

**MINUTES OF A
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF CORONADO
Police Facility – Emergency Operations Center
700 Orange Avenue
Coronado, CA 92118
Tuesday, April 5, 2005, 3:00 p.m.**

Mayor Smisek called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL:

Present: Councilmembers Downey, Monroe, Tanaka, Tierney,
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: Marlys Simmons, Coronado Community Church, provided the invocation and Mayor Smisek led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. MINUTES: The minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 15, 2005, copies having been provided Council prior to the meeting, were approved as submitted. The reading of the minutes in their entirety was unanimously waived.

MSUC (Downey/Tanaka) moved that the City Council approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 15, 2005, as submitted

AYES: Downey, Monroe, Tanaka, Tierney and Smisek
NAYS: None
ABSENT: None

4. CEREMONIAL PRESENTATIONS:

4a. Proclamation: National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week. Mayor Smisek presented the proclamation to Chief Bob Hutton, Director of Police Services, Joan Carney, dispatcher and Mary Ann Adams.

4b. Proclamation: National Animal Control Appreciation Week. Mayor Smisek presented the proclamation to Police Department Animal Control representatives Mark Stahl, Myra Workman, and Jeff Hutchins, who staffs the Animal Control Facility.

5. CONSENT CALENDAR: The City Council approved, adopted and/or accepted as one item of business Consent Agenda Items 5a through 5h with the addition of Items 10b, 11e and 11f.

MSUC (Tanaka/Downey) moved that the City Council approve the Consent Calendar Items 5a through 5i and Items 10b – Recommendation from the Traffic Operations Committee Regarding the Installation of a 44' Yellow Commercial Loading Zone at 1200 First Street, 11e – Consideration of Request from Councilmember Tierney Regarding Pacific Animal Welfare Society, Coronado (PAWS of Coronado) Event During Flower Show Weekend and 11f – Approval of a Resolution Approving the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan's (CIWMP) Summary Plan and Siting Element

AYES: Downey, Monroe, Tanaka, Tierney and Smisek

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

Item 5i was removed from Consent by Councilmember Monroe.

Chief Hutton clarified the item for Spreckels Park, Item 11e. If Council chooses to do that, Council should also suspend the Animal Ordinance for Spreckels Park.

5a. Approval of Reading by Title and Waiver of Reading in Full of Ordinances on this Agenda. The City Council waives the reading of the full text of every ordinance contained in this agenda and approves the reading of the ordinance title only. **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. 10042298 thru 10042960 audited and approved by the Audit Committee, provided there are sufficient funds on hand. **The City Council approved the warrants.**

5c. Authorization for City Manager to Negotiate a Final Purchase Price for Recreation Management Computer Software. Recreation and Information Systems staff began researching new recreation management software products as early as 2002. Several products were explored, including Internet-based programs requiring no support hardware other than a PC. Although these Internet-based programs were attractive due to no initial outlay of funds, ongoing service charges were high, and the control or “ownership” of data and the inability of “real time” processing made these options unsatisfactory overall. Two products consistently came to the top when seeking input from other agencies: Class Software Solutions and RecWare Safari. In the San Diego and Orange County area, 12 of 15 agencies polled are using these products, including Carlsbad, Chula Vista, Escondido, El Cajon, Poway, Vista, Encinitas, Oceanside, San Clemente, Newport Beach, Cerritos and Irvine.

As of this date, one company, The Active Network, Inc., now owns both products, and has merged them into one hybrid product, Class. The Active Network is promoting this product as an upgrade to the current RecWare Pro program. Information Systems staff supports this choice and has indicated that Class is compatible with the City’s current computer system, as well as has the ability to interface with the door access/security system at the Community Center.

The advanced technology of Class will facilitate the expansion of services in the new recreation facilities and provide the option of new components that will enhance customer service and assist in providing efficient tracking, reporting and accounting systems. The system will be used to process class and activity registration, facility reservation and booking, pass or “membership” registration, point-of-sale transactions, and sports league scheduling. Activity registration and facility availability inquiries can be completed over the Internet.

Other recreation software products available do not currently have the capability of interfacing with the security access and hand scanner technology that will be utilized at the Community Center.

The cost of the software replacement package has a total estimated cost of \$56,000. This price includes all software components, user licenses, implementation and support services, and the first year of the annual maintenance fee for ongoing technical support.

Recreation Staff, in conjunction with Administrative Services, requests that the City Council eliminate competitive bidding for this product and support services, as allowed by Administrative Procedures No. 402, and approve the waiver of the solicitation of competitive bids by the Purchasing Officer, as permitted by Coronado Municipal Code section 8.04.070, finding that the supplies and equipment can be obtained from only one vendor, to wit, the Active Network, Inc. **The City Council approved the purchase of Class Software, an upgrade to the current version of the RecWare Pro software program and authorized the City Manager to negotiate a final purchase price, not to exceed \$58,000, to be paid for with budgeted funds from the Recreation Services Department operating budget.**

5d. Adoption of a Resolution Providing for Additional Temporary Partially Paid Military Leave of Absence and Continued Health, Retirement, and Leave Accrual Benefits to City Employees Called to Active Duty with the Armed Forces by the President of the United States to Combat Terrorism.

The City of Coronado currently complies with federal and state military leave laws for employees serving in the military reserve or National Guard. Under California law, employees who are recalled to active duty and have been in the service of a public agency for at least one year are entitled to receive their salary for the first 30 calendar days while engaged in the performance of military duty. Compliance with state and federal law is generally sufficient for short term recalls. However, when reservists are recalled for significant periods of time, some employees and their families may experience financial hardship. A number of public agencies in San Diego County have passed resolutions to provide an additional temporary partially paid military leave of absence and a continuation of benefits for employees recalled to active duty to assist in alleviating the economic hardship for their employees.

In response to the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, the President of the United States began calling up military reservists and members of the National Guard for an anticipated war on terrorism and to increase homeland defense. On November 5, 2002, the City Council adopted Resolution 7885, which authorized continuation pay to employees called to active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces beyond the legally required 30 days. The Council later extended these benefits through June 30, 2005. Adoption of this resolution will continue supplementing the employees' military pay to equal their regular City gross bi-weekly wage at the time of activation and a continuation of health, retirement and leave accrual benefits until their return to work or June 30, 2006, whichever is earlier. **The City Council adopted A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO PROVIDING FOR ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY, PARTIALLY PAID MILITARY LEAVE OF ABSENCE AND CONTINUED HEALTH, RETIREMENT AND LEAVE ACCRUAL BENEFITS FOR CITY EMPLOYEES CALLED TO ACTIVE DUTY WITH THE ARMED FORCES BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO COMBAT TERRORISM. The Resolution was read by Title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by Council as RESOLUTION NO. 8056**

5e. Request for Additional Funds to Complete the Glorietta Boulevard Sewer Improvements and Golf Course Restrooms.

