not imposing it on any city within the SR 75 boundaries. Imperial Beach has requested. They approved a resolution several months ago by their City Council requesting that a relinquishment project be initiated.

Councilmember Sandke noticed in the staff report and other documents he has read that 282 is not included in the Atkins' bill currently even though this 2013 map shows it. Was the thinking, from the legislator's office, that we didn't want to do that or was there thinking that maybe if they asked for it we would get it? How would that process look if we want to include 282 going forward?

Ms. Spehn responded that you ask the Assemblymember if she is willing to add it to the bill and she adds it.

Mr. Sandke asked if it is time to include other things we want such as speed cameras to enforce our speed limits in our residential neighborhoods.

Ms. Spehn responded that this is only about relinquishment.

Mayor Tanaka invited public comment.

Kim Schmid would like to ask the Council to move forward with requesting the proposal from Caltrans for the relinquishment of SR 75. This roadway has become increasingly dangerous over the past few years to the point where people are being seriously injured or killed. Caltrans has let it be known that they have little interest in making any changes that help the safety of our community. In fact, they willingly raised the speed limit on this roadway that was already averaging 37 mph in a residential area. Look at the relinquishment as a business deal. Everything has its price and at a time when Caltrans wants to relinquish this roadway and Coronado wants to

have safer, calmer streets, why not at least be open to a negotiation? This would just be a starting point. No commitment is involved. With SB 254 pending, Caltrans is a vote away from relinquishing that highway to us with absolutely no negotiation and absolutely no funding to go with it. Please be open to all of the options and see what they have to say. There is no better time than right now. Second, she would like to propose that the Council rehire the consultants that were hired for the traffic calming report that was done last year. She showed a rendering of what the Fourth Street intersections could and can look like. She would like to have everyone agree that it was obvious that the consultants who were hired were told to put traffic signals in all the options. She doesn't know why this preset agenda was in place but it obviously hindered the consultants from actually doing their job and giving us their expert knowledge on ways to calm the traffic. The consultants flat out told her and her husband that traffic signals are not traffic calming devices and she could see the frustration in that particular consultant's eyes. Why they were told to use them in the traffic calming report she doesn't know. Let's get them back in here. They have all the data. They have our City memorized. They know the traffic flows, the quantities – everything about our City. Let's let them do their job, which was to calm the traffic, not to put in stoplights. It is the perfect time to implement the gateway program with the traffic calming on Third and Fourth with all the information they already had. It is perfect opportunity for Mayor Tanaka to leave a legacy of making these changes on Fourth Street that have never been done in 40 years.

Carolyn Rogerson read this and was really quite surprised that Caltrans wants to relinquish. One man's relinquishment is another man's dumping. She really does have a lot of respect and empathy for those who live in the Third and Fourth Street corridor from the bridge all the way down to North Island. She realizes the problems people have living there. We have to realize, though, that SR 75 is not just the Third and Fourth Street corridor and before the City makes any decisions as to what it wishes to do, she thinks we need to know very clearly how many miles of roadway we are talking about, what it costs to maintain that roadway. Not only do we have the Third and Fourth Street corridor, we have going through the City and all of that 65 mph roadway that goes through the Silver Strand, past the Navy out to the Imperial Beach city line. That is a lot of roadway to maintain. Please let's remember that the Navy is going to be increasing their traffic there so we are going to have an increase in heavy equipment, trucks and vehicles on the roads that we now use and she doesn't think they are all going to come through IB. They are going to come over the bridge, down Third and Fourth, all through what is now SR 75 past the Cays. As she understands it, IB wanted this. That is fine. San Diego wanted this. She doesn't know if this is such a great idea for Coronado. Besides the liability that Councilmember Bailey and Downey have mentioned, we also have to think about cleaning up this roadway. We are going to be taking on an awful lot of expense if we accept this relinquishment. Not only do we need to look this gift horse in the mouth, she thinks this gift horse needs a complete, full body MRI.

Michael Schmid can understand some of Ms. Rogerson's points about the Silver Strand portion but he thinks it is imperative that we begin to negotiate because during negotiations you don't necessarily have to take relinquishment of things that fall under Caltrans' guidelines as highways versus the sections he is talking about which does not fall under those guidelines. Let's not get distracted by certain areas just not fitting in. Let's look and see what there is, what can be done and, as far as liability, there is a great liability to do nothing or a great potential liability to do nothing also.

