

**MINUTES OF A  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
CITY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF CORONADO  
Coronado City Hall  
1825 Strand Way  
Coronado, CA 92118  
Tuesday, April 3, 2007**

Mayor Smisek called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

**1. ROLL CALL:**

**Present:** Councilmembers Downey, Monroe, Ovrom, Tanaka and Mayor Smisek

**Absent:** None

**Also Present:** City Manager Mark Ochendusko  
City Attorney Morgan Foley  
City Clerk Linda Hascup

**2. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.** Layperson Mary Gwen Brummitt provided the invocation and Mayor Smisek led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**3. MINUTES:** Approval of the corrected minutes of the Regular Meeting of February 20, 2007, and the minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 20, 2007. The reading of the minutes in their entirety was unanimously waived.

**MSUC (Downey/Tanaka) moved that the City Council approve the corrected minutes of the Regular Meeting of February 20, 2007 and the minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 20, 2007, a copy having been provided Council prior to the meeting, as amended.**

**AYES: Downey, Monroe, Ovrom, Tanaka and Smisek**

**NAYS: None**

**ABSENT: None**

**4. CEREMONIAL PRESENTATIONS:**

**4a. Introduction of Director of Police Services Lou Scanlon.** City Manager Mark Ochenduszkowski introduced the new Director of Police Services Lou Scanlon.

**4b. Proclamation: Arbor Day.** Mayor Smisek presented the proclamation to Ron Henderson, Paul Corriere, and Robert Lindsay, Chair and members of the Coronado Street Tree Committee.

**4c. Proclamation: Coronado Woman's Club Day.** Mayor Smisek presented the proclamation to the Coronado Woman's Club. He recognized Barbara Darnell, the oldest original member of the Club.

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

**MSUC (Downey/Tanaka) moved that the City Council approve the Consent Calendar Items 5a through 5g with the exception of Item 5c and the addition of Item 11b – Adoption of a Resolution Supporting the Homeporting of a Third Naval Nuclear Aircraft Carrier at Naval Air Station North Island (NASNI).**

**AYES: Downey, Monroe, Ovrom, Tanaka and Smisek**  
**NAYS: None**  
**ABSENT: None**

Regarding Item 11b, CAPT Mike Allen, Chief of Staff, Navy Region Southwest, expressed the Navy's gratitude for the longstanding support shown by the City of Coronado. The Navy looks forward to working with the community to ensure this homeporting change reflects the Navy core values and strengthens the relationship between the Navy and the City.

CAPT Tony Gianni, Commanding Officer, Navy Base Coronado, echoed CAPT Allen's comments that the Navy is very grateful for the City's support, long standing commitment, and the commitment of the community not just to the Navy but to the local bases. They look forward to working with the City in the future.

**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. Approval of Warrants.** The City Council ratified payment of warrants Nos. 10057202 thru 10057260 audited and approved by the Audit Committee, provided there are sufficient funds on hand. **The City Council approved the warrants.**

**5c. Authorization to Grant a Utility Easement to San Diego Gas and Electric for Placing Equipment Related to the Underground Utilities for the CUSD Palm Academy**

**Project, CDA Senior Housing Project and the City's Village Fire Station in the Public Right-of-Way.**

Councilmember Monroe mentioned his concern with the number of utility boxes in view on the street even though he recognized the need for the junction box. Because of the recent legislation passed with AT&T and their ability to get into cable tv, etc. he sees in the future for Coronado that there will be requests for junction boxes all over the City. He thinks this is the first leg of a long battle. He wonders if there is any way this box can be moved next to the tennis courts.

Assistant City Manager Jim Benson explained that the box would be located on the back side of the curb. Unlike the future situation with AT&T, this is a City project that was raised as a way of getting around all of the overhead utilities along Sixth Street and down the alley. SDG&E has two concerns when they put in a box like this: accessibility for their equipment when they need to work on it and the desire not to damage tree roots in the park. He said the timeline is a concern. This needs to be in and soon because it is delaying the Senior Housing Project.

Councilmember Tanaka asked what is preventing the City from placing it closer to the tennis court. Mr. Benson responded that the book drop area is also there and SDG&E needs to have access to the boxes. He added that these boxes are the trade off to be able to get the utilities underground. Ed Walton, staff engineer, added that SDG&E was also coordinating the connection with the Library's power.

**MSUC (Monroe/Ovrom) moved that the City Council authorize the Assistant City Manager to sign the necessary SDG&E utility easement agreement.**

**AYES: Downey, Monroe, Ovrom, Tanaka and Smisek**  
**NAYS: None**  
**ABSENT: None**

**5d. Adoption of Resolution Certifying the 2007 Apartment Vacancy Factor.** The 2007 Apartment Vacancy Factor has been calculated at 1.0 percent. The City received from the owners of apartments a usable response of 959 of the approximately 1,597 apartment units in the City. This response accounts for about 60% of the apartment units in Coronado.

Since the 2007 apartment vacancy factor is less than five percent, applications for conversion of an apartment complex into a condominium complex during 2007 cannot be approved by the City Council in accordance with Subsection 82.40.100(F) of the Municipal Code. **The City Council adopted A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO ADOPTING THE 2007 CORONADO APARTMENT VACANCY FACTOR PURSUANT TO SUBSECTION 82.40.100(F) OF THE CORONADO MUNICIPAL CODE. The Resolution was read by Title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by Council as RESOLUTION NO. 8204.**

**5e. Adoption of the "Greenbook" Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction 2006 Edition, the San Diego Regional Standard Drawings 2006 Update and the City-Annotated Drawings 2007.** The "Greenbook" and the SDRSD, along with Coronado's annotations, are criteria used by the City of Coronado to describe and depict the materials and methods used in the construction of public improvements such as sidewalks, curbs

and gutters, roads, sewers, storm drains, etc. These documents are also used throughout Southern California so that infrastructure is constructed in a safe and uniform manner throughout the region. The “Greenbook” Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction is published by a joint committee, including representatives from City and County agencies, American Public Works Association, Associated General Contractors of California, Engineering Contractors Association and the Southern California Contractors Association, at three-year intervals. The San Diego Regional Standard Drawings and City-annotated drawings are updated when appropriate. Most of the City of Coronado’s capital improvement projects reference the documents as referenced project specifications. **The City Council adopted the “Greenbook” Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction 2006 edition; the SDRSD 2006 Update; and the City-annotated SDRSD drawings, 2007 edition.**

**5f. Designation of Council Representative to the League of California Cities, San Diego Division Legislative Subcommittee.** Mayor Smisek recommended that the City Council appoint Councilmember Carrie Downey to represent the Council on the Legislative Subcommittee and Andrew Potter as alternate. **The City Council appointed Councilmember Carrie Downey as the Council representative to the Legislative Subcommittee.**

**5g. Approval of a Resolution Authorizing a Quitclaim Deed from the City of Coronado to the San Diego Unified Port District Regarding Property Along the Glorietta Bay Waterfront; Approval of a Resolution Granting a Lease of Certain Property Along the Glorietta Bay Waterfront from the City of Coronado to the San Diego Unified Port District; Approval of a Resolution Accepting a lease of Certain Property Along the Glorietta Bay Waterfront from the San Diego Unified Port District to the City of Coronado; Approval of a Resolution Authorizing the Amendment of an Existing Lease of Certain Tidelands Property Along the Glorietta and San Diego Bay Waterfront (a Portion of the Coronado Municipal Golf Course) from the San Diego Unified Port District, to the City of Coronado.** Adoption of the attached quitclaim and leases are necessary to allow the “Yacht Club Promenade” portion of the Glorietta Bay Master Plan to be implemented and constructed. A significant part of this project is the creation of a public amenity by acquiring a portion of the CYC leasehold for a public park. To accomplish the completion of the promenade project a number of parcels owned by the Port and City must be identified and transferred from or into a new lease.

- Parcel 1 owned by the City and containing 29,553 sq ft is part of the existing CYC lease. It would continue to be leased from the City by the Port and in turn leased by the Port to CYC as a part of a new lease;
- Parcel 2 owned by the City containing 10,404 sq ft which is presently undeveloped and currently outside of the CYC fence and leasehold would be leased by the City to the Port and added to the CYC leasehold;
- Parcel 3 is within state tidelands and contains roughly 15,994 sq ft. This parcel is also currently outside of the CYC fence and leasehold with the easterly one-half presently undeveloped and the westerly one-half currently used by the City for the easterly end of Strand Way which will be relocated to the west. Parcel 3 will also be leased by the Port to CYC and added to their current leasehold;
- Parcel 4 within state tidelands containing 22,070 sq ft is currently leased to CYC. This parcel would be removed from the existing CYC leasehold and leased to the City in exchange for the addition of parcels 2 and 3 being added to the CYC lease. Parcel 4 will

be developed by the City with Port funding into a public park and reconfigured public parking lot;

- Parcel 5 was quitclaimed to the City of Coronado from the San Diego & Arizona Eastern Railroad Company on September 17, 1970 as part of a larger parcel which included their former right-of-ways within Pomona Avenue. This portion, which is within state tidelands, should have been quitclaimed to the Port. To correct this, the City will quitclaim this parcel to the Port;
- Parcel 6 is a portion of the current golf course leasehold. It contains a restroom that was used for the golf course. The restroom has been abandoned but the CYC would like the area to straighten out the lease line and have a more usable area. This parcel would be released from the golf course leasehold and become a part of the new CYC leasehold. Not shown on the Attachment A map is the northerly edge of the golf course parallel to SR 75 at the San Diego Coronado Bridge toll plaza which has been improved with a public bicycle path. When the Port constructed the bike path they failed to remove that area from the golf course leasehold. This amendment will delete the bike path from the leased area; and
- Parcel 7 is owned by the Port and currently leased to CYC. This portion would remain as a part of the CYC lease and a new single lease agreement would be made between the Port and CYC, which would include parcels 1, 2, 3, 6 and 7.