While installing the new sewer main along Glorietta Boulevard, Elken Contracting encountered saturated soil conditions. The saturated soils were unsuitable for backfill and were hauled off site and the sewer main encased in a stabilizing "rock burrito" consisting of ¾" crushed rock wrapped in filter fabric. In addition to the cost of the extra rock and filter fabric installation, the saturated soils caused excessive trench sloughing, increasing the width of the trench and slowing production. This increased trench width will require additional base course and asphalt paving to repair the road. The unusual soil conditions encountered also required a great deal more soil testing than originally budgeted for. The extra soil testing costs have contributed to exceeding the project contingency. **The City Council authorized the transfer of \$50,000 from the Wastewater Master Plan account 510781-9862 into the Glorietta Boulevard Sewer Improvement and Golf Course Restrooms project account 510781-9853. The City Council also authorized the Director of Engineering and Project Development to execute contract change orders to cover the increased cost of the sewer main installation.**

5f. Resolution Approving and Authorizing the Mayor to Sign the Memorandum of Understanding Regarding Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) Grant Funding Between the City of San Diego and the City of Coronado. It is proposed to have the City Council approve and authorize the Mayor to sign the memorandum of understanding regarding Urban Area Security Initiative grant funding between the City of Coronado and the City of San Diego. Approval will assist the City of Coronado in preparing in the event of a large-scale emergency incident. Funds received through the UASI grant will assist City departments by allowing us to purchase new equipment and send personnel through training. The UASI Working Group has placed personal protective equipment (PPE) as the highest priority for grant funding. All participating agencies are expected to meet the minimum PPE standard to ensure a standardized level of protection for all first responders at a large-scale incident inside and outside of their jurisdictions. Once the minimum standard has been met by an agency the funds may be used for discretionary spending off an approved equipment list. The training funds may be used to send first responders to training off a list approved by the Office of Disaster Preparedness. Costs covered include travel, material, supplies and overtime for the person or for coverage. Another approach will be to hire a trainer to conduct a class in Coronado for a greater cost benefit. Examples of training included on the list are Confined Space and Trench Rescue; Rescue Systems 1 and 2; and many CSTI and POST certified classes. The increased level of preparedness will make the City of Coronado safer and better prepared to respond to an attack in the urban area. Standardized equipment and training will promote a more effective response for any city receiving or providing aid. In today's environment, this comprehensive planning approach for large-scale emergencies and the sharing of regional resources in the event of a disaster is even more important. **The City Council approved the resolution approving the MOU regarding Urban Area Security Initiative ("UASI") funding between the City of San Diego and the City of Coronado. RESOLUTION NO. 8058**

5g. Approval of Cooperation Agreement Between the County of San Diego and the City of Coronado for the Administration of Coronado's Portion of the Federal Community Development Block Grant Program. The Cooperation Agreement formalizes those regional activities with which, historically, all of the participating agencies have cooperated. Staff is comfortable with all provisions of this Cooperation Agreement and is therefore recommending that the City Council approve the Cooperation Agreement. **The City Council adopted A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO APPROVING THE CITY'S PARTICIPATING WITH THE SAN DIEGO URBAN COUNTY IN A THREE YEAR (2006/07, 2007/08, 2008/09) COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) PROGRAM. The Resolution was read by Title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by Council as RESOLUTION NO. 8053**

5h. Approval of Grant of Public Utility Easement to Pacific Bell Telephone Company, Time Warner Cable, California-American Water Company and San Diego Gas and Electric for Relocation of Their Facilities onto City-Owned Land at Glorietta Bay. The granting of the utility easement allows the utility company to access their equipment should that become necessary, which is highly unlikely. No other options are available since the water company is requiring the water line as a condition of the project and there is no other space

available because there are 19 known utilities filling Strand Way. The only location for the Pacific Bell Telephone Company and Time Warner lines is to move them out of the Strand Way right-of-way into City property a short distance (ranging from 6-10 feet). Should the line(s) be abandoned the City could pursue the reconveyance of the easement. **The City Council adopted A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO APPROVING A GRANT OF EASEMENT FROM THE CITY OF CORONADO TO PACIFIC BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY, TIME WARNER CABLE, CALIFORNIA-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY AND SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC. The Resolution was read by Title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by Council as RESOLUTION NO. 8057**

5i. Review and Comment on Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) Phase I – Routine System Optimization. Councilmember Monroe wanted to let the public know that the items up for efficiencies at MTS do affect Coronado quite a bit. MTS has a problem. They are spending \$8 to \$10 million more each year than is sustainable. The reserves have gotten down to about \$12 million, coming down from \$40 million in the last three or four years. Some major changes have to happen. The second phase of this will rebuild a transit system for San Diego County, but the first phase of that is to try to find efficiencies throughout San Diego County that they can use to balance the current budget. Their initial proposal is to cut Route 904 totally and to take 902 and 903 out of the system. During rush hour they will add some buses to 901. The whole Community Center complex was designed around transit and multi-modal. This is the wrong time to cut back on the shuttle. The shuttle is the only service there is for people coming on the ferry to bring them uptown. At a minimum, the City should try to get this delayed until there is some really good operational experience with the bus and the Community Center. When MTS talks about changing bus service they go out and hold workshops in the area. The fact is that there are not very many Coronadoans who ride the 901, 902 and 903. However, there are people who come from all over San Diego County to Coronado or to the Naval Base to work and use the buses. It is his hope that the Chamber and the City to let the businesses and town know that these are being proposed because it is their employees who ride these buses. **The City Council reviewed the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) Phase I and provided comments to MTS to include:**

- 1. Recommend MTS use “subsidy per passenger” as one of its performance criteria;**
- 2. Recommend MTS consider a policy of not eliminating small community “lifeline” services as long as efficiencies can still be achieved on other services;**
- 3. Recommend retaining Route 904 Shuttle service on an hourly schedule rather than discontinuing the service; the City’s proposed efficiency (reduction in service) on this route would come from not providing the half-hourly summer service that has been provided in the past**

6. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

- a. Lindsey Arendsee, 740 Cabrillo Avenue, Coronado High School PTO President, announced that the PTO has been working on the “Every 15 Minutes” program since September. Coronado High School, in conjunction with the CHP Office of Traffic Safety and Coronado SAFE Foundation will be conducting the program April 6 and 7th.**

It is a powerful, nationally recognized program that forces teenagers to confront the fact that they are not invincible. Students will be challenged through a variety of activities to think seriously about drinking, driving and their personal safety and the impact their decisions make on their family, friends and others. The name of the program was derived from the fact that in the early 1990's someone in the United States was killed in an alcohol related traffic collision every 15 minutes. Through grass roots programs such as MADD, SADD, Friday Night Live and Every Fifteen Minutes, the death rate has changed but it remains unacceptable. The two day event is very dramatic and emotional. It is designed to provide a realistic simulation of what happens when a student is killed due to an alcohol related traffic condition. On April 6th a dramatic simulation is portrayed as an announcement comes over the public address system announcing that a student has just been killed in a drunk driving crash. Coronado High School students have been selected to represent fatalities and are removed from class for the remainder of the day where they will participate in an intense debriefing session later tomorrow night. In addition, a simulated drunk driving collision involving many agencies such as the Coronado Police Department, paramedics, and the Fire Department is staged on the school grounds on the football field for the benefit of the entire school. Day 2 involves a gathering of the student body to attend as an assembly where they review, listen to speakers, talk about events of the prior day and some of the students and their parents will read their letters that they have written the night before as if they were dead and they did not have the time to say what they wanted to say to their parents. It is a very emotional time. It is treated like a memorial assembly. The PTO is really excited about this program. There are about 30 people who have worked on this since September. She introduced Kelly Purvis, member of the Executive Committee of Every Fifteen Minutes.

- b. **Amanda Marks, ASB President, 1007 Second Street**, is so excited for this program. One of her favorite things about it is that it is not just trying to show kids the effects of drinking and driving, but it is to the point and is dramatic. It is very hard to watch. She showed Council the t-shirt for the program.
- c. **Kelly Purvis, 560 C Avenue**, explained that help from the City of Coronado, the Police Department, the Fire Department, Coronado SAFE Foundation was invaluable. With California Highway Patrol giving \$10,000, in all they have raised over \$13,000. T-shirts and bracelets that say "Every Fifteen Minutes" are available. She encouraged the Council and other people to come at 9:45 a.m. tomorrow. The community in the surrounding area has been notified. There will be ambulances, sirens and fire trucks and lots of noise. It is going to look like a real drunk driving scene. The residents have been notified.
- d. **Louise Shirey, 828 Guadalupe Avenue, President of PAWS Coronado**, thanked the Mayor and Council for proclaiming the week of April 11th through 17th as National Animal Control Appreciation Week. She also thanked Chief Hutton for his cooperation with PAWS in helping facilitate adoption. Over the past year they have experienced personally the increased cooperation and higher level of services to the public and the animals in Coronado. This is team work happening and it is highly successful. They are so excited to see the discussion of a new animal care facility being addressed. PAWS and their membership of over 130 residents are available to help the City in any way possible to bring this new facility about. As Admiral John Nyquist, one of the PAWS Charter members, so eloquently stated, "There are two essential requirements that this new facility must meet – outstanding animal services to

the citizens of Coronado and humane and caring environment for the animals.” They hope that the same due diligence that went into the design and location of Coronado’s other major capital improvements will be followed to ensure these two requirements are met. We in the community are standing by to help make that happen as they move forward together.