Deanna Spehn clarified that the City of San Diego has not taken any position on this at all. Councilmember David Alvarez has sent a letter of support for the bill; the City itself has not spoken with their office about whether it would be interested in relinquishing its portion.

Mayor Tanaka asked if she has any idea what the timeline might be for the City of San Diego to do something.

Ms. Spehn explained that the legislation will take until August before it goes to the Governor's desk and then after that there is no deadline by which a city needs to respond. It is any time that a city is interested then the mechanism is there through the legislation.

David Greer commented that earlier tonight we were debating very heavily about \$5 million or \$7 million or spending \$60 million on a gateway project. Do you really think we can maintain all of these roads all the way down to Imperial Beach? You are talking hundreds of millions of dollars. Caltrans themselves does not do what needs to be done. We think we can? If you think relinquishment is so great and we can do whatever we want on these roads, we can't. We have to follow the same highway manual that Caltrans does as put out by the state.

Toni McGowan is hoping that the Council will support this. She actually believes that we can run our own City and can manage our own streets. The thing that holds us back from everything every time we want to do anything is Caltrans, Caltrans, Caltrans. This is an opportunity; support this process and she hopes the Council will support it.

Fern Nelson is very concerned about taking over SR 75. She feels like we are getting backed into it, even backed into evaluating it just because IB took over part of it. She is extremely concerned about the cost. To take over Third and Fourth alone is going to be an issue. Taking over Silver Strand is just going to be a huge nightmare, especially since the base down there hasn't even been built yet. She thinks it is a huge financial commitment. Certainly it is okay to look into the issue but she is very concerned about the amount of money we will be on the hook for.

Mayor Tanaka commented that there is a right way to handle relinquishment and a wrong way to handle relinquishment. The right way is what Imperial Beach has done. They wanted it for themselves. They approached Caltrans. Caltrans was willing to put together a map and enter into negotiations. He wants to be really clear that is the right way to do it. If you, as a city, contemplate it, talk about it, agendize it, and make a decision to do this. That is how government is supposed to work. He wants to be really clear that there is a wrong way to do relinquishment. Here is how the wrong way sounds. Let Imperial Beach trigger your process for you. That is absolutely the wrong path for the City of Coronado and proof of it is this map. This map doesn't make any sense for people in Coronado but it does make sense for someone else who sort of gets Coronado. Logically, the red should end when you hit Fourth Street because 282 exists. 282 connects the bridge to the Navy Base. He wants to be really clear about something. Whether you favor relinquishment or oppose it, there is a reason the state routes are drawn the way they are, and numbered. There is a concept. One of the concepts here that we all need to accept is that more cars come in and out of Coronado than Coronado produces. This is not a local issue. That is why the state of California designated not one but two different state highways. One acknowledges the traffic that goes back and forth from the Bridge to the Navy and back out, and a second one that

acknowledges all the traffic we get from our other way in and out of town, the Strand. You don't deserve to call yourself a Coronadoan if you don't understand that there are only two main ways to drive in and out of Coronado. The state route system acknowledges that. He wants to be emphatic. For the people who want to pursue this, he gets that but the end result of wanting relinquishment does not justify a terrible process. A terrible process is Imperial Beach requesting it, us getting named into it, and then just acquiescing and saying it is a fait accompli. He firmly believes that if relinquishment is an important topic to discuss, and he does not like the idea but he is certainly willing to concede it is worth a City Council discussion, and step one from Coronado's point of view would be one member agendaizing the issue, see if the Council wants to discuss it, and then start studying and discussing it. The absolute wrong way to do it is to let Imperial Beach start this movement and now we feel we have to respond.