**The City Council adopted A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO AUTHORIZING A QUITCLAIM DEED FROM THE CITY OF CORONADO, A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, TO THE SAN DIEGO UNIFIED PORT DISTRICT, A PUBLIC CORPORATION, AS TRUSTEE OF TIDE AND SUBMERGED LANDS REGARDING PROPERTY ALONG THE GLORIETTA BAY WATERFRONT, A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO GRANTING A LEASE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY ALONG THE GLORIETTA BAY WATERFRONT FROM THE CITY OF CORONADO, A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION TO THE SAN DIEGO UNIFIED PORT DISTRICT, A PUBLIC CORPORATION, A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO APPROVING AND ACCEPTING A LEASE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY ALONG THE GLORIETTA BAY WATERFRONT FROM THE SAN DIEGO UNIFIED PORT DISTRICT, A PUBLIC CORPORATION, TO THE CITY OF CORONADO, A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, and A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO AUTHORIZING THE AMENDMENT OF AN EXISTING LEASE OF CERTAIN TIDELANDS PROPERTY ALONG THE GLORIETTA AND SAN DIEGO BAY WATERFRONT (A PORTION OF THE CORONADO MUNICIPAL GOLF COURSE) FROM THE SAN DIEGO UNIFIED PORT DISTRICT, A PUBLIC CORPORATION, TO THE CITY OF CORONADO, A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION. The Resolutions were read by Title, the reading in their entirety unanimously waived and adopted by Council as RESOLUTION NO. 8206 RESOLUTION NO. 8207, RESOLUTION NO. 8208, and RESOLUTION NO. 8209.**

**6. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

- a. **Jon Ford, Manager, Coronado Visitor Center,** provided an update on the Visitor Center's operations.

- b. Susan Keith, 801 Tolita Avenue**, spoke about the issue of the lack of parking in her neighborhood. She has observed workmen from the Hotel Del who arrive early and sleep in their cars while waiting to start work at the Hotel. By 8:00 am all the parking on the street is taken. She asked for solutions to this problem and suggested that the Hotel should be involved in this.
- c. Jane Mitchell, 431 Ocean Boulevard**, thinks that the City Council should consider the impact building on Coronado's historic beach will have in this community. She feels it is not needed and that there must be a more resourceful and more responsible way to deal with the lifeguard transportation back and forth to do what they need to do on the beach. She thinks the City should take the Judge's recommendation and take the EIR seriously. She added that this is her first visit to City Hall and she is embarrassed to see a room where 11 people take up the space of 50% of the room and the rest of the community is in the other half.
- d. Elaine Fenwick, 1133 First Street**, said she spoke with an off duty lifeguard about the lifeguard garage who said that this issue has become so political and is out of their hands. She commented that Councilmember Monroe had just referred to protecting the beauty of Coronado and wondered how the City Council can, in good conscience, live with this. She signed a petition with about 2,500 other people who are upset about what is going on and does not want any more building on Coronado beach without the approval of a majority of Coronado residents.
- e. Councilmember Tanaka** asked if Mayor Smisek was planning to announce the passing of Dr. Vernetti. Mayor Smisek responded that his intention is to honor him at a later time.
- f. Councilmember Monroe** announced that KPBS had an hour special on Coronado. It was very well done. It centered on the Hotel Del, the history there, the ship that capsized off the beach, etc. Joe Ditler was on the program and gave a lot of information about Coronado's past and how the City has gotten to where it is today.

7. **CITY MANAGER:**

- 7a. **Update on Council Directed Actions and Citizen Inquiries.** No report.

8. **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

8a. **Continued Public Hearing for the Introduction of "An Ordinance of the City of Coronado, California, Amending Subsections B and C of Section 90.10.100 of the Coronado Municipal Code Regarding the Coronado Cays Specific Plan Side Yard Setback Requirements for Detached Single Family Dwellings in the Village Residence Zones" in the Coronado Cays (PC 20-06 City of Coronado).**

City Manager Mark Ochenduszkowski recused himself as his property is within 500' of an Egret model. Assistant City Manager Jim Benson took his place at the dais.

Tony Pena, Director of Community Development, summarized the staff report. He said that based on Council direction at its March 20<sup>th</sup> meeting, staff has brought back a revision dealing solely with the Egret model, which includes a side yard setback reduction of 10' to 6' opposite a zero setback. In addition there is a correction to a typographical error where the old SUP said 5'

for a setback and the Specific Plan said 3'. Everyone believes, including the HOA, that this was a typographical area and the setback will be pushed back to 5'. He explained that there has been some confusion based on some sections having been taken out of context. For example under Subsection C2 - if it is read as a general provision it would apply to all of the models and would seem to imply that people cannot do two story additions. However, it falls under Subsection C so applies to and modifies only Subsection C. If an owner does not use the special side yard and uses Section B, this allows additions to occur.

Mayor Smisek reiterated that the direction the City Council gave staff was to focus on the Egret model and do the modification as requested by the HOA. That is what has been brought back to the City Council with the exception of the typographical error.

Councilmember Ovrom said that Mr. Pena explained to him about C2 and asked Mr. Pena to repeat this so that everyone understands the interpretation. Mr. Pena explained that, the way the codified ordinance is read, the subsections pertain to their preceding sections. In this case, if you look at only Subsection 2, you would get the impression that only expansion on the first floor is allowed in all of the models. However this is not the case. Subsection C2 applies only to those properties that have a special side yard and you want to develop along the zero setback. The prior paragraph, B, talks about interior side yards as a standard and doesn't limit it to one story. That is the way both the City and the HOA have been applying this section. Mr. Ovrom added that this paragraph, C2, does not keep an expansion on the second floor from happening.

Councilmember Monroe commented that he had previously recused himself, but does not need to now because this action pertains only to the Egret models in Port Royale. He went on to say that the special side yard provision of C is for those who moved their house to the zero lot line.

Mayor Smisek opened the public hearing.

Ralph Longfellow, 28 Catspaw Cape, read a statement that he submitted to the City Council for the record. He thanked staff for replacing the words "only on the first floor" in paragraph C2. Paragraph C3 was also removed that discussed second story additions. Rumor has it that City staff assumes that the second story additions have been built and will be allowed as long as they adhere to a 5' setback along the zero lot line. He read from the March 20 City Council minutes where Mr. Fait elaborated that Section C is titled "Special Side yard". It is a separate regulation to build within that special side yard along that zero setback. That is what it was intended to regulate. If you were to build off of the zero setback and provide a nominal, say 5', setback, you wouldn't be restricted or governed by Subsection C. That has always been part of the guidelines that the city has interpreted and applied and issued permits accordingly. He believes that the CCHOA resolution 01-01, passed on April 26, 2001, clearly states the desire to prohibit second story expansions. The resolution does not ask that the restriction be applied to the side of the home on the zero setback. The resolution was sent to the City by letter dated April 30, 2001 and it was incorporated into the Specific Plan. In spite of the many second story additions that have been approved by the City, some are small and attractive; others are big and out of place. Home additions in the Cays have run amuck. Somebody is not watching the barn door and the horses have escaped. Please let us rein them in and bring calm and chaos and create an understandable, workable zoning code that will be reviewed, planned addition. The City has before it a proposal that will allow only the Egret models to have a side yard that is less than 10'. His neighbor's garage is 6'6" from his property line. Someone is not doing his homework. Please remember that these changes affect all four villages.

Mayor Smisek clarified that the amendment currently before the Council does not affect all four villages. It is only about the Egret model. He asked people to please concentrate on the Egret model only in their comments. Other comments are not helpful in making this determination.

Ella Croshier, 25 Blue Anchor Cay Road, disagreed that this is regarding the Egret model only and went on to read her comments. She feels this is very misleading. People will read this after the fact and they will be just as confused as everyone else was when this began. She reread a letter she submitted for the record to the City Council.

Tracy Stickel, 50 Blue Anchor and 2 Bridgetown Bend, an Egret model, said she loves living in Coronado and living in her Egret model and changing her home and making nice additions. As a former Board member she understands that governing documents are fluid. As a student of the Constitution, she knows that document has been changed by amendments and that is why people vote for Board members. There are a few people in the Cays who sometimes like to voice their negative opinions. However, the majority of people are happy to live in the Cays and enjoy the changes that the City is allowing them to make. Specifically, the Egret model is a lovely little home where the change proposed will border against a zero lot line wall. There is not one situation where an Egret home has a common wall on the extension side. No noise is ever affected, no view corridor will ever be affected, and there shouldn't be a privacy issue because it is already private. She hopes that the City Council knows that a lot of people support the hard work it is doing.