- e. **Joan Raymone, 4616 Bermuda Avenue, San Diego, President of AFSCME Local 127, representing the City’s Golf Course workers and public service workers,** was at Council’s last meeting and feels more positive this time. She is happy to say that they are back to the bargaining table now and she is hoping that they can make significant progress quickly. They presented their proposal to the City on Wednesday, to the management team. The City team did not have the authority to make their counter proposal; however, she is hoping that an agreement can be reached this time around. Still, their members feel very strongly that the City can improve its offer and give it the highest priority. They want to also continue to be sure that the community is aware of their situation and that is why they are still outside today with the horn honking and with the picket signs. They are still confident that their workers provide the utmost quality of service to the City of Coronado and it is because of that that the City is maintained so beautifully and operated so efficiently. They look forward to closing these negotiations so that everyone can move on in harmony in the very near future.
- f. **Toni Gaylord, Coronado MainStreet Executive Director,** reminded the community that next weekend is Flower Show weekend. It is the absolute heart of Coronado’s volunteerism with anything from the Friends of the Library down to MotorCars on MainStreet on Sunday.

7. **CITY MANAGER:**

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

8. **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

8a. **Public Hearing: Adoption of Resolution Establishing Policies and Fees for Coronado Recreation Facilities and Programs.** Linda Rahn, Recreation Director, provided the staff report for this item. This item was the subject of a special meeting on February 22nd. The Special Council workshop allowed for maximum opportunity for the public to hear and comment on these fees. The Park and Recreation Board and City staff have been working on this for the last year, with excellent work from the Park and Recreation Board really bringing the community’s concerns to life. They have developed a classification of users that has several tiers, including City use, non-profit and community groups, residents, non-residents and commercial users. These fees are for facility use, including parks, athletic fields, the swimming pool, Community Center facilities, and banquet rooms at the Community Center. The fees are based on the cost to offer the services. Staff feels that these are reasonable fees. The fees also create revenues to support recreation services in the community and to continue offering quality services.

Several changes were made to the suggested fee policy based on feedback from the City Council. These included defining family, putting teen and youth into one category, removing individual court use fees for individuals. They also included a clause to provide for periodic review by the Department and make adjustments according to the cost of living.

Councilmember Downey referred to Classification B on page 120 of the staff report. There is a parenthetical, “(As clarification, this would not include ASB activities, dances, booster club meetings, Parent Teacher Organization or staff meetings).” Would they become C? Ms. Rahn responded that is correct. Ms. Downey also referred to page 122, Section 4, #2. It talks about how alcohol will be permitted only at the Community Center Banquet Room, Banquet Room Patio and Playhouse. There is an additional cleaning/security deposit. The user may pay for cost of security guards or City of Coronado Police Officers or Reserve Officers.

Ms. Rahn explained that was left up to the discretion of staff. There are some events that it may be more prudent to have additional officers, based on past experience; they did not set an absolute of 1 per 100. Normally there would be two security guards. They also have the ability to require that one of those security guards be a Coronado Police Officer or Reserve Officer. The word may was put in rather than will so that there is flexibility. There might be a situation where there is a community group having a wine tasting where there is a single glass of wine being served. City staff may determine that there really isn't a need for a security guard at 1 p.m. for a wine tasting. Some of this has been left up to the discretion of staff.

Ms. Downey moved on to #7 under Section Four (pg. 123). There will be competition for space within the Community Center. Ms. Rahn explained that there will be a negotiation period to sit and talk with the group. They didn't want to lock in. The very first year there will be 20 community groups and they will take up all of the time in the banquet room and there are not any times available for the revenue groups to be in there. The fee for community groups doesn't even pay for all of the staff that is needed.

Councilmember Monroe commented that a lot of people did a lot of great work under Ms. Rahn's leadership to get this document here. He applauded all of them and Ms. Rahn in particular. Mr. Monroe was concerned about one of the fee classifications. Ms. Rahn clarified the situation for him.

Councilmember Tierney asked what the age range for seniors is. The range is stated as any person 55 or older. He feels that is generous and not necessarily needed. Ms. Rahn responded by saying that they used the existing age at the swimming pool to come up with that. They want to encourage everyone to use the facilities, but particularly the population that starts getting a little quieter in their activities.

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

MS (Monroe/Tanaka) moved that the City Council adopt A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO ESTABLISHING POLICIES FOR SETTING USER FEES AND CHARGES FOR RECREATION SERVICES DEPARTMENT

OPERATED ACTIVITIES AND FACILITIES. The Resolution was read by Title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by Council.

Councilmember Downey would like to amend the fee on page 126. She has discussed this with Ms. Rahn. She understands that the City wants to charge the \$25 fee for the jump house to encourage people to reserve the space, to coordinate with the City, to get the proper insurance, to clean up after themselves, but it brings the same concern she has. If someone wants to have a Spreckels Park party for a 4 year old, of one has to pay the \$50 to reserve the space in the Park, another \$25 jump house fee, the additional insurance fee, etc., a party in Spreckels Park is going to cost close to \$500 and people won't bother asking for the permit. Then there will be an enforcement issue. In order to encourage the compliance and the concern of the jump house, she recommends that the fee be lowered if one wants to reserve a space at Spreckels' Park, without the gazebo, to a combined \$50. She thinks it is a little bit more palatable.

Councilmember Tanaka is not so interested in the \$25 fee at all, but is more interested in the cleaning and damage deposit and the insurance. It is not the fee, but rather holding them accountable for the damage that is being done to the Park with the jump house. He thinks it is perfectly reasonable to have a deposit of \$100 or \$200 and they should have to comply with the insurance requirement.

Mayor Smisek pointed out that, as it is written, Spreckels Park without the gazebo requires \$100 cleaning and damage deposit and \$50 to rent it. People have the option of paying \$25 or double the deposit. Mr. Tanaka thinks the fee is irrelevant, but that the deposit is relevant.

Councilmember Tierney explained that he has problems with these fees. "With offsetting revenues, the net increased operational expense may be limited to approximately \$50,000 to \$100,000. This means that the City is going to have to probably dip into general revenue funds to pay the additional costs that these fees don't in effect reflect. He thinks it is fair to say that the next three to four years is going to see the City in a very precarious situation, in terms of finances. The City is very likely to have to reach into the surplus to offset other costs in the community. It worries him that these fees are very low – too low. He would like to decrease the amount of money that the City will have to reach into revenue monies to finance this program. He would like to have the fees increased 15% across the board, except where they exceed the actual costs. He thinks the City should start tightening their belts now on all programs. If these fees are set in motion, they won't be changed for years. People just add to the general cost of running these programs. 15% across the board, with the exception of where they exceed the actual cost, is recommended.

M (Tierney) offered an amended motion that the City Council increase these fees 15% across the board except where the fees exceed the actual costs

City Manager Mark Ochendusko commented that the point about what to do with the fees and charges is a policy matter for Council consideration, not the manager. He did say that the City's projections over the next seven years do show that expenditures will exceed revenues in terms of providing government at the same level that is now.