In front of him today, the clear response is that the Council should request that Assemblymember Atkins remove the City of Coronado from this. We didn't request this and this isn't drawn to favor the City of Coronado. If this Council or a future Council wants to talk about relinquishment, then we ought to pick up that torch ourselves, define what we think should be relinquished, whether it is just 282 or 75 or the whole thing, and he wanted to point out leverage. Even Ms. Spehn said that there is a lot to be gained at the negotiating table. To him, this is the weakest version of leverage we could have to just say we got pulled into this. There is no logical reason for Coronado to be in this, particularly the way this map is drawn. Why would it make any sense to keep the bridge under state control, dump 100,000 trips into Coronado, not allow us to fix the toll bridge plaza, and leave the rest of 282 stranded orphans there. That doesn't make any sense. This begs us to respond and not to respond on our terms but to respond on either Speaker Atkins' terms or Imperial Beach's terms, Caltrans' terms – we don't have leverage in this. Step 1 is to say, respectfully, that this does not suit our needs and to please remove us from it. Step 2 is to see how Speaker Atkins responds. If she says no and that her judgment is that it should stand, then we deal with that. He really thinks the strongest relinquishment discussion happens when we say we are at the point where we want to discuss it. He doesn't want to say oppose it yet because he wants to see if Assemblymember Atkins is willing to remove Coronado from this. Here is one reason why. It is totally subjective where all that red stuff ends right at Glorietta. We all know that is within the City limits. That is why when the Port asks something about Tideland Park, we are asked as it is within our City. He is not buying any of that stuff. Logically, if the state wanted to relinquish, they ought to consider relinquishing the bridge because the starting point of SR 75 is when you leave 5 to go on the bridge. If the state isn't willing to do that, and he wouldn't blame them, then it really casts a lot of doubt on the logic of relinquishing any of these state highways because the reason the state highways exist is there is far more traffic coming in and out of Coronado that has nothing to do with us. Those are other people's cars from other cities, other locales. It is silly to say that we have the wherewithal or the resources to process all of that. We don't. This is a shortcut and this is not the right way for Coronado to pursue relinquishment if it wants. To him, it is very clear that we should see if Assemblymember Atkins would remove Coronado from this initially and if she won't, then we should continue to talk about what we want to do to address what is on the table. He wanted to make the point that he has no interest in trying to harm Imperial Beach. If they want to pursue relinquishment that is great. He thinks we need to make sure that this is pursued in a way where it helps Imperial Beach and it does not harm Coronado. In his opinion, this harms Coronado.

Councilmember Woiwode sort of agrees with Mayor Tanaka. When one thinks about how this came about, Imperial Beach came to the conclusion that a relinquishment worked for them because of some very specific things they are trying to accomplish – a project that they are building that they can only build if the highway is relinquished to them. He thinks that is the right time at which to ask for it. If we are doing work that requires relinquishment in order to accomplish it that is the point at time at which we want to talk about relinquishment and not have it something that is staring at us all the time without us taking a conscious look at it. There are people who think that we can set speed limits differently than Caltrans does. We can't. We have the same process and are governed by the same laws. There are people who think we can do things with the roads that Caltrans can't. Maybe sometimes that is true. Speed tables is one example where we are asking for them and we are asking for all of the traffic calming improvements that were recommended by the consultants except for the traffic signals so we are following through on that study and we are asking Caltrans' permission to do those things. If Caltrans is serious about their intent to make city streets more accessible to all modes of transportation, they may change their approach to those things. He doesn't think we should assume that we have to have the roads relinquished to us in order to make progress on those items. The fact that state roads interconnect communities – SR 75 has 12 miles inside Coronado, 1 mile inside Imperial Beach, and 1 mile in San Diego – makes it clear that we are the biggest factor in this bill and yet we haven't had a public discussion about relinquishment. He agrees that the cart is before the horse here in terms of our City's interest. He would also like to see our name removed from the bill.

Councilmember Sandke shared in the *Eagle* last week that he thinks we have inexorably, step by step, council by council, year by year gotten closer to the necessity to do this. He sees the point about the trigger being pulled by someone other than us. He thinks that, in looking at the map, on the southern end the red line stops at Rendova. Taking over the Strand would not be a good idea. He would not include the bridge even though the City boundary for Coronado is about a quarter of the way up the bridge. Having some control over the toll plaza would have to come with money. We need the control we would want to have there. Recognizing that the boundary right at Glorietta is not a conducive boundary for the things we want presents a stumbling block going forward. He would certainly include 282 and the simple inclusion of the small plastic sign that says 'Pedestrian Crossing' has been like a root canal times one thousand just to get something like that done in the Safe Routes to School area. This has been horribly difficult and frustratingly so. That is just one more tick of the boxes of all the things we have tried to do that Caltrans has said no to. That is just old and we are tired of that broken record. The community is tired of that broken record. He doesn't disagree that it would be expensive. He doesn't disagree that there are liability issues and maintenance issues and all those things need to be vetted. The community needs to know what those numbers are before making a decision. At the risk of adding one more thing to the ballot, it is probably something that the residents should vote on. He would love to find some ways to include some very innovative solutions to what is a tremendously unique and dangerous situation in any traffic community and that would be a trial of some speed cameras for enforcement in the area between Orange Avenue and the bridge. As Mr. Woiwode points out, we have to follow the same set of rules and he thinks we had better learn to play inside that box but find some innovative solutions to reclaim the neighborhood. He thinks the definition of state of good repair is something that we have to be very careful about. The City Manager talked a little earlier about something being thrown in the kitty. This isn't a poker game. This is our future as a community and for us to be able to have all of the aces in our deck is simply not something that the state is going to let