Tony Orfilla, 14 Buccaneer Way, CCHOA Board member, pointed out that this is the fourth public hearing on an issue that started out very simply. The CCHOA Board, in support of the Architectural Committee, wanted to allow limited expansions of the Egret model in the Port Royale Village. That was the sole purpose with which they started last August. He asked that the City Council stay focused on that and hopefully approve this. There have been three presentations thus far, including two PowerPoint presentations. In all three cases, the Planning staff supported the HOA request. He reiterated the request that the City Council focus on the single issue, the Egret model, and vote to allow the expansion.

Vernon Fry, 25 St. Christopher's Lane, thinks that if one accepts staff's interpretation of paragraph C, then the City Council is, ipso facto, making a change to all four villages. He would like to be clear about that.

Mayor Smisek clarified that this is only about the Egret model and the 5' setback versus 3' setback.

Mr. Fry asked if there will be a time that the issue of interpretation comes up before any second story is built. It seems important to him. He asked that the City Clerk distribute documents he provided that are in support of the meaning that second stories were prohibited.

Lou Miliotti referred to documents he handed out. He said he still has an issue with the words in the document. He read from the Specific Plan. "Any modification, addition, reconstruction, replacement of a home constructed using the special side yard may be expanded only on the first floor and only within the rectangular area formed by a projection of the outermost exterior walls of the home as constructed by the original developer." Those words are in the Specific Plan word for word. The other issue is intent. Peter Fait and Tony Pena have told the City Council

that the intent of that was never not to disallow second stories. In other words, second stories are allowed. The Kranz letter says the intent is to allow zero lot line homes to be expanded only on the first floor. That was the intent. The second part of that says the Board does not want to allow second story additions because of the inevitable effect that such expansions would have on neighbors. That was true in 2001 and it is true now. This afternoon the City Council will take a vote and then wash its hands of it. The people have to live with it. He didn't buy his home to be in a building expansion area. He bought it to have what he saw as what he got. If the City Council allows this building expansion to occur in moving the entire footprint over it will forever change the Cays. The City Council needs to think about that very seriously.

Loretta Sorias, 33 St. Christopher's Lane, next door to an Egret model, pleaded with the City Council to reject the proposal that allows expansion of homes in her village that would bring walls and roofs closer together. She explained that the lots in Port Royale are small. The homes on those lots were built to allow as much privacy as possible. It is a planned community and everyone who purchased a home in Port Royale Village knew that when they signed their copy of their CC&Rs. There are other neighborhoods in the Cays with larger homes. People who need more space have the option of buying a larger home without having to leave the Cays. It defies logic to make major changes to the Specific Plan that would accommodate the request of a single homeowner. It would seem to her to be more logical to determine exactly how many homeowners want expansions next door and how many don't want expansions next door and how many homeowners just don't care. Perhaps those groups could join together to create a solution or solutions that most people could live with. The people of Coronado, the people of Del Mar and the people of Solana Beach have recently passed resolutions to prevent the building of large homes on small lots because of the privacy issue. What those who object to the expansions are requesting is not unreasonable. Don't pass the resolution today. Give the people time to assemble a committee of homeowners from both sides of the issue to see if guidelines can be established to accommodate all concerns.

Kevin Foley, 17 St. Christopher's Lane, commented that this does focus solely on the Egret model in Port Royale Village. This is one of two items that was brought to all the people in Port Royale Village for a period of four months. All of the people who have come before the City Council expressed their opinions at that time in open forums and communications and in a number of ways. Subsequent to this long process, the majority of the people voted for the second story additions and specifically the Egret model and that it be allowed in the Port Royale Village. There was a forum. There was consultation. Everyone had a chance. He urged that the City Council pass this together with the majority of the people in Port Royale Village.

Ned Floy, 10 Jamaica Village Road, thanked the City Council for restricting this to the Egret model, but feels that the staff analysis on page 139 is misleading. It uses words such as "...the HOA originally requested this amendment..." Original implies other amendments. Further on in the second sentence in that paragraph, "...as with any detached single family Cays Village residence, these additions would be limited to two stories and 35'." This is bringing in more than just the Egret model.

Beverly Dyer, 93 Trinidad Bend, provided some history on the Cays. She said that with this proposition the addition could be taken out into the one side yard that exists. That is where the only light comes from. There are villages in the Cays where people can build any way that they want to and they have side yards available. She is not in support of this proposal at all. She doesn't understand why the City Council is deciding this. It should be a Planning Commission

item. It should be totally up to the people who live in those particular areas. She has not been called to get together for any kind of a decision on what they want to do in the Cays. To be really democratic, the people should know what they want.

Tom Stickel, 2 Bridgetown Bend, explained that numerous discussions and long neighborhood corner debates, arguments, meetings after meetings, HOA meetings after HOA meetings, angry comments, complimentary comments, campaigns have all gone on over this one issue. For those who support Mr. Foley and what he is asking to do, he stands before the City Council as one who had no interest in getting involved and got involved. Every process, every discussion, every fairness of opportunity to have at this moment has been completed ad nauseum. It is time for a vote. It is time for the people in the Village who spoke 54.7% in favor of this to be heard and recognized.

Mayor Smisek closed the public hearing.

Councilmember Ovrom asked about the interpretation of the new C1 & C2. Mr. Pena's explanation was that this would allow the expansion of both the first and second floor. Mr. Ovrom wanted to know if the HOA was in agreement with this. Mr. Peterson responded that there is agreement.

Councilmember Downey went back to when the City did the RSIP. A lot of time was spent to try to find a way to help keep the village atmosphere, help keep the buildings to the size people wanted yet still not take away people's property rights to build the home that their family wanted to build. After a year of the same kind of discussions in the Cays communities, with the vote in Port Royale, the same struggles are going on. She understands these struggles, but this is only the Egret model and only will be in a place where there is a blank wall. A compromise has been made. The vote of the village really helped her. She added that if the people don't like this, they have the ability to change it.

Councilmember Monroe clarified that this is not just a single homeowner's issue. Mr. Foley is trying to do what 20+ other homeowners have done and what others would like to do. Ms. Dyer commented that light, space, air, etc. would be affected. If there is any degradation of light, etc. it would be for the people making the expansion because it will be towards the zero lot line wall that has no windows and no openings. He shares Mr. Fry's issue on clarity. He said that Mr. Pena made it very clear that special side yards are Paragraph C. He suggested that under C2 the wording should also state "except for the Egret model homes."

Mayor Smisek explained that right now the City Council is addressing the request from the Egret model, not cleaning up the language of the Specific Plan. The interpretation has been verified. There will be time to clean up wording such as this and the rest of the Specific Plan at another time.

Peter Fait, Associate Planner, explained that pages 151 and 152 of the staff report show the floor plans. Section C2 applies to the first floor and allows expansion along the zero, but on the second floor, any expansion to any model including the Egret on the zero property line has to come in 5'. That is what is shown on the floor plan on page 151 with the shaded area.

Mr. Monroe is in support of that explanation but would like to bring the English language into the words in this paragraph.

Mayor Smisek said he would not support a change at this time. The City has worked too hard to get to this point. He is satisfied that it can be left as is and if there is clean up that has to occur at a later time.

Councilmember Tanaka referred to page 147 where it talks about current allowed net addition. On the Egret model can already expand 579 sq ft. So, a fair amount of expansion is already allowed. The current rules are not that clear. Regardless of what Mr. Fait and Mr. Pena believe is clear; he doesn't think it is that clear to a lot of people. The whole point of rules, laws, rule of order, and government is to lend clarity to things. He doesn't think the City has done that. To him, what is being talked about today seems rather pointless. He doesn't see the policy need for this change. He doesn't see the wisdom in changing 10' to 6'. He doesn't see the practicality in it. He added that he believes this change makes things less clear to people. The City's job, eventually, would be to clarify the Specific Plan language so that everyone is clear that the City either is or is not allowing certain types of development and that those envelopes should be clearly illustrated to everyone. This change, if allowed, leads to more disorder rather than order. He would sooner end this discussion, not allow the change for the Egret model and when either the HOA or a plebiscite in the Cays adds a little more clarity as to what the majority really does want, and then the City Council can act more readily. He does not think this is a good policy move.

Councilmember Ovrom said he has heard three basic positions. The first is that people bought into the Cays to have it stay the way it is. The second is the fear that if this is done for this particular village and particular model, then it will spread. The third is that this is okay because the village in question voted for it. He pointed out that the Specific Plan, regardless, is the extreme. If the people from the villages want to change their CC&Rs to make them tighter they can do that. That is the way the system works. It appears that both the HOA and the Architectural Committee have concurrence with City staff on what this means and have had so for a period of time. If people find that objectionable, they should get together to act on that. His general feeling is that he goes with the voice of the people. That means the majority.

**MSC (Downey/Smisek) moved that the City Council introduced AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF CORONADO, CALIFORNIA, AMENDING SUBSECTIONS B AND C OF SECTION 90.10.100 OF THE CORONADO MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING THE CORONADO CAYS SPECIFIC PLAN SIDE YARD SETBACK REQUIREMENTS FOR DETACHED SINGLE FAMILY DWELLINGS IN THE VILLAGE RESIDENCE ZONES IN THE CORONADO CAYS. The Ordinance was read by Title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and placed by the City Council on FIRST READING.**

**AYES: Downey, Monroe, Ovrom, and Smisek**  
**NAYS: Tanaka**  
**ABSENT: None**

City Manager Mark Ochendusko returned to the dais.