Mr. Tierney thinks that Council should entertain this motion. We must start somewhere and this is a point to which the community can afford. It will move forward and preclude the City having to dip substantially into the surplus, especially when the City is not too sure what other pressure points are going to be put onto it by the State.

MSUC (Monroe/Tanaka) moved that the City Council adopt A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO ESTABLISHING POLICIES FOR SETTING USER FEES AND CHARGES FOR RECREATION SERVICES DEPARTMENT OPERATED ACTIVITIES AND FACILITIES. The Resolution was read by Title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by Council as RESOLUTION NO. 8059. The resolution is amended to reflect a change to the fee when one wants to reserve Spreckels Park without the gazebo to a combined \$50

Mayor Smisek commented that the City has built in some safeties into this whole thing and there are mid-year reviews. The City is very fortunate that the City Manager has been a very conservative estimator on the revenue side and he has been very good at holding the cost side down. Therefore, the City has been very fortunate in that there were higher surpluses than anticipated. Because, in keeping faith to the general public, when this project was started people were told that it was going to be very affordable which is why the City encouraged them to allow the use of the Capital Improvement funds to be able to built this nice facility. He would like to keep it at that, at least for the first shot. These fees take into consideration the cost factor and which projects/programs can pay for themselves while others need to be subsidized. It can be reviewed at mid-year to see how things are going. That will provide a better picture.

Councilmember Tanaka agrees with Mayor Smisek. He agrees with Mr. Tierney that it is hard to estimate these things accurately, but that was one of the assumptions going in. He doesn't think it is necessary to assume that the fees are all at 15% too low. Staff has already done its best guess at what the right fees are. The City has a healthy enough bottom line to accept some liability. Decisions can be made to make adjustments later. He also thinks Mayor Smisek is correct that the City has had a long standing expectation that the costs should be as low as possible.

AYES: Downey, Monroe, Tanaka, Tierney and Smisek
NAYS: None
ABSENT: None

9. ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS: None.

10. COMMISSION AND COMMITTEE REPORTS:

10a. Report from the Port Commissioner Concerning Port Activities. There was no report.

10b. Recommendation from the Traffic Operations Committee Regarding the Installation of a 44' Yellow Commercial Loading Zone at 1200 First Street. Municipal Code Section 56.30.090 states that in a yellow curb zone vehicles shall stop only for the purpose of loading or unloading passengers, material or freight for a period of time not to exceed 20 minutes. The yellow loading zone shall be operative between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., except Sundays and holidays, unless the resolution designating such locations specifies different hours or days. **Under Consent, the City Council approved A RESOLUTION DESIGNATING A YELLOW NO PARKING CURB ZONE IN FRONT OF THE MULTI-USE DEVELOPMENT, 1200 FIRST STREET. The Resolution was read by Title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by Council as RESOLUTION NO. 8054.**

11. CITY COUNCIL BUSINESS:

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

Councilmember Downey reported on the briefing of the Airport Authority.

Councilmember Tierney let everyone know that on the 16th he attended the Coronado Floral Association Barbecue. He attended the SANDAG Border Committee meeting, the Chamber of Commerce Salute to the Military, served as the representative from the Wastewater JPL to the Public Advisory Commission, had a meeting with Nick Inzunza, had a Metro tour of the facilities under the Wastewater Management JPL, and a JPA meeting in Del Mar.

Councilmember Tanaka attended the Coronado Schools Foundation Annual Telethon and the Military Ball.

Councilmember Monroe attended SANDAG meetings, Transportation Committee meetings, the Borders Committee meeting, the Military Ball, the Naval Complexes meeting, the Tunnel Action Committee meeting and a meeting of the Metropolitan Transit Board.

Mayor Smisek attended the Military Ball, the South Bay Mayors meeting, the CHA bi-monthly Board meeting, a meeting of the Southwestern College Fundraiser Committee, a meeting with Pat Miller and Dick Scharff on the Traffic Study, took a MainStreet tour of the SBC building (the ribbon cutting will be on April 21st) and met with Chamber Board members to update them on Council agenda items.

The City Council adjourned to closed session at 7:14 p.m.

11b. Review and Comment Upon the Draft San Diego County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

Tony Pena, Director of Community Development: The San Diego County Regional Airport Authority required by State mandate to prepare an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The purpose of today's meeting is to allow the City to comment before the deadline which has been adjusted from April 8th to April 15th now for comments to the Airport Authority. We have the representatives of the Airport Authority with us to do a PowerPoint presentation on the Plan. However, I would just like to indicate that staff has been reviewing the Plan for several weeks now. We find that it is a very, not only voluminous plan, but it has significant potential impacts on the City. Just to outline some areas of major concern is that the Plan was based on an AICUZ study that was required by federal directive. That pretty much drove the rest of the findings in the Plan in terms of overlay zones that cover most of the City with the exception of the Coronado Cays. Within these various zones there are regulations that are being set out that we would have to adhere to regarding land use and development, which is an impact on the City's policy regarding our local land use control and sovereignty in that area. There is also a new process involved with this Plan where the Airport Authority would pretty much have jurisdiction over a wide variety of categories of development and land use contained within those zones so that is another layer of government property owners will have to deal with. And also, we are concerned with the very, very short review period that we've had on this Plan. We received it approximately mid-March. We have to get comments to the Airport Authority by April 15th. We can only give sort of the gist of our comments. We are not able to, for example, come up with our own plan that would materially change the impacts, the regulation for example, or have any say in how the zones are overlaid on the City. I think that another thing that has grown out of this review is that it has become apparent that NASNI, Naval Air Station North Island, is playing a significant role in the development and execution of the Plan. So far they have been fairly silent based upon the City and Navy meeting we had on Monday regarding the Plan. I think it is going to be very important in the near future that we get the Navy to meet with us because they could be an ally in how this plan is carried out. For example, even though Runway 29er has not been changed, the flight pattern has been changed by a CO policy to change the angle of approach. I don't think that was taken into account as a formal demonstration of the AICUZ, so that probably did not get translated into the change of zones. So, that is something we have to work with, not only with the Navy, but with the Airport Authority. It takes time and we are also sending out letters to state and federal legislative allies of the City to try to get either the law changed or policies changed. For example, we want to get this deadline extended, possibly for a year or more, to be able to develop an appropriate response. Also, to make these regulations more advisory than compulsory. It is really going to take time to do that. We do need to extend ourselves in this area. And by commenting before April 15th that doesn't mean the issue is going away – it is just the beginning of the issue that we have to deal with. If you have any questions of me at this point, I can certainly respond. I just wanted to give you a general overview of where we are coming from. After this meeting, I think that if you look at pages 143-145 in your staff report, we have outlined, through Ed Kleeman, our project planner on this issue, some of the major concerns that we have. And you can add/delete/amend those and we will forward those in terms of our comments to the Airport Authority. With that, I would just turn it over to Angela Shafer-Payne at this time and she will introduce what she is going to be talking about and we'll go from there.

Councilmember Downey: Mr. Mayor, before we do that could I ask one question? What is the date that you received the first piece of paper that let you know that is what they were doing?

Mr. Pena: We received the two volume document March 11th.

Ms. Downey: Did you receive anything before that so that we would know it was coming and we would be invited to assist in the preparation?

Mr. Pena: We were not invited to participate in the development of the Plan.

Ms. Downey: So it was only on receipt of the complete, final plan, the draft plan, I understand, on March 16th was the first official notice.

Mr. Pena: Yes. To my knowledge the only city that was involved with the development of a plan was for Lindbergh Field and that was the City of San Diego. There have been a number of airports involved here, not just North Island, and I think a number of cities share the same concerns that we have.

Councilmember Tierney: Mr. Pena, you have, does the federal government have a similar type plan and are we covered by that in some respects to this community?