happen. It is important for us to go in with our eyes open and play a good hand. A complete analysis of the existing roadways, as would happen with a project study that we talked about initiating, would be tremendously important and he would like included in that state of the art adaptive timetable traffic signals being included as well. It is a big project and he doesn't disagree that it would be expensive. He thinks it would be in the interest of the state to get the roadway in what we both determine is a state of good repair and then, in the interest of the state, relinquish the roadway to us. Whether that is with a vote tonight or not, he doesn't think it is something we should give up on.

Mayor Tanaka pointed out that Mr. Sandke has discussed how he feels about relinquishment and some of the ways to approach it. The issue at hand is Imperial Beach is the mover behind this. They are the reason this bill exists and Coronado is being asked to review it. Where does he stand on this bill?

Mr. Sandke responded by saying that we have the attention of the state. Our name is in a bill. Every time we have tried to get something done at the legislative level in Sacramento, we have gotten responses that things can't be done as they are Coronado-specific. He thinks it will be doubly difficult to come back to them later and say that we have a great idea now and have someone act on our behalf. He thinks we have the attention of the legislature currently and we have the opportunity to move forward with a project study and perhaps even a public vote based on that study that would give us an opportunity to move forward. He is at this level a support but amend.

Mayor Tanaka asked if the reason he is optimistic is because our name is in the bill.

Mr. Sandke explained that the reason he is optimistic is because he thinks, given the fatality and the two serious injuries that we have had, we have an opportunity to use some legislative momentum on our behalf. He thinks that specifically makes him think we should strike while the iron is hot.

Mayor Tanaka thinks Mr. Sandke makes very good points about perhaps the time being ripe or nearly ripe to discuss relinquishment. Where he really doesn't agree with Mr. Sandke is he doesn't agree that the process before the Council involves Coronado having any better leverage than it would all things considered. He actually thinks we'd have far more leverage if we were the ones who initiated it. He thinks the proof is that we really weren't consulted on this. If we were to oppose it today, we will then find out whether Assemblymember Atkins cares about our opinion or not. If she decides to keep Coronado in her bill, then that will show that we don't have any leverage. We need to find out if the Assembly member really does care about the Coronado City Council's position and if the colleagues in Sacramento do. He is really concerned that this whole process was driven by Imperial Beach. The Speaker's bill is to advantage Imperial Beach. It is not to advantage Coronado. It is to dispose of Coronado. We are part of this solution so in order to fix Imperial Beach's problem logically they had to include us. Mr. Sandke is absolutely right that the time may be ripe for a discussion on relinquishment. He wants us to do it on the most favorable terms to our residents.

Michael Schmid thinks Coronado was added in response to a meeting they had with the Speaker at their house right after his son's accident. She was very sympathetic at that time that Coronado could do more to make these streets safe than Caltrans can. That is when it was added.

Mayor Tanaka appreciates that insight and he is sure that might be part of it but there is a larger picture.

Deanna Spehn clarified that it is generally Caltrans' policy that an entire route be put into the legislation because it takes a year for a bill to move through the legislature. It also costs money to process a bill, just under \$20,000 per piece of legislation. That is why the administration's preference, generally, is if you can consolidate. In this case, it is an entire route. The discretion is entirely Coronado's whether or not you take advantage should the bill pass of asking for relinquishment and it is entirely Coronado's discretion of sitting and negotiating with Caltrans. That is not a legislative process.