**8b. Public Hearing to Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Lifeguard Public Safety Service Building (IS 2-06, City of Coronado).** Tony Pena, Director of Community Development, explained that the Planning Commission and City staff are recommending that the City Council certify this EIR for the Lifeguard Safety building. This has an extensive history of being associated with the Lifeguard Tower as well as the restroom at North Beach. There is also an extensive timeline that goes along with this. He indicated that at the Planning Commission there was quite a bit of comment on the adequacy of the EIR. The staff finding is that the EIR is adequate under the CEQA guidelines. It may not be a perfect document but he has never seen a perfect EIR. It is adequate. At the Planning Commission level, Lloyd Zolla of HDR provided a PowerPoint presentation and he would like to give it to the City Council. It is a good summary of the issues and the mitigation that is required under the EIR.

Lloyd Zolla explained that the project is located on Ocean Boulevard at the foot of Isabella Avenue. The basic project of the lifeguard project is to provide adequate safety personnel and equipment at the beach area in times of need so that there is the shortest possible time to stage equipment during all hours. The objective is to store equipment and locate them in proximity at the center of the City so that, in emergency conditions, those facilities can be used, and also, to meet California building code requirements, by providing lifeguard staff a separate shower and locker facility. The proposed operation is that the lifeguard facility would serve as a base or headquarters for lifeguards to meet and store equipment. It is not quite the same as a fire station where the patrol materials and the vehicles are stored all day long and then there is an emergency when they leave. That would occur only in the evenings. The vehicles would be taken out during the day and then brought back in the evening. It would also provide a central location for lifeguards to go for breaks, use the restroom, or to use showers, when they need to do clean up, house the beach wheelchairs and a place where lifeguards could educate the public on safety issues and hopefully avoid some accidents. As Mr. Pena said, there has been a long history of environmental review going back to March 2005. An Initial Study Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted by the City Council in April 2005. That Mitigated Negative Declaration was challenged by Citizens for Preservation of Coronado Beach. In July of that year the California Coastal Commission found the project to be consistent with the Coastal Act and the City's Local Coastal Program. In November the case was heard in Superior Court and the Court determined that the project required an EIR to analyze certain issues, those being aesthetics, public safety and land use.

In May of 2006 a Notice of Preparation was prepared for an EIR. In June the responses to the Notice of Preparation were received both from the US Fish & Wildlife Service stating that the EIR should address potential impacts to the western snowy clover and habitat for that species. Subsequent to that, in October 2006, the Court of Appeals found that the project is consistent with the Local Coastal Program and that the EIR being done would not need to address the land use impacts. In December of last year the EIR went out for public review into January 2007. In January of 2007 letter were received commenting on the Draft EIR. A letter from the Native American Heritage Commission and another letter from Citizens for Preservation of Coronado Beach were received. Subsequent to that, in March 2007 the response to comments were prepared, responding to each of the comments received in those letters, a mitigation monitoring and reporting program was prepared and a Final EIR was distributed on March 14, 2007. On March 27, 2007 the Planning Commission met. The EIR that is being considered by the City

Council addresses four issues: aesthetics, public safety, biological resources and cumulative impacts.

In relation to visual impacts, there were simulations prepared to show what the lifeguard facility would look like. There were ten simulations prepared under contract to the City. Additional simulations were provided by Citizens for Preservation of Coronado Beach. All of these are shown in the EIR. Mr. Zolla reviewed a few of the simulations. The basic conclusions regarding aesthetics are that the impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant. This is due to several reasons that are cited in the document. Basically, the Local Coastal Program policy group identifies what the important scenic vistas are and determined that the project will not block those vistas as identified in the Coastal Program except from that sidewalk area and the bench adjacent to the project site. Potential impacts to views to the ocean, blue water views, are limited and are transitory from passers by. There are only slight differences in the height of the rocks and the building. Both have a jagged height. The design features, in using that kind of rock, are designed to blend with the rock. There are a limited number of homes whose private views could be affected – less than 10 homes. In terms of scenic resources, there are not prominent ridge lines, rock outcroppings, vegetation, and other features which have important scenic value that would be affected. In relation to the visual character of the area, there are design measures applied to the building that would, to the extent feasible, blend the design of the building into existing structures and character of the area using the rock format of the building. The visual character of that area is largely panoramic in nature. The project itself is visible only in a small section until one gets closer up to it. The project will be located in proximity to developed features on the beach such as the lifeguard tower and the restroom. In relation to light and glare, the conclusion was impassibly less than significant. Lighting on the building was requested as a public safety measure. That will consist of small, wall mounted fixtures that will be shielded with baffles so they shine downward and reduce light spillage going out. The lighting source will not be visible from homes on Ocean Boulevard.

In relation to public safety there were a lot of questions and discussion. The determination of the EIR is that the impacts to public safety would be less than significant for the following reasons: the future operation will result in increasing lifeguard vehicle activity during routine setup and breakdown but there is a relatively low incidence of beach goers there before 9 and after dusk. The level of beach use in front of the project site is relatively low. The access corridor as equipment is moving in and out will be more to alert beach goers of presence and this will not impact the established walkways used by pedestrian traffic through the day. The lifeguard building will result in a net increase in public safety. Because it will consolidate lifeguard facilities and equipment at a central location it will eliminate the need to move and transport facilities and equipment through the City and across the beach for after hours emergencies. There will be a reduction of overall beach traffic as a result of the equipment being stored at that central location. After hour response times would be improved. There will be faster initial deployment of equipment and redeployment of lifeguard staff because of the centralized lifeguard shower facility and locker rooms. And the amount of time lifeguard will need to spend going back and forth will be reduced.

In relation to biological resources, the conclusion was that impacts would be less than significant. There were biological surveys of the specific site done and, based on those site surveys, it was determined that there would not be impacts to sensitive vegetation, associations or habitats. It would not impact State or Federal jurisdictional waters. There is not an impact to trees, shrubs, desirable ground cover that would be suitable habitat for migratory birds; there

would not be interference with wildlife corridors or native nursery sites, nor would there be any conflict with habitat conservation plans or local program. In relation to the Western Snowy Clover, there was a site specific survey and the determination was that impacts would be less than significant. Habitation of the site by the clover was not observed. Future use was considered unlikely. Potentially, the determination was potential significant impacts because of ground cast predator species increase in ambient light and perching opportunities for predators. For those reasons, there was a mitigation measure applied and compliance with the municipal code regarding trash receptacles, light spillage and the ultimate conclusion of the EIR was that there would be less than significant impacts.

In terms of cumulative impact analysis, they looked at aesthetics and determined that impacts would be less than significant, that there would not be a cumulative view shed impact when added to other potential projects. This project, added to others, would not change the conclusion related to just the project. The same in relation to biological resources.

A number of alternatives were looked at. Some were not evaluated further. An alternative site, located off the beach at North Beach alternative east location, designing with two buildings, subsurface building locations and then other alternatives looking at different designs were considered. The alternatives addressed in the EIR were a 'no project/no build', a G Street alternative, a reduced project alternative and then a site looking at the Hotel Del Coronado site. The basic summary of the alternative conclusions is in the EIR and these are comparisons. CEQA requires determination of an environmentally superior alternative. In the environmentally superior alternative there are no impacts to doing nothing. CEQA also says that when the environmentally superior alternative is the no project alternative, what is environmentally superior least impacting impact would be reducing the size of the project and then would be the building as it is proposed.

The mitigation measures that were laid out in the 2005 Mitigated Negative Declaration for air quality, geology and soil, hydrology, water quality, noise and traffic are carried forward as conditions of approval into this project. There was the biological resource measure that is included in the mitigation monitoring program to ensure compliance and implementation of that mitigation.

Following the public review of the EIR, two letters were received, one from the Native American Heritage Commission related to cultural resources and one from Johnson and Hanson representing the Citizens for Preservation of Coronado Beach. The responses to those are also included. The Johnson and Hanson letter addressed the environmental setting, project objectives, aesthetics, public safety and all of the impacts. In the letter one of the questions and a large part of the debate was as to why the North Beach alternative eliminated without further consideration. The response to that is provided in the final EIR. The North Beach alternative would not place the project in a central location so there would not be a substantial reduction in terms of response times relative to the proposed project and biological and visual resource impacts would be greater.

Councilmember Downey requested clarification on the North Beach alternative. She asked Mr. Zolla to explain to the public about the increase in biological and visual impacts as he did in his letter to Johnson & Hanson.

Mr. Zolla explained that one of the questions had to do with the assumption that the building was going to be there. One of the issues at North Beach is occurrence of flooding. To find a location free from flooding, that is where the building was assumed to be in the EIR. That has greater habitat value. That location that is free from flooding also happens to be the area with more sensitive habitat. The area where there is no flooding is not where the rock revetment is and the building becomes more visible. Add to that the issue of not meeting the project objective related to response times. Together this led to the determination at the time of the Draft EIR that it did not warrant further review.

Mayor Smisek opened the public hearing.