Mr. Pena: Well, the federal government required the AICUZ to be prepared. The AICUZ does not have the same kind of regulatory authority that is being proposed in the Compatibility Plan. That is sort of the next step. It came as a shock to us, also, that it would create another level of government authority over land use in the local community.

Mr. Tierney: Can I ask a question here pertaining... Since we in this community are directly next to a federal base, are we not covered by that? And, more so, that we've accepted that and that therefore, we feel that these, that this plan that is being put forward exceeds in many ways what the federal government has in place for this community.

Mr. Pena: I can't answer that. I think eventually we are going to have to get some assistance, possibly from a consultant, to answer those kinds of questions. I will say that there has been recent state legislation to require cooperation between bases and surrounding jurisdictions because the Navy hadn't found some cooperation like that in other areas of the state. In Coronado, we were sort of a good example of cooperation with the Navy. I spoke at a SANDAG meeting a couple of years ago about this very issue. When I talked to them I addressed the fact that we do have a City/Navy and City Policy meetings on a regular basis and they were very impressed by that because most cities don't do that. I think we are ahead of the game in that respect. But still, this document is different than our one-on-one dealings with the Navy.

Mr. Tierney: You've had, I just to make sure the public understands that you've had only three weeks to address this, correct?

Mr. Pena: Yes, and I would also say that I think probably most of the general public is not aware of the ramifications of this plan. That is one reason why we need additional time.

Mr. Tierney: Along that same subject, the only City that seemed to be brought into the process, considering the fact that we have a vital interest here, has been San Diego. In other words, it has been a two person dance at this point and we've been left out of the formula, which I feel, as an

elected official, is rather bizarre for the Airport Authority to pull such a stunt. And I think that it was disingenuous by the way.

Mayor Smisek: Before the Airport Commission came into existence, SANDAG had this authority, is that correct? As I recall, in the years I served on SANDAG, I don't remember any Coronado issues ever coming up, any requirements for reporting or anything. We were basing everything under AICUZ at that time.

Mr. Pena: That's correct.

Mayor Smisek: So, what we are doing here, in essence, is, instead of being able to continue that way we are using the AICUZ criteria in a mandatory fashion and it is going to require us to have another level of government that is going to allow us to remodel my house.

Mr. Pena: Essentially, yes, I think that is a good example. Maybe not a remodel, but maybe a tear down and rebuild, especially in an area of the zone called B-1. I would like to point out that, before I sit down, is this issue, right now, does not deal with the airport siting, which is an ongoing issue and I think a lot of attention was diverted to that subject. This one sort of came in the vacuum behind it.

Mayor Smisek: I agree

Mr. Tierney: I agree. Well put, also.

Angela Shafer-Payne, Vice President, Strategy Planning, San Diego Regional Airport Authority: Good afternoon, Mayor and Council members. I want to start off with just a few brief remarks and then turn it over to our consultant team, our internal staff to walk you briefly through a presentation. What we really want to accomplish today is answer your questions. I believe I can address some of your concerns that were raised during the introduction, but let me just start out by saying that, I think it was just pointed out by the Mayor, the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority took over the responsibility as the Airport Land Use Commission when the Authority Act creating us, was put into place. Under that responsibility we do have a legislatively mandated requirement to put together Compatibility Plans for the public use and military airports in San Diego County. What is new is that in the year 2002, State law changed, requiring that military air installations develop compatibility plans. So that is a new requirement and probably why you had no, in the past, did not have, with SANDAG, the relationship of looking at a compatibility plan going forward. The Airport Land Use Commission and I think this is a common mistake that is made when referring to the Commission, has no land use jurisdiction. We are required to, as a land use commission, to put together compatibility plans with the operators of those airports in the County. So, in other words, everything that you are seeing in the Compatibility Plan, with the exception of SDIA because we also own and operate that airport, is in addition to being the Airport Land Use Commission, is derived from information we received from the airport operators themselves, either their forecasts, their master plan or, in the instance of North Island, it would be the AICUZ that was referred to. We rely solely upon the operators to take their information, look at the State guidelines, put the information with the State guidelines and develop a Compatibility Plan. This process kicked off last July, with all of the airport operators in the County of San Diego. The jurisdictions, as we move forward in this instance, the City of Coronado, have the ability to overrule any compatibility plan that's put together. I think that is a whole separate topic and I'll let the technical team address that going forward. We would prefer, as the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority Airport Land Use Commission, to work with the jurisdictions,

to work with the operators, and to facilitate changes or modifications that need to be done in the Plan. Again, they simply took the AICUZ in this instance and incorporated it into the Compatibility Plan. We are very interested in what the City of Coronado would like to see, modifications they would like to see, in the Plan. City staff has communicated some preliminary comments to us and we are receptive to all of those comments. Again, needing to bring in the third party in this situation, which is the Department of the Navy, because ultimately they are the operator of the airport and we're the facilitator of the Plan. One final comment before we go into the presentation itself. If your house burns down, if you want to do a remodel, you don't have to submit it to the ALUC. The Compatibility Plan, once completed, once adopted by the Airport Authority, is then given to the jurisdictions to update whether via General Plan, whatever system you have in place as the jurisdiction. If you incorporate those changes; if we come to an agreement with the compatibility plan, you incorporate any changes into your plan; you do not need to submit projects to the ALUC. We are in a situation right now in this County that the majority of the comprehensive land use plans are out of date. Many of them are 10, 15, 20 years old. So, when we accepted this responsibility, we were faced with development going forward and we are in a development boom here in San Diego, that many of the projects were not compatible with general plans, were certainly not compatible with the comprehensive land use plan for that particular airport, requiring those projects to be brought forward. So, you may have heard of projects being brought forward to the ALUC. That is the reason. Because simply the plans are out of date. We are endeavoring, as we move forward, to work with the operators to get their updated information, to incorporate that into the Plan, to work with the jurisdictions to come up with a plan that people can be comfortable with, whether it be the operator and the jurisdiction and then ultimately, we implement or adopt the Plan and turn it back over to those two entities. So, with that, we will quickly walk through the technical presentation and then we are absolutely happy to entertain any questions you may have. We look forward to continuing this dialogue and I just finally want to point out, although the comment period right now is scheduled to end April 15th, there is a second comment period related to the environmental process associated with each one of the compatibility plans, and that is later in April. With that I'll turn it over to Sunil Harmon and then he will introduce Ken Brody.

Sunil Harmon, Project Manager and Director of Airport System Planning, San Diego Regional Airport Authority: It is an ambitious project to take what has been eight antiquated plans and turn them into sixteen current plans in a period of eleven months. So, while I hear you on the issues with regards to the coordination periods, we've complied with State statutes all along in providing the adequate periods of time for review, both in the draft document as well as the environmental document. The Board took under advisement a letter from your county manager, along with others, to extend that period; requested that staff add some time. We added it to the 15th of this month. And we also have the Initial Studies that have been issued for the environmental parts of this document. They have a 30 day comment period. We don't view this Plan as a mandatory plan, as Angela has indicated. In fact, you can summarily overrule this plan and not comply with it. Our concern is that you have to ultimately strike some kind of a balance between your community development needs and the compatibility issues that drive operations around airports. We've attempted or endeavored to strike that balance, based on the data available. The AICUZ data that's been referred to is circa 1984 data. The operations levels in that document remain the same, approximately 189,000 take offs and landings. The issues with the Compatibility Plan are four fold. One, it relates primarily to noise and the quality of life issues associated with impacts due to noise on your day to day activities, your ability to enjoy the peace, use and tranquility of your dwelling. Two, more important, it addresses life safety, limb safety, and property damage,