Councilmember Downey is not as afraid that if we came to the decision we wanted to relinquish in a year or two that it would be harder to get the legislature's attention. When she met with Laurie Berman, she has been trying to get rid of SR 75 in Coronado for as long as she has been there because we are a pain in the neck to them. Our citizens know who she is, her phone number and how to reach her. She would prefer they didn't. She does her best but she gets a lot of input from Coronado and since Coronado residents see it as a local issue, her thought all along was why don't we make it a local issue. She also knows that we are going to be bound by the same laws that Caltrans is bound by in terms of what kind of traffic measures, in a lot of instances, you can use. It just means we have to answer all of the people that are mad that we can't put whatever we want in. She was certain there was an impetus for putting this in the bill and she thinks it is partly because they want to do the whole thing but then when you have the input of our residents specifically saying they want to be able to take control that all came together. She doesn't know if it harms Imperial Beach if we ask to be pulled out. Since Caltrans has suggested they would not be including the bridge, which is a portion of SR 75, then she doesn't know that it makes any difference whether it is the small section or the 14-mile section. The other issue she has is she has no intention of supporting the City taking the bridge. There is a reason Caltrans needs to operate the bridge. We don't have the budget, the time, the resources, or the inclination to be in charge of managing the bridge. She would recommend that we actually ask Assemblymember Atkins to remove our name from this particular legislation but she thinks now is a great time to start looking at those numbers, working with Caltrans on those numbers. It is \$50,000 now but it could be \$100,000 any time there is an accident. We know how many accidents we have on SR 75. She wants to have idea of how much the costs are that we have to incorporate into us possibly taking over the bridge. She also does agree that there are a lot of things we can talk about because one of the things that we would have always wanted to do with Caltrans and we have no leverage at all is we have asked several times why we can't have three lanes going outbound all weekend long. It is a simple reason because they would have to put another shift on. There are a lot of options out there but she doesn't know that this is the right time to do it. She is recommending that at this time we ask to be pulled from the bill but that we actually start the staff work to see. Everyone on Third and Fourth wants to know why we don't do it. So let's find out what it is so people can talk about and maybe put it up to a vote.

Councilmember Bailey commented that it doesn't sound like there is support for us to stay in the bill as it is written. He is happy to also support removing ourselves from the bill but to piggyback off of Ms. Downey he would also like to see us have this discussion. We don't have any leverage right now because we aren't at the table. How do we gain leverage? Perhaps it is as simple as asking Caltrans for a proposal through a PSR and if we don't like it, we can reject it. He would rather have that option available to us sooner rather than later where we don't have the option at all and they can just dump it on our laps. He is fine pulling Coronado out of this bill but he would like to direct staff to agendize for discussion at a subsequent Council meeting what it would actually look like for Caltrans to prepare a PSR.

Mayor Tanaka thinks that there is a way forward for today. Something that is abundantly clear to him is that this is an election year and we are very close to that election. One of the things that he thinks is really important about an election year is it is the City's chance to vet candidates and have these discussions. He thinks it would be far more healthy to see who is running for City Council and who is running for Mayor and there will be at least five to ten forums. They will ask the question as to where people stand on relinquishment. And it is really important to let that process play out.

Mr. Bailey responded by saying that we are eight months away from the election. He has no doubt that they will be asked what it would look like if we did take over Third and Fourth Street. As of right now we don't know because we have no information to go off of. He would rather have that information available for those exact discussions. He doesn't see any harm in asking Caltrans to put something on the table.

Mayor Tanaka thinks the flaw to his position is we are letting Imperial Beach dictate our timeline again. He knows that is not Mr. Bailey's intention but it has the same result.

Mr. Bailey thinks the discussion on Imperial Beach is irrelevant. One way or the other we are going to have to have this discussion in the future and he would rather know this information sooner rather than later before being forced into a corner where we have no options.

Mayor Tanaka commented that if that is all one motion, he will have to vote against it. He thinks we need to bifurcate the issue and first see if there is a Council majority that is ready to put a motion forward to request that Assemblymember Atkins amend her bill to remove Coronado from it and then we certainly can take up discussions about relinquishment but he doesn't think we have to tie the two together and if the two are tied together, he has to vote against it.

Mr. Bailey asked if Mayor Tanaka views the process of requesting a PSR to be akin to pursuing relinquishment.

Mayor Tanaka does. He doesn't want to send the signal that we want it. He wants to send the signal that we first want to have our own discussion and if and when we as a City decide to pursue it, we chose to pursue it.

Mr. Bailey asked at what point we would be actually ready to have that discussion if we have no information to go off of. He hears Mr. King saying that Caltrans will make us a proposal and then we will have some information with which to decide if this actually makes sense for Coronado.

Mayor Tanaka challenges Mr. Bailey to use Council Policy #2 to formally think about how he wants to word it and word it that way. He does not want to ad hoc add that.