Mildred Dahill, 1068 Isabella Avenue, said she attended the Planning Commission meeting last week. The key word seemed to be safety and the safety of people in the water but there was very little reference to people on the beach. She said this is still a building and asked if a snack bar would be next. The building would be in the busiest part of the beach. The building at G Avenue was originally built for the lifeguards and taken over by the City. That building could be extended or torn down and rebuilt. As far as distance, it is exactly .2 miles from the site that has been chosen to the G Street location. That wouldn't be a problem for the lifeguards. She is still shocked that this is going through. If this does go up she would like to see alarms on the doors so that when they open people are aware. The dunes were taken down before this was made public, so there cannot be any more impact on vegetation.

Heinz Steiner, 1007 Flora Avenue, said he is disturbed that this has reached this point and that it does not make sense to him to consider this EIR as adequate. It was stated, by City staff, that the EIR is not a perfect document. He feels there are a lot of shortcomings to it. He doesn't see a problem with response time. The people have been told that the reason it has to be on Central Beach is because of response time. The safety issue is one of the big items that has contradictory premises in it. It is a poor safety location because of being in the busiest part of the beach where the restrooms and the most traffic of people coming and going to the beach are. All the vehicles that come from the street to the beach have to go through North Beach. He believes the City Council should think about it and have the conscience to hold off in order to work for a better solution before there is this large permanent structure obstructing the beach.

Jarod Hanson, Johnson and Hanson, 600 West Broadway #225, San Diego, represents the Citizens for Preservation of Coronado Beach which is an organization of Coronado residents devoted to protecting Coronado Beach from unnecessary development. Members of the organization did not oppose the lifeguard tower because it was a necessary project that was necessary to protect public safety at the beach. They do oppose this project as currently designed and do not believe that it is necessary to be placed directly on the sandy beach and particularly believe that the location that has been selected, Central Beach, is especially inappropriate. They submitted an extensive public comment letter in January 2007. He mentioned two primary points that were in the letter. One was public safety based upon the location of this project because it is the primary entrance to the beach and the primary stairway. It is a gathering place. The bathrooms are there. The showers are there. The volleyball courts are nearby. This is a particularly inappropriate place for safety reasons. Aesthetics have been talked about a lot. The location at the foot of Isabella on Ocean Boulevard is the focal point for views to the project. The profile of the building will project above the rock revetment and will be visible even from across the street. They believe that aesthetic impact, contrary to the EIR's finding, is very significant and very substantial. In addition, there are biological impacts with respect to the

Western Snowy Plover. The Fish & Wildlife Service submitted several suggestions of how to deal with those impacts that are not all mentioned in the EIR. For example, specific measures with regard to trash containment, and training staff with respect to the Western Snowy Plover were not included in the mitigation measures, nor was the recommendation that the light be of the lowest illumination necessary for human safety. With respect to the North Beach alternative, the reasons rejected in the Draft EIR were that it was not within a clear zone of the Naval Air Station. That has been found to be incorrect and they believe that alternative should be submitted to full alternative analysis in the EIR. Lastly, he mentioned that a majority of Coronado, they believe, does not want this garage on the beach. The residents have submitted an initiative petition to the City which has more than 2,500 signatures indicating that they are opposed to any building on the beach that has not been subjected to a public vote. When this initiative qualifies for the ballot it will require a project such as this one, on the beach, to be subjected to a public vote. They request that the City honor the will of the people of this City and hold off considering this project until it has been subjected to a vote of the people.

Tom Christensen, 476 C Avenue, beach user, thinks this is coming down to a debate between beach users and beach viewers. He represents the beach user side. He is strongly in favor of this project. He thinks this has gone on much longer than is reasonable. It is smart to listen to the lifeguards when they get involved in design. This building needs to be built and it needs to be built quickly. There has already been one fatality on the beach and perhaps if there had been a lifeguard tower it could have been avoided. He does not think the majority of the people in Coronado oppose this project. He thinks the majority approves of it, want it and are highly upset that this has drawn on for so long and been held up by such a small minority of people. He urged the City Council to qualify this and move forward with the project.

Wayne Strickland, 854 I Avenue, is not in support of this garage on the beach. He is in favor of getting the tower done as soon as possible. The lifeguard tower should have been done years ago. There is storage at the City shops. It is a lot less corrosive on the vehicles to leave them down at the City shops. They can go and pick them up, bring them over there and use them in that respect. It is not safe having all of the vehicles there and just coning off that little area. He doesn't believe it is necessary and that it is not a good place. When the Fire Department vehicles go onto the beach they go on from North Beach.

Susan Keith, 801 Tolita Avenue, does not have a view from her home of Center Beach, but she can not believe that the City Council is considering putting an office building and a garage at Center Beach. Coronado beach has been voted in the top 10 beaches in the United States. The EIR talks about there not being an impact because it is not within the view of a scenic highway. That is likely a legal definition, but if Coronado had a scenic highway it would be Isabella Avenue and Ocean Boulevard. It is where the tour buses and trolley go, and where everybody walks and drives by. Central Beach is not just a gem in the crown – it is the crown. She has great love and respect for the sand there and it is what has made Coronado. She doesn't believe the City Council is listening to the people on this issue. She said there is too much building in this town and it needs to be controlled and done in a better manner.

Carolyn Mitchell, 517 Adella Lane, spoke in support of the lifeguard facility building. The City's lifeguards are definitely professionals who need a place to work. They are there to protect the people and if this will help them protect the people when they use the beach on a daily basis, they need to have it. The EIR, Planning Commission, and Coastal Commission have given their positive input so it is time to get this on the beach. As far as the impact is concerned, if people

are in a tour bus they will be high enough to still enjoy the beautiful view of the beach. As far as the citizens of Coronado getting a bill on the ballot, the way the issue was represented was not accurate. The people who were sitting there trying to get signatures represented this as a discussion of what has happened at the Hotel Del; not about the lifeguard facilities. She appreciates all of the work that has been done and feels it is time to build the building.

Susan Heavilin, 1144 Isabella Avenue, asked that the City Council listen to the people. People are upset about what is going on the beach. There is no need for a storeroom on the beach. She disputed the comment about the ballot being misrepresented. It asks that no further building happen on the beach without a vote of the people. She mentioned that when this whole thing started she went to the chief lifeguard, Sean Carey and asked him if the City was to build this facility, where would be the very best place for it. He said that it would not be at Center Beach. It is needed at North Beach because that is where the fire pits and parties are. John Ryan, on the Planning Commission, mentioned that he was very upset and thought the EIR was vague; it didn't appropriately look at North Beach. She agreed that is a perfect spot for this between the driveway where the bathrooms were put and where the Navy Base is. There is a nice big expanse there and there is a nice road that goes right out to the beach. That facility could be built the other direction. There is only one house that is already looking at a wire thing so it isn't even affected. It was said that it couldn't be used and then the bathrooms were built there. It was said that the sand dunes couldn't be changed and then they drug the sand dunes off Central Beach. She asked why the sand dunes are being scraped every two weeks. She said to leave the beach alone and the dunes will come back. She would like the City Council to wait for the petition to qualify she believes from the response they've had from the people, it will pass. If this is bundled back together with the tower then the whole tower building will be stopped. She said the tower has been promised for years so the tower should be built and stop worrying about this garage. Finish the bathrooms and then do this later if it is needed.

Mayor Smisek closed the public hearing.

Councilmember Downey addressed the Final EIR. She apologized to the City that she should have made some comments of her own to improve it, but that doesn't mean to say that it is not sufficient. It is. Staff is correct. It does exactly what the Court ordered the City to do and it does it. To be of service to the community, the City could have done a better job. The presentation did the best job of discussing Local Coastal Program policy group 107, visual resources in special communities. That is an issue that matters greatly to everyone who came up and spoke about where to put this building is how it affects the view shed. She thinks, in the future, the City may want to visit updating this so that it is easier for people to understand when it is referred to in documents. It talks about how a view is important enough to qualify from less than significant to a significant impact. She thinks the City did a good job in its responses to comments. She referred to page I-30. She thinks that was an error. The City was responding to a comment about what was going to be stored in the building and what the location was. The last sentence reads, "While it cannot be identified which equipment would be stored on and off site under this alternative, it can be stated that access to all types of rescue equipment in the quickest amount of time will afford the lifeguards to react to all emergency situations in a prompt manner." She thinks that the City was trying to say that the preferred alternative and the project requirements are the least amount of time the lifeguards need to have to get to the equipment. She doesn't think the sentence referred to explained that very well, but that was the point. In the response to the comments from Citizens for Preservation of Coronado Beach there was discussion about none of the cumulative projects being located within the same view shed, as

shown on page I-31. She thinks the answer is that they are within the same view people are looking when looking from the street, so she clarified that, for her to agree with this, it should say that it is not going to affect it greater because there are two of them in that same eye view. She appreciated the pictures that were shown. She truly believes that people will not see this building when driving down Ocean. It will be visible when people are right on top of it. She doesn't think the comment "not the same view shed" is a fair representation. It is in the same view. It may not be in the legal view shed. Ms. Downey thinks the document was sufficient. It answered the question. The City had four things it had to discuss. That was done. The Court's questions were answered. She thinks the discussions now and all the presentations that have taken place give the information she would need to vote that the City has done a thorough job in analyzing the impacts to the visual scene. The one thing that was not anywhere was what these orange cones are going to look like. That is part of this project as a safety mitigation factor that the City is agreeing to do. She has not seen a picture of this. That is her concern of moving this to North Beach. The farther away it is the more cones would be needed.