liability. That is more significant. There are some accident potential zones (APZ's) that come out of both California Plan Land Use Handbook as well as the AICUZ plan. We've attempted to include those areas in that. There is also the issue of notification. People buy property, rent property, come back and say I never knew that this was located in an area where there would be occasional over flight or disturbances. So, we have factored in the annoyance issues associated with living and working around airports. And finally, there is another jurisdiction that governs land use. In your case, that is the military. If you were to put in temporary structures or permanent structures that would impede the arrival and departure corridors, missed approach procedures or instrument approach procedures for an airport, the military would weigh it in under their federal jurisdiction. For civilian airports, the FAA does the same thing. What we have found is that, while there have been plans in place, and there have been old plans, they really haven't been complied with. You only need to look at downtown San Diego to can see that there was a plan all along. SANDAG had jurisdiction. There was no desire to comply with that plan. Buildings were built in the approach pattern, causing the runway capacity to be diminished, extending the thresholds of the runway. Inevitably, what happens is that either you impede the operational capacity of the airport, in your case the Navy, or, on the other hand, which is worse, potentially impact the safety and well being of the populations. And that's fundamentally the purpose and need of a compatibility plan. Now, in order to complete this plan in eleven months we put together a team of seven firms, led by Mead & Hunt, Dudack and Associates, a local firm, doing the environmental work, VRPA, TAIC as well as Harris, Miller, Miller, Hanson. These folks are all very well known in the area of land use planning. In the case of Mead & Hunt, when we selected them they had done fourteen counties in California and had completed 103 airports. They are by far the most qualified firm we found. In fact, the project manager, who I am about to introduce, Ken Brody, helped write the California Planning Handbook under the firm of Shutt and Moen which was acquired by Mead & Hunt. He has been doing this for 30 some years. I have been doing land use planning for 17 years and it is hard to come up and talk to you when there is a negative stage that has been set on the onset of a presentation that says they are trying to impose this on you. Absolutely not. You cannot impose a land use plan; it's a negotiative process. With that, I'll throw it over to Ken Brody.

Ken Brody, consultant, Mead & Hunt: Thank you Sunil, members of Council. I'd like to fairly briefly go through our presentation. Some of you have seen it at one of the workshops and those who haven't we invite you to our final workshop which starts in about an hour, and that's in Chula Vista. Briefly, this presentation is one that was used at the workshops. The three major topics we discussed had to do with the role of the ALUC; we've already talked somewhat about that so I'm going to skip over most of those areas fairly quickly and talk about the draft Plan and finally about some implementation issues. I'm just going to go through some of these slides. Just to really highlight the authority of ALUC. It is a state mandated function. ALUC law came into place in the mid 1960s. As it was noted, it was only in 2002 that it became mandatory for military airports to be included in the process. Prior to that it was an optional law. In our work we have included various military airports in various other counties in the past. The two chief duties, as was pointed out, is the preparation of the Compatibility Plan and then the review process. The major limitations of the ALUC have already been discussed about the limitation over operation of the airport, no authority over existing land uses, and it is really up to the local jurisdiction in terms of the implementation. We'll talk a little bit more about that in a few minutes. Some key distinctions with master plans, it doesn't really apply here because there isn't a master plan, per se, for North Island. That is more in terms of the civilian airports. This Plan is organized into two volumes and indeed it is somewhat voluminous, but bear in mind that it covers sixteen airports,

and if you distill it down to what's really significant for the City of Coronado, it would be Chapter 2, which is the County wide policies, and then certain portions within Chapter 3 that deal specifically with the North Island facility. The second volume is merely background data supporting the overall document and not part of what is expected to be adopted per se. There are four types of compatibility concerns that the Plan addresses: noise, aircraft over flight, safety, and airspace protection, and this is quite similar to what the AICUZ study has. In looking at the various factors, and I didn't go into detail on them again, but what we have done a little different than what the AICUZ study has where it has the noise and the safety and so forth and set of criteria separately for those, we have pulled those factors together into a composite set of a half a dozen zones here, ranging from Zone A, which is right off the end of the runway and very high noise, high risk levels, out to the Zone C, which is moderate, and then out further where it diminishes beyond that. So although we've structured things differently than what the AICUZ has, we very much have paralleled what is in their plan for North Island. Here are those compatibility factors as we drew them directly out of the 1984 AICUZ. The noise contour, for example, is from AICUZ. We did extrapolate one additional contour just to get some idea of where it might be, but otherwise, this is fundamentally right from the AICUZ study as are the Accident Potential Zones (APZ's) and that's been one of the areas of concern, is down here, this portion of Zone C, is directly taken from APZ 2 that is in the 1984 AICUZ. Now, if indeed there have been some further modifications to the military flight tracks, which take virtually all aircraft farther out over water then there is that potential for further adjustment to where these zones are located. But we would definitely want to get the input from the military as to what their actual flying practice is. Then we would adjust these zones accordingly. So this overall set of factors, as we presented them here, are what were then used to end up with the final set of zones as portrayed here, with of course, the significant area that has been discussed is along the waterfront and in this area of zone B1, which again, this boundary as the previous slide had indicated is within the 65 decibel CDL contour, as well as APZ 1 as defined in the AICUZ plan. Again, the zone boundaries are taken from the AICUZ and the criteria fairly much parallel what was in that plan. Here is the set of criteria in very simplified form. I know there has been some discussion with regard to residential uses out in Zone C. Again, our intent was to not allow additional single family development in there, but given that safety is less of a concern than noise in most of that zone we were entertaining allowing multiple family, these are based on gross acreage. One comment I know is the City's policy of 28 dwelling units per net acre, which we have considered to be consistent with this criteria within portions of that area. Airspace protection, again this is directly from AICUZ, just indicating what the height limitations are as they would apply to this airport and certainly there are some variations on that, again, because these are based on standard federal regulations and there is really not significant military activity out of the top of SDIA, for example.

Mr. Brody: Getting on to the implementation which I think is really the key thing here. As we've said, the implementation of this Plan ultimately rests with the individual local jurisdictions. This is by State law. When ALUCs first came into place, for a few years it was required that everything come to ALUCs. That quickly was recognized to be untenable. The law was changed to put the emphasis on having general plans become consistent with the compatibility plans. Those are the two real key requirements of local jurisdictions – to make general plans consistent, and to submit certain actions by changing the general plan. So, very simply, the county and each of its cities must modify its general plan to be consistent with the compatibility plan or take the certain steps to overrule the Airport Land Use action. Those are spelled out in the State law. Existing land uses are not considered in that process, because, again, the ALUC has no jurisdiction over existing land uses. So, if there is something in your General Plan Land Use Map that is

merely reflecting what your current development is and there is no expectation to intensify that development, then, by law that is the consistent use for the purposes of this land. It is basically exempt, if you will. In terms of implementation, the other portion of it is submittal of projects. As I said, certain things are defined by State law that always must come to the ALUC including general plan and specific plan amendments, zoning amendments; but master plan doesn't pertain here. Other actions we list as major land use actions. Those, whether they would be referred to the ALUC, depends on the status of your general plan consistency. Once you have basically internalized the criteria or have overruled the ALUC then any of these major actions we would consider and request that they be submitted, just on a voluntary, advisory basis, just as you would maybe to a neighboring jurisdiction or to the Navy. That basically is basically a summary of what I wanted to present. Certainly, at this point, would entertain your questions.

Mayor Smisek: Thank you. I do have a couple questions. I think, I apologize for us appearing hostile from the get-go. I think it is because of the short views on when we received the document. You read documents and when you do that, sometimes you skip over certain parts of it. Some of the questions I believe, that would give us much more of a comfort level would be, for instance, the discussion about the City Council overruling the decision by the land use commission to incorporate some restriction in a document. You say that's embedded in State law. And so, by you providing this document and with that piece of information in there, we can be pretty well assured that the State is not going to say, "Oh no, that doesn't apply, this new land use commission requirement supersedes your ability to not comply with this." Has this been tested in courts that city councils have been able to overrule the land use commission determinations?