Jonathan Clay wanted to present some information for the Council. If the City decides to go down the path to have a conversation with the Assemblymember about removing Coronado from the language, he thinks it should also then consider what happens if that is done and what happens if that is not done. This bill will most likely be heard some time in the month of April. The policy committees are going to be meeting then. It could be heard as early as next week. If the City wanted to engage one way or the other, it would want to have a position at that point.

Mayor Tanaka wants to do something more deliberate.

MSC (Tanaka/Woiwode) moved that the City Council request Assemblymember Atkins to amend her bill to remove the City of Coronado.

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

MS (Bailey/Sandke) moved that the City Council direct staff to agendize for future discussion having Caltrans prepare a Project Study Report or the Caltrans document regarding relinquishment.

Ms. Downey doesn't know that we need to go that route. She knows our staff is so over worked but rather than go to Caltrans and ask them to do that, first she would rather have an idea of what the costs are, what we think they are. We do a far better job of maintaining our streets than Caltrans has ever done. If we know how many miles exist on all of the roads and we know what our seven-year replacement plan is, we could do a back of the napkin at least for road maintenance for some of these roads. She thinks we can have a ballpark figure about additional legal risk costs that might be necessary based on the number of accidents. Our staff could put together at least a basic idea of some of the costs we are taking on. What it won't have is what could be offered in negotiations with Caltrans. She doesn't know that she wants to go out and so definitively say that we are heading in a direction and for Caltrans to give us something.

Mr. Bailey's intention behind this is simply to say to Caltrans that they told us informally many times that they want to give us Third and Fourth Streets and now we want to be able to discuss this from an informed position after knowing what the maintenance costs look like. Mr. King has stated that Caltrans won't provide that information to us unless we, as a body, formally request it.

Mayor Tanaka asked if Mr. Bailey thinks that his motion encourages Assemblymember Atkins to keep Coronado in the bill. Mr. Bailey responded that, if that is the case, she hasn't listened to this body.

Ms. Downey understands that there is a risk that this could go down the road where we don't have any say in the matter. Based on how some of these processes work, and she really appreciates Ms. Spehn coming to talk about this, because she understands that it could get pushed down our throats and we wouldn't have a chance to stop the train. She believes Ms. Spehn when she says that is not the case but the staff report suggests that it is possible that it is going to be up to the California Transportation Commission, etc. She is just not as comfortable that we could stop the train if we decided we didn't want it. That is her worry. That is why going to ask Caltrans for that report just makes it that much likelier that it will get shoved down our throats. She wants it to be on our terms and wants to get a better understanding of what the costs and benefits would be and to negotiate from a position of strength as opposed to last-ditch efforts.

Mr. Bailey agrees and that is why he thinks that we are going to have to have this discussion. All this motion would do is simply say to Caltrans to put together some information for us. He completely agrees that we need to substantiate that information on our own. At this point in time, we do have leverage because we can always say no. Eventually we might reach the day where we don't have that leverage any more. Why would we want to limit the information available to us if Caltrans is willing to provide it? All he is seeking is information. He just wants to know some facts.

Mayor Tanaka would rather see the issue forced and then us dealing with it then and that way we never gave the signal that we were really open to it. Again, we could, at a minimum ask staff to put together their own preliminary thoughts before moving forward. He would rather take the more conservative approach of wait and be deliberate rather than do it right now.

Mr. Woiwode thinks this all makes sense for Imperial Beach because they had a specific need and relinquishment enables them to satisfy that need. We haven't done that yet. We haven't come up with a reason why relinquishment works in our benefit. We speculate that it might. We speculate that we could do things that Caltrans won't do but we don't know that for a fact. He would rather see us tie relinquishment to something in particular that we want to accomplish. The issue of how much the road costs and whether or not it is worth it only makes sense in the context of what we benefit from and we don't know that benefit until we have got a toll plaza project or a traffic calming project or something in front of us that we could do with relinquishment but we could not do without. When we get to that point then he thinks he is ready to talk about it. Until that point, he thinks we are just asking people to negotiate against us.

Mr. Bailey withdrew his motion.

12. **CITY ATTORNEY:** No report.
13. **COMMUNICATIONS - WRITTEN:** None.
14. **ADJOURNMENT:** The Mayor adjourned the meeting at 9:05 p.m.

Approved: April 5, 2016



Casey Tanaka, Mayor
City of Coronado

Attest:



Mary L. Clifford, CMC
City Clerk