Mayor Smisek asked Sean Carey, Lifeguard Captain, about locations and buildings. He explained that when this all began there was going to be one large Central Beach Tower that was going to contain all the facilities. The City felt it was so massive and large that it should be broken up into two buildings, which is what has led to this situation. The City did talk with lifeguards at the time to try to find out the pros and cons of all the various facilities. Mayor Smisek wanted to give Mr. Carey, along with the Fire Chief, the opportunity to comment about those discussions and their feelings about where this should be.

Sean Carey commented that Central Beach is the best location for the facility. It is centrally located so that the lifeguards can respond to emergencies at either end of the beach within a reasonable amount of time. Originally the plan was for a much larger tower. It was requested by many residents at a public workshop to move as many functions out of the tower as possible and locate them back at the rocks. The best ultimate solution is for one gigantic building at Central Beach with everything in one building. No one wants that. The next best thing is to have two buildings close together in the same area, centrally located.

Mayor Smisek requested that comments be centered on the EIR process. There was a lot of discussion over the years on the decision to place the support facility in this location. When this began the City started looking at all the various sites to try to figure out what was the best. Most people have stated the need for what the building provides but they just don't want it where they can see it. The idea to separate the building did come to the CIP. It was the prudent thing to do. The Navy Base had just built a rather large lifeguard facility at their beach that was very tastefully done. The City lifeguard facility was going to be larger than that, but he and the Council at the time didn't feel that was appropriate. The decision was made at that time to break it up into two buildings. The City has attempted, in working with citizens in the area and the community, in working to develop an organic design, to make this as acceptable a building as possible. In his mind, the EIR has gone through a very focused approach, which was what it was supposed to do. He thinks it has done a good job. It has addressed all of the different concerns and responded to questions. He is pleased with the results. He knows that when Ms. Downey critiques this, that is a good thing for the City because she is an expert in the field. He is ready to proceed with the acceptance of the EIR.

Councilmember Monroe agrees that Ms. Downey is a valuable asset to the City Council in matters such as this. He asked for clarification regarding the assertions by a number of people

that make it sound like the lifeguards will be driving and parking their cars in this facility. He doesn't believe that is what it is intended for.

City Manager Mark Ochenduszko explained that the lifeguard service building houses facilities that typically are found in a tower to provide essential lifeguard services on the beach. Half of the building holds lifeguard lockers and showers, a toilet for each sex, an office for the captain who supervises the people who work on the beach, and a janitorial closet. The other half of the building holds one lifeguard vehicle that is there to respond to an emergency on the beach, two beach wheelchairs which are required for providing services and access on the beach, one inflatable boat with a trailer, two personal watercraft, the Junior Lifeguard and Surf Awareness program materials and one equipment trailer to get those materials on the beach when those programs are provided. That is the extent of the equipment that exists on the beach. No personal vehicles will be driving up and down, into or out of, that facility.

Mr. Monroe commented that not only did the City separate the buildings, but this building was downsized as well. From the first time this building was seen, it was downsized and lowered. A lot of work was done to reduce its impact on that area. He also commented that there are 2 million visitors to this beach every year. The safety of those people is very important to the City.

**MSUC (Monroe/Tanaka) moved that the City Council certify the Final Environmental Impact Report as adequate to comply with the standards of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and adopted A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO, CALIFORNIA, TO CERTIFY WITH FINDINGS THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT OF THE LIFEGUARD PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICE BUILDING AND TO ADOPT ITS MITIGATION MONITORITY AND REPORT PROGRAM. The Resolution was read by Title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by Council as RESOLUTION NO. 8205.**

Councilmember Ovrom recalled that in August of 2000 he and Mayor Smisek voted for a replacement to a tower. As Mayor Smisek pointed out earlier, the tower design has gone from a large to a smaller one, splitting the functions up from what might have been in the central location around the tower. He asked for clarification as to what happens to the building that is currently at the foot of G Avenue.

Mr. Ochenduszko responded that the building at the foot of G will remain. There is some lifeguard equipment in it but it is primarily a beach maintenance building. The trailer next to that building that is currently providing a lifeguard office and some supplies and equipment will be removed.

Mr. Ovrom stated he would probably not have wanted to see this building in this particular location had he been a part of the process. He would have preferred to have seen it at G Avenue or at North Beach. However, he wasn't part of the discussion with regard to the size of the tower and what was associated with the tower and how it was divided up. Today the City has an EIR in front of it that says the City Council can either vote for it or send it back to look for a different alternative. He noted that the reduced size of the facility would be an environmentally better alternative, although it may not be as useful to the lifeguards. He is troubled and is not sure he is

supporting this yet, but he is troubled by the fact that it is at Center Beach. He understands some of the alternatives and the decisions that were gone through to get it there, but the fact that the two beachgoer functions were put together and put at that location does bother him.

Councilmember Tanaka thinks that the two most relevant questions about this project and this EIR are first, whether or not the facility is necessary and second, where to put the facility. He thinks that the facility is absolutely necessary. The location issue is one that people will disagree on. Central Beach, to some, may not be ideal. The EIR explained why North Beach isn't superior to Central Beach. It is just one rationale, but he has to say that he tends to agree with that assertion. The City calls this the lifeguard support building. There is a reason for that. He is not interested in another garage. He is not looking for a place to park four Subaru vehicles. That is not what is being parked in there. It is obvious that the people who don't like this project smear it by calling it a garage just as a way to mock it. People who support the project aren't looking for more garage space. The City Manager listed some of the things that will be in there and there is only one vehicle that is scheduled to be parked in the facility because one vehicle is needed to be able to bring out the equipment. With respect to the person who recently died at the beach, Mr. Tanaka said he is not saying that this facility would have saved the gentleman's life, but it explains why it is designed the way it is. There is a truck that is designed to bring out the watercraft someone would consider using in a case like that. The two most illustrative parts of the EIR document are the maps in Figure 30.0-1 and 30.0-3 that show the proposed building in the context of the entire beach. Figure 30.0-1 says that the overall beach area is just about 80 acres. This facility will not take over the entire beach; it is one spot, up by the rocks. The goal is to keep those things away from the beachgoers but ready for an emergency if needed. 30.0-1 gives a better appreciation for the context of the facility and what it is meant to do. The second diagram, 30.0-3 shows the layout of the facility itself. Mr. Tanaka said that he does care about history, but the City of Coronado has never had a facility worthy of its lifeguards or of the City. The City Hall and Community Center are beautiful. The City has always had substandard facilities for the lifeguards and he is not proud of that. He is proud that the City is trying to correct that. This is a very modest building. There is no snack bar. The Captain's Office is not an office building. He does not think there is anything opulent or outlandish about this. He sympathizes with anyone who thinks this is not the right location. He stated that there will never be consensus on the exact right location. There is a reason why this one was selected. The building can be hidden better here than anywhere else. And this was part of a larger package. Someone mentioned lifeguard parking. That will be an issue regardless of this project. The lifeguards work at the beach and they will park somewhere near the beach. Tourists will be a much bigger impact on the available parking spaces than the City's lifeguards will. Many of the lifeguards take their bikes to work.

Councilmember Downey agreed with Mr. Tanaka. She was not on the City Council when the decision was made to split the two and make the smaller tower with a second building. She would have left everything on the tower. It is easier, environmentally, to leave it in the tower. That is one reason why Ms. Heavilin wants the City to build the tower so that the City cannot go back and put it all in there if this building isn't completed. A bathroom for the lifeguards needs to be built somewhere. If it is taken out of the tower, until the City knows for sure that it can build them somewhere else, the tower cannot be completed. OSHA requires that they have a bathroom and for safety reasons they have to have a shower. She resents the critics calling this facility a garage. When she started looking at what equipment is going to be in that building and started thinking about what needs to be done to rescue people; that location seemed to be the perfect place if it isn't to be in the tower. There was discussion about the watercraft, but there

wasn't discussion about the wheelchairs that are there and some of the other facilities. The lifeguards are more than capable of running whatever the distance is. A lot of people cannot. This location provides that opportunity for those who might need one of the wheelchairs. She suggested that people should try to pull or push one of those wheelchairs across sand. It is not easy. If it is needed in an emergency, that is the location to have it. The EIR did a good job of explaining the response times. The EIR did an excellent job of explaining why this location is the preferred location. It stated that this was the best view location, and that for safety reasons, this was the best location. This project offered the best opportunity for public input she has ever seen. The City has complied with CEQA, there has been public input, and the document is sufficient. The City needs to do this. This is the best location with the least impacts to the most people. That is the job of the members of the City Council. What does the City need? How can the City provide it for the betterment of the community? In her opinion, this location is the best place to go and this document supports that. She will be supporting the EIR.

Mr. Ovrom knows what the vote is going to be, but he still thinks that it is unfortunate that the City Council made some of the decisions that it made, but it is where it is. He doesn't see that any sort of a reduction or more would not be sustained and would put too much of a kink in it.

**AYES: Downey, Monroe, Ovrom, Tanaka and Smisek**  
**NAYS: None**  
**ABSENT: None**

**8c. Public Hearing for Consideration of Initial Study Documents and Determination Whether to Proceed by Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report for the Construction of the Animal Care Facility Project at 1395 First Street (IS 2-07, City of Coronado).**

Mayor Smisek announced that there would be one presentation for Items 8c and 11c and then recused himself from discussion on the two due to the location of property he owns. Mayor Pro Tem Downey took his place at the dais.