Mr. Brody: There are very specific requirements that are in the law, but the most particular one is that you have to establish findings that say, the ALUC's plan notwithstanding, what you are doing is consistent with the basic purposes of the State law that establishes the requirements for a compatibility plan. That is the first and foremost one – the detailed findings. In one poor case some years ago, a local jurisdiction did not list specific findings and they were challenged in court and indeed they were found in violation of the law and had to proceed to redo their action basically, or to change their plan. It also requires notification to the State Division of Aeronautics and the ALUC, a public hearing and a two-thirds vote of the council to overrule the ALUC. So, it is not just a simple, "well we want to change it." You do have to take certain actions but it is within your power to do so.

Mayor Smisek: I think our general concern is that we have, we are a pretty well built out community. We have zones that state, we call them R1-A, which means you can have one home on it, which are the ones that are closest to the airport area, which are those R1-A zones, with the exception of the Hotel and a couple of other ones. Our concern is that here, in the last three or four years, we have been seeing a lot of the older, small homes being purchased and scraped and a new, larger home, because of the excessive cost of the dirt, the people feel they need a bigger home for instance. We are going through a very intensive process right now to kind of change our rules to control how big those homes are. In my mind, if we are built out and we have an existing condition, like you said up there, that even though it is single family and if at those close in zones something should happen to that house that it could be replaced and maybe even a larger one, but it is still only one house on one piece of land. Now we have something called an R1-B which allows two homes on a piece of property. Many of those only have one currently, but they are zoned for two. That would be the other question; would they still be able to build two on those because that is the way it is currently zoned and that has been in our general and master planning,

how we wanted to divide up our population; where we have our multi family homes and where we have the single family homes. And we had this discussion during the Navy's AICUZ, when they reviewed their AICUZ just in the '90s. They took the '84 document again and reviewed it to see if they needed to update it. That one, the determination was really made because how AICUZ works, that here we are, we're here, we're not really changing anything that much. Can we feel comfortable that we are going to be able to have that same feeling and control of the situation?

Mr. Brody: I think there are three points there. First of all, the policies and the plan specifically allow a single family dwelling or reconstruction of that dwelling on any legal lot of record. It also would allow a secondary unit, as defined in state law for any type unit, to be built on such parcels. I don't know whether you are talking about your duplexes, where a second larger unit, as the policy is currently written, in some zones that would not be permitted. But, straight single family or a secondary unit would, with the exception of the clear zone, which is right off the end of the runway, and as defined by the military policies. There we are actually looking in general at a mechanism where by, our general feeling is that those areas ought to be controlled by the airport because this is close to the end of the runway. If airports choose not to, then we need to have some sort of way out that would allow certain uses to continue or be built in those areas where it is privately owned lands. With regard to those issues I hope that helps clarify. I wanted to speak a little bit about AICUZ and I'm sure you are aware of this anyway, but the whole AICUZ process as you know is strictly advisory because the federal government has no authority over local land use. So again, the whole purpose of State law and the requirements of compatibility planning for military airports, and it is required that we be consistent with what is in the AICUZ. We don't have to be identical, but we have to have the same basic as level of compatibility. That is what we have really strived to achieve here. In looking through the comments that the City staff has provided, it seemed like there were a few that were a matter of clarifying what the intent was, would resolve the issues. There are some others with regard to the flight path and so forth the military is using, that if we get input from the military that says that things are indeed somewhat different or they are willing to live with something different that certainly would open the opportunity for some additional changes. So beyond that, we were really feeling that there weren't a whole lot of conflicts, at least that was our feeling when we were developing this plan. I would like to mention, although there was that gap in between, we did meet with your planning staff back when this project was started last July. Because of the overall schedule, adopting by June, there wasn't a lot of opportunity for further input along the way, and unless we had something for you to react to we felt that is was going to be rather difficult for input anyway. It is always a sort of a balancing act between just plunge ahead, get a document out on the street and then change it, or try to have a lot of interaction. In this case we felt we needed to get something else so there would be the opportunity to react and modify it.

Mayor Smisek: I think, again, our primary concern is that we have a pretty set standard of zoning established and it's in conformance with our General Plan. We have looked at the AICUZ in the past relative to our General Plan and I think that we are in pretty good compatibility. The problem that you address, though, are probably some of the prime real estate that's on the ocean in the City. There is no doubt my mind that we would use every avenue we have to modify the ability for those people to rebuild, or to take their homes down and put new homes there. Not that they would increase intensity, because believe it or not, they have already voluntarily voted to eliminate most of their lot splitting in that whole general area that you are talking about. But they have built substantially new homes there because those are the largest lots in Coronado that are available to build nice homes. I think it would really be a travesty to restrict that prime real estate right there

based on the idea of it being a safety concern. Because all of those who live under the flight path know what happened back in the late 70's. It is something that could happen. We all know that. The chances are extremely slim. But again, our concern really is we want to make sure that we have a good, legal leg up on this whole thing, that we can make that final determination. We try to be as compatible, like Tony said, we work with the Navy on a daily basis and we work together on these things.

Mr. Brody: I understand your concerns. I think I can speak as the consultant, we would definitely like to, within the time constraints we have, to continue to work with your staff and to try to resolve issues. Our approach, in general, having done well over 100 airports around the State over 20 some years, is we want to end up with something that you can live with, the ALUC can live with, the airport operator can live with. It may not be the perfect plan for everyone, but that's better than you having to go through an overruling process and then nobody really comes out ahead on that. We frankly feel that it is pretty close. And with some fine tuning we think that something should be able to be workable for your city.

Mayor Smisek: That would definitely be our objective.

Councilmember Tierney: As you can see, the public can't see this, we happen to be the only community that is totally within this reserve that has been set aside. At some point, a quarter of the community here, roughly, is in a constrained area. I would like to ask you this question: what sort of environmental impact study is being done by you relative to this plan?

Mr. Brody: There is an Initial Study that is currently being circulated. Given the analysis that was done and my comments that we really felt that we are pretty close in terms of what the impacts would be and what the policies would be, the expectation is that a negative declaration would be the final determination. Our emphasis, really, is to work with you and come up with a plan that is going to be mutually agreeable.

Mr. Tierney: I would say that you are way off base with the negative study, way off base. The impacts of this plan, what you are saying now is hey, it is like a piece of clay. It is very soft now. But give it a few weeks and it hardens, and before you know it, it wasn't negative; it became mandatory. That makes it, as far as I'm concerned, a major environmental impact study, which has to be done. And I think you'll be challenged at some point. I think this is an effort by the way, I don't want to speak out of turn, but I think this is an effort by your group to move very quickly and ramrod this thing through to the detriment. You're not going to be around. You are going to be out of here basically. You are going to leave us to live here within this zone to swim, and I think we are going to be swimming in a lot of soup. What effort did you make in terms of having a workshop over here? None. There were workshops; you had them in San Diego. This community is the only community that's within the zone, entirely, and you had no workshop. This reflects very poorly on your group. This is the only community that is within this problem area, almost entirely, and no workshop. This community deserves a workshop. Where were you? You were dancing with another girlfriend over in San Diego and that girlfriend has limited losses in terms of this plan. This community has major impacts by this plan. I'd suggest, before you ramrod this thing any further, that you establish a workshop, and very quickly, over here. Failure to do this means that you don't really give a damn about how this community feels. And I echo what our civil servants have said – the Airport Authority has created a vacuum and you've

slithered right in. And I think that we need that closer communication. It is about time you started looking in this direction.

Councilmember Downey: I have a laundry list of questions and I understand that you are trying to do your job, but I need to let you know that I do your job; I am an environmental attorney. I hold public meetings all the time. So I am going to put on the record; this is a public record. We are making a transcript. I would request, that since we did not have any consultation as required between our entity and the Airport Authority, that the transcript of this, my comments, any public comments here, are then going to be put into the public comments for your sector, because this is as close as we get to consultation. My first question is when did the Airport Authority build the compatibility plan for North Island. I understand that supposedly a year ago July something happened and I am asking was that just the general compatibility that started working or did you start working on North Island, and therefore, Coronado, in July of last year.