Tony Pena, Director of Community Development, explained that there was sufficient site planning, elevations, and indications from the Planning Commission and Design Review to base an Initial Study on. Staff prepared the Initial Study because CEQA requires it when there is a discretionary project. The Initial Study is intended to flush out any significant adverse impacts that would be related to the project either in construction or in operation after construction. He pointed out that starting on page 184 of the staff report shows a checklist process. The result is that staff does not see any significant impacts coming out of the project. In this project, because of the design and triple pane glass and being almost air tight with a lot of buffer landscaping. There will not be a lot of walk up traffic. It is a unique use. Technically the City could even apply a categorical exemption to this project under the infill provisions because the traffic study that was done indicates that there will not be a traffic impact and it is consistent with the General Plan that was summarized by the Planning Commission meeting. Staff is not recommending that, but is recommending a Negative Declaration based upon the Initial Study.

Mayor Pro Tem Downey opened the public hearing.

No members of the public wished to speak on this item.

Mayor Pro Tem Downey closed the public hearing.

Ms. Downey asked Ms. Louise Shirey how the dogs would be walked who aren't going to be walked in the dog run, and where the dogs would be walked at the new site.

Ms. Shirey explained that the dogs will be walked along Tidelands Park. They are not permitted on the grass but all of the paved areas of Tidelands Park are available for walking.

Mayor Pro Tem Downey said she reviewed the information and verified that the 'no impact' choices were appropriate. She explained that she asked Ms. Shirey the question about walking the dogs to demonstrate that it was appropriate to mark 'no impact' because there will not be increased use of parks on the grasslands. She is glad that staff chose to do a Negative Declaration so that the public can see that the City has addressed every possible area of concern with this building.

**MSUC (Ovrom/Tanaka) moved that the City Council direct that a Negative Declaration be prepared.**

**AYES: Downey, Monroe, Ovrom and Tanaka**  
**NAYS: None**  
**ABSENT: None**  
**DISQUALIFIED: Smisek**

**9. ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS: None.**

**10. COMMISSION AND COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

**10a. Report from the Port Commissioner Concerning Port Activities.** Port Commissioner Robert Spane announced that the next Port meeting is Tuesday, April 10, 2007 at 9 a.m. There will be an issue on the agenda that has to do with Coronado. The homeowners of 501 and 505 First Avenue have removed the rip rap that lines the shore and may have encroached on Port tidelands property. That item will be heard at the Port in an open session to provide the facts of the matter and to attempt to get direction from the Port commissioners as a body as to what the Port's position is and where it should go with that issue. This is an environmental issue. There are a number of regulatory agencies involved in this. There are a number of permitting agencies involved in this, the City of Coronado being one. At least the permits he knows of, the permits from the Port, do not appear to be in line so that will also be discussed.

Mayor Smisek indicated that the City Manager had advised him that the City of Coronado did not issue any permit to allow that rip rap to be removed. Admiral Spane feels that the issue really is the environmental impact of having no rip rap and the encroachment onto public land.

Councilmember Monroe asked why someone would have removed the rip rap. Admiral Spane explained that they built a beach. Environmentally, this destroys the eel grass and erosion in the Bay and if one homeowner does this, more will do so, too.

Councilmember Ovrom asked about the timetable for South Grand Caribe to be finished. Admiral Spane responded that the removal of the sand from South Grand Caribe will be done by May or June, which is almost a year from when it was supposed to be done. The best news of this is that there is indeed work going on as to what the final configuration of what South Grand Caribe should look like. That will take HOA or Cays homeowners input because it will be a nice, natural, environmentally sensitive area.

## **11. CITY COUNCIL BUSINESS:**

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

**Mayor Smisek** announced that Dr. Jim Verneti passed away on Sunday, one month away from his 93<sup>rd</sup> birthday. He was a fantastic man who has done tremendous things for this community. He has been involved in everything from Rotary, to Little League, to being a dentist when he came back from the War. In Rotary he had the perfect attendance record for all the years he was there. He is the one who, when they brought the torch through Coronado for the Salt Lake Olympics, he was the person the City selected to carry the torch. The Verneti Little League field was named for him. The family, Ron, Betsy and the family, were saddened by his passing but he went very peacefully. The City will miss him. He was a tremendous man and was someone everyone should emulate. Councilmember Tanaka echoed Mayor Smisek's comments and thinks he is irreplaceable.

**Councilmember Monroe** attended a SANDAG Board meeting, a SANDAG Borders Committee meeting, the Salute to the Military Ball put on by the Chamber of Commerce, participated in the School Foundation fundraiser, and attended an MTS meeting.

**Councilmember Tanaka** attended a CIP subcommittee meeting where the proposed artwork for the Marina building was discussed, the CSF telethon, the Police Chief's badge pinning ceremony and met with John Palmieri about the efficiency of compact florescent lighting.

**Councilmember Ovrom** attended a CCHOA meeting, the Rotary Golf tournament, the Chamber Military Ball, the Margarita Avenue project presentation, the CSF Telethon and Chamber of Commerce breakfast with Mr. Tanaka, the Chief's swearing in ceremony, and a South County EDC meeting.

**Councilmember Downey** attended a meeting of the Democratic Club where they passed out the light bulbs Mr. Tanaka mentioned, the Rotary Golf tournament, the Military Ball, the CSF telethon, a meeting and workshop of the Solana Beach City Council where they reviewed their EIR for sand on the beach. She attended that meeting because she serves on the SANDAG Shoreline Preservation Committee. Coronado has already joined with several other communities, through SANDAG, to do the Scoop Program so that if there is opportunistic sand available, the City would take it. The Shoreline Preservation meeting and her EMP meeting at SANDAG were cancelled because they are still negotiating with Fish & Wildlife. They are working on an agreement so that mitigation projects over the next 30 years, including Coronado projects, can be expedited with a process to get permits more quickly.

**Mayor Smisek** worked with the City Manager, Assistant City Manager, and Mr. Tanaka on the art for the Marina building, toured the Hotel Del with Todd Shallen and Bill Dodds to learn about how the Hotel Del Master Plan is going, met with Dale St. Denis, some Planning and

Design Review Commissioners as they were part of a large planning group that was touring through Coronado and they stopped by the Senior Housing Project, talked to the Navy League at Tent City for an update on City projects, attended the Military Ball, the MainStreet retirement ceremony for Toni Gaylord and met with MainStreet and Chamber representatives regarding today's City Council agenda.

**11b. Adoption of a Resolution Supporting the Homeporting of a Third Naval Nuclear Aircraft Carrier at Naval Air Station, North Island (NASNI).** Since February, the Mayor, Councilmember Ovrom, and the City Manager have been working with the Navy and the City's Federal legislative representatives to communicate the City's position on homeporting a third nuclear carrier at NASNI.

On March 7, Mayor Smisek and Councilmember Ovrom traveled to Washington, D.C. and held consecutive meetings with the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Facilities and Installations, the Chief of Naval Operations, Congresswoman Davis, and staff representatives of the offices of Senators Feinstein and Boxer to discuss the City's long-term traffic solutions to mitigate traffic issues associated with NASNI. Mayor Smisek asked the Navy to reinvigorate and increase its participation in the City's SR 75/282 Traffic Corridor project and to provide funding for the next project phase. Following these meetings, Navy representatives committed to continuing to support the City's and the region's efforts to mitigate traffic impacts as a result of homeporting a third carrier at NASNI.

Therefore, given the Navy's continued commitment to addressing and participating in the funding of traffic improvements in the SR75-282 corridor, as well as the national importance of military readiness associated with the Navy's homeporting decision, it is recommended that the Council adopt a resolution supporting homeporting a third nuclear carrier at NASNI. **Under Consent, the City Council adopted A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO, CALIFORNIA, SUPPORTING THE HOMEPORTING OF A THIRD NAVAL NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT CARRIER AT NAVAL AIR STATION, NORTH ISLAND. The Resolution was read by Title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by Council as RESOLUTION NO. 8203.**

**11c. Review and Acceptance of the Proposed Design, Scope and Cost Estimate for the Animal Care Facility Project.**

Bill Cecil, Community Development Department, introduced Rick Davy, the architect for the project.

Tony Pena, Director of Community Development, clarified that the action of the City Council at this hearing is not approval of the project because that can only be done after CEQA is completed. The City Council's action would only be authorizing design work to go forward.

Project architect, Mr. Davy, 918 Second Street, explained that the site selected is on First Street, at the end of A Avenue. The property is 80' wide on First by 165' deep. It is not much larger than the typical 50' x 140' residential lots. There are several site constraints. There were discussions and negotiations that occurred with the Coronado Village Homeowners Association. These have resulted in a 10' landscape buffer which leaves a site of about 70' x 165' to work

with. The building, including the garage, is 4170 sq. ft. and is a one story building. The second constraint that is not really shown on the site plan is that the corner of the building is within 51' to a fault that runs diagonally across the southwest corner. In fact, the southwest corner of the proposed building where the garage is one foot from a 50' required buffer or setback from that fault line. The last thing is that one can see 5' on the west side between the building and the property line. This is a commercial zone. The property abuts commercial property even though it is a driveway. In order to get any windows on that west elevation, it was necessary to move the building 5' off of the property line. Additionally, it was a programmatic desire to have a dog run area as long as was possible, which becomes the back yard. The building literally occupies the only rectilinear space left on the site. 8 parking spaces have been provided. The parking lot is planned with permeable surfaces just as the lot is for the City Hall. There will be an integral concrete center drive. He reviewed the landscape plan, the parking area, the trash enclosure, and the footprint of the building. He went on to describe the interior of the building. The right side is the public area where there will be an entrance, lobby and counter area. There is a rotunda element to the right where and an area with cat community rooms. There is a volunteers' office to the left and public restrooms. There are kennel areas that open out into the courtyard on the east of the building. There is a trellised area that is under cover and around to the west is the dog run. Behind the public spaces is the staff area. There are four holding kennels, a large treatment room and a food prep area. There are two more holding rooms for cats. There is also a small staff lounge and a small staff restroom and shower.

Mr. Davy went on to review elevations. The structure of the building will be made of concrete masonry with slate shingles and is built on a residential scale. The size of the building will lend well to being able to use incredibly durable, elegant materials. The FAR for this is about .28. Design Review passed the project 5-0.

Councilmember Tanaka asked for information about fencing and where animals would be able to go other than in the fenced dog run. Mr. Davy mentioned how various holding areas can empty out to different spots. Mr. Davy explained that the building is entirely internal. It is totally enclosed with a very quiet heating and ventilating system and either dual or triple pane glass. There are glass doors and windows for the pets to look out in certain holding areas. Mr. Tanaka asked about the accessibility of the 10' easement on the right. He assumes that anyone who wanted to walk in that area could access it. Mr. Davy explained that it will be fully landscaped with ground cover, trees and bushes.

Mayor Pro Tem Downey asked about permeable surfaces for the parking. Mr. Davy explained that the storm water pollution prevention requirements in the State have been ratcheting up so that new construction cannot introduce any more storm water into the public system than currently exists on the site. This is a green site. It is a natural site. He doesn't know that just doing the permeable pavement pattern that has been done at City Hall is going to be enough to satisfy the latest storm water management requirements. That is the next step.

Louise Shirey, 828 Guadalupe, representing PAWS of Coronado, expressed their appreciation to the City for including their organization in the process of site selection and the design of the new facility. Their input was solicited on the function, features and general creature comforts of the building and they feel their ideas have enhanced the design process. The Coronado residents are very involved in many aspects of their pets' lives and they now know that the City intends to take care of their pets should they come into harm's way. They look forward to continuing their partnership with the City of Coronado during the construction and operational phases of this

project. They are hopeful that the resulting building will be one that the City as well as the residents and the animals can take pride in well into the future.

John Nyquist, 685 Margarita, read a statement from Chevy, Coronado's favorite shelter pup. Chevy requested that the City get on with this and build a new shelter. The animals have been in the Police Station since last August.

Councilmember Monroe thinks that the community room for cats was a great idea. He visited and toured the San Diego Kroc Animal Center. He recommends others take the tour as well.

Councilmember Tanaka is very happy with the facility. In reference to Adm. Nyquist's remarks about getting on with the project, Mr. Tanaka said he is glad that the City took the time to plan this properly. He is grateful that the neighbors were able to work with the City to create a solution for everyone.

Councilmember Ovrom would like to meet Chevy.

Mayor Pro Tem Downey thanked everyone who worked so hard on this. This is a wonderful plan and the facility will be stupendous. Councilmember Tanaka led the committee.

**MSUC (Ovrom/Monroe) moved that the City Council accept the recommended design scope and cost estimate to allow staff to complete the CEQA processing.**

<b>AYES:</b>	<b>Downey, Monroe, Ovrom and Tanaka</b>
<b>NAYS:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>ABSENT:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>DISQUALIFIED:</b>	<b>Smisek</b>

Mayor Smisek returned to the dais.

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

**13. COMMUNICATIONS - WRITTEN:**

**13a. Consideration of Request from Councilmembers Tanaka and Monroe for Discussion Regarding Options to Protect Sea Life in the Tide Pool.** Councilmember Tanaka said he had received a letter discussing some problems going on at the tide pool in front of the Hotel Del. He said he is familiar with the location but is not familiar with what kind of sea life is there. The letter reported that there are sometimes starfish or crabs and that it was the experience of the letter writer that some people will abuse the area and take the starfish out. One person who witnessed this and was concerned and called the police. The letter alleges that the police told them there was nothing they could do about it. If that is the case, he would like to see the City do something about it. If it is not the case, he would like to see the City explore the protections that might already exist. Staff has provided some background indicating that is the type of issue that is difficult to enforce. There are some enforcement mechanisms that the City

could take a look at and pursue. If need be, the City could even draft its own ordinance. He believes that the State is probably fairly restrictive already. This is common sense, but for someone not to use common sense and to abuse sea life is very objectionable. Anything the City can do to take care of that resource, he would be in support of.

Councilmember Monroe pointed out that Cathy Thomas was in the audience. He was impressed with the letter and thanked both Ms. Thomas and Eddie Warner for writing. It seemed that the City should look at this to determine if it wants staff to look at and compare with what other cities are doing.

Mayor Smisek agrees that the City could have someone designated by the City Manager to review all of this and determine what the City's capabilities are without having to do a new ordinance, but if the City has to, it would then institute one to supplement Fish & Wildlife and everyone else who has rules on this.

Cathy Thomas, 710 Eighth Street, explained that what prompted her letter was walking on the beach and witnessing people with barbecue tools ripping starfish from the rocks and children ripping crabs to pieces, etc. She feels the sea life should be protected. Other cities have tide pool laws. Fish & Game has ordinances that carry a \$600 fine to take anything from these tide pools. She and Mr. Warner volunteered to head a volunteer program and they have talked to a couple of organizations who will put them under their umbrella. This is really only a problem two months out of the year. A volunteer program could be helpful in stopping people from doing this. If there is signage there with pictures of the wildlife and a reference to the penalties for disturbing the sea life that would likely take care of the problem.

Councilmember Downey thinks that there should not just be a sign about the \$600 fine, but also the educational aspect would be very beneficial.

Mayor Smisek suggested locations for the signs. They could be at the Del as people are entering off the Paseo in that area and at the City entry ways at Central Beach and North Beach as well as at the Shores.

City Manager Mark Ochenduszko announced that he would be very happy to have City staff work with a group of citizen volunteers who want to look at the options for putting a program together that would help better protect the tide pools, better educate people who come to the tide pools and, under the worst of circumstances, enable the City to enforce the existing laws.

Mr. Tanaka referred to this as a 'teachable moment.' He thinks that some sort of signage will be needed but he thinks that signage that is educational coupled with the warning that removing is illegal is more effective than just hitting them over the head.

Council consensus was to allow the City Manager to bring this back to the City Council.

**13b. Consideration of Request from Councilmember Tanaka for Discussion Regarding Adding Staff and Hours to Weekend Library Services.** Councilmember Tanaka has long had some concerns that the City has had. If one looks at Monday through Thursday, the rationale is pretty clear as to why it is 10 a.m. to 9 p.m. The second thing is that the weekends serve a whole different group of people, potentially. Certainly families are one group he can see wanting to use the Library, particularly on Sunday. He thinks a four hour window is a fairly

narrow one. He thinks the City can afford hours such as 10 a.m. to 9 p.m. daily. He doesn't think there is necessarily a money issue. If that violates some people's sensibilities, then maybe 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. would be better.

Mayor Smisek commented that this was gone through in the mid 1990s because money was not the question. His recommendation would be to send this to the Director of the Library and have him work with the Library Board to see what they think about this and gather information on the subject.

Councilmember Downey would like the Library Board to look at computer usage. A lot of people would go there for quiet space to use their computers.

Mr. Tanaka added that DVD rentals are a huge service for Friday nights.

The City Council agreed by consensus to refer this to the Library Board and the Director of Library Services.

**The City Council recessed to hold the CDA meeting at 7:01 p.m.**

**14. CLOSED SESSION:**

**a. CLOSED SESSION – CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS**

AUTHORITY: Government Code §54957.6

CITY NEGOTIATORS: Mark Ochenduszko, City Manager; Leslie Suelter, Director of Administrative Services; Jim Benson, Assistant City Manager.

EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATION: Coronado Police Officers' Association (CPOA)

**b. CLOSED SESSION – CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS**

AUTHORITY: Government Code §54957.6

CITY NEGOTIATORS: Mark Ochenduszko, City Manager; Leslie Suelter, Director of Administrative Services; Jim Benson, Assistant City Manager.

EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATION: Coronado Firefighters' Association (CFA)

**c. CLOSED SESSION: CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL  
EXISTING LITIGATION**

Subdivision (a) of Government Code Section 54956.9

NAME OF CASE: Citizens for Preservation of Coronado Beach v. City of Coronado, et al.

San Diego County Superior Court Case No. GIC 845202

**The Regular Meeting resumed at 8:38 p.m.**

**The City Attorney announced that on Items 14a and 14b direction was given to the City's negotiators, and on Item 14c no action was taken.**

**15. ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 8:39 p.m.

Approved: April 17, 2007

Attest:

---

Tom Smisek, Mayor  
City of Coronado

---

Linda K. Hascup  
City Clerk