Mr. Brody: The whole project got underway in July of last year. We went to each of the affected jurisdictions and staffs including yours.

Ms. Downey: July of 2004. As I understand it, I have from the environmental document; page A-41, that it was in 2001 that the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority's responsibility for planning for San Diego was enacted. So in 2001 the Airport Authority was assembled and it would appear your obligation to do this, except for the military, I understand it happened in 2002, but in 2001 you should have started working on Lindbergh and all the other civilian ones. I guess I'm questioning why that didn't happen.

Ms. Shafer-Payne: In 2001 the Act was created by the State legislature. It went into effect January of 2002. March 15, of 2002 the responsibility for land use changed from SANDAG to the Authority. The Authority came into being on January 1, 2003 as an independent agency. In 2003 we did an amendment to the existing compatibility plans. An annual amendment allowed for under State Law that was adopted by the Board in September 2004. Mr. Brody is correct that we started this process in July of last year and again, specifically to address your question about when was the North Island compatibility plan put together, in December, December 28th I believe, of 2004 we received the information from the Department of the Navy in relationship to AICUZ to be able to incorporate that into a plan which was then released for draft in March.

Ms. Downey: OK. When did the Airport Authority first meet with representatives from the City of San Diego to look at their plan?

Ms. Shafer-Payne: The City of San Diego, being involved in both SDIA as the jurisdiction and then also owning and operating two airports, Montgomery and Brown, they were brought into the discussion. They were actively involved in the amendment that took place and was adopted in 2004, provided comments, and in November of 2004 we shared with them. Again, being the operator of SDIA, we had just completed a forecast. We had just completed our information for SDIA to be incorporated into the Plan. We brought them in in November to provide them with the noise contours and then as the Plan was developed and provided them, I believe their first preliminary draft in late January for the SDIA plan.

Ms. Downey: Actually that is what brings me to the question. They had a preliminary draft of their noise contours. On page 3-28, under their section, it talked about compatibility zone factors

and I read, “The compatibility factors listed in Table 3 as the basis for the delineation of the compatibility zones for other airports addressed by this plan do not apply to the San Diego International Airport.” Instead, the factors described below are used to facilitate implementation the resulting boundaries as shown on Map SAN-1 are adjusted where possible to follow nearby roads or graphic features rather than the calculated noise contour or other aeronautically based line.” It would appear to me that once you provide the draft you all worked together and sat down with your maps and said, “You know what, it doesn’t make sense. We’ll move it over here just slightly so that it actually makes sense for planning purposes.” Is that what happened when you exchanged these plans?

Mr. Brody: In actuality, staff, our Authority staff proposed the delineation following roads where possible and trying not to dissect parcels of land. As we were noticing, one of the issues we recognized since becoming a land use commission is that is an issue with compatibility plans now. We divide parcels of property, which makes it more difficult to then analyze a project as they are being brought forward. But actually the Authority staff proposed those changes once the noise contours were developed. That is actually something that we have encouraged other jurisdictions – that they provide forecast noise contours to incorporate into their plan. The Authority Board wears two hats, which is somewhat unique, although we are not entirely alone in the State of California in that they are the Airport Land Use Commission for the County and they turn the hat around and they are the operator of SDIA. So, staff is the operator of SDIA and also the Land Use Commission staff. We had the opportunity once the forecast was developed, we could then develop the noise contours to present them in such a way that they followed, as I mentioned, roads and such, trying to get away from the issue. But we would encourage all operators and jurisdictions to propose similar proposals trying to eliminate that issue. We as staff don’t want to impose upon another operator, another jurisdiction, where we think that line should be. Obviously there is some discretion that needs to be played as when you look at the noise contours and they are just very broadly drawn. You need to have that input from the jurisdiction or the operator to say, “You know what, the 65, or the zone should fall here.” And that’s the type of thing we are seeking. We do not want to impose our opinion on that for their airports.

Ms. Downey: I would applaud that, but I guess the question is, everybody started working on San Diego some time ago. I have looked at a map. I have yet to see...I have in front of me your CD’s which I got, and we will talk about why I didn’t get paper copy, but that’s okay. Right now we are talking about the CD’s. Even looking at that map on there, and the ones that are up on that board, and at the presentation I was at a couple of weeks ago, you are right – you can’t tell where the line goes for the zone. So the maps aren’t detailed enough to do that. The problem is my staff here, everybody, is going to have to come up with exactly those lines in a span of what was supposed to be four days from now, which is obviously not realistic. And the problem is, I will recommend, and I will tell you right now I will work extremely hard to encourage us to overrule this and to adopt our own which will be commensurate with the right findings and to suggest that it is appropriate and we will work with the Navy to do that. But, we don’t have time. I want to make it clear, that is exactly what we need to be doing and you didn’t give anybody time to do that. The next question is besides that July meeting, I guess you invited representatives from all the cities affected in July? So we received notice of some kind to be there in July? Would everybody have been invited to those meetings?

Mr. Brody: Are you referring to the meetings of last July?

Ms. Downey: Whatever would have been the first peek to the world that you were doing this.

Mr. Brody: As consultants and with some of the ALUC staff, we had individual meetings with the primarily affected jurisdictions at the staff level.

Ms. Downey: Okay. After that were there subsequent meetings? It appears in the document, and maybe it's not true, but you had subsequent meetings with just representatives from the City of San Diego alone. Did that happen?

Mr. Brody: There were meetings with the City of San Diego. There was various, if not meetings, at least follow up conversations as needed, and information exchanged with various jurisdictions mostly to try to obtain additional input during the course of the plan development. But there was not a product for you to look at until the draft prior to this time.

Ms. Downey: I am more about process than the product, because we don't like the product, so we'll deal with that later, but I would like to know about the process. From what I understand then, the City of San Diego didn't receive their copy either until December or January, or somewhere thereabouts, so that all the drafts were done about that timeframe, December 2004? Do I have the right timeframe? Have meetings or workshops, for lack of a better word, been held with any other city besides San Diego, prior to the release of the draft report in March?

Mr. Brody: In terms of public workshops?

Ms. Downey: Well, your ... statute, well, we'll get to the statutes, but the statute suggested there should have been some consultation with the jurisdictions before these plans were put out. I'm trying to figure out what consultation occurred and with whom did it occur?

Mr. Brody: Consultation prior to when the plan is adopted, and we feel that this meeting is consultation.

Ms. Downey: I thought you might. I want to clarify that.

Mr. Brody: One of the mechanisms of that, I mean certainly we would continue to be meeting with your staff.....

Ms. Downey: I appreciate that and that's why I am giving you..., and we are going to take the time for me to get through all of this today, because apparently it's the only consultation I've been aware of that I could participate in, but I just want to clarify what happened with other people prior to this because it appears to me, and I have to warn you, you've raised a red flag over here when you said only negative declaration. In Coronado you get sued when you do that. We can't get away with that here, so I'm trying to make sure the record is clear that you probably did do consultations. So I want to get on the record what consultation happened and you know.

Ms. Shafer-Pane: I think not following, not speaking of the definition of consultation under environmental under CEQA, we did have meetings with all of the operators to obviously solicit their information during the process. We didn't get their information off of a website; they had to provide us with all that information. We did have meetings, numerous meetings between July and when the draft plans were released with each one of the airport operators, whether that be the Department of the Navy, Department of Defense, whoever it may be to provide us that

information. I'll let Ken provide additional follow up on the environmental process. I just want to bring up the point that, I'm not sure if Ken raised it or if maybe it wasn't clear, when our general counsel and our attorneys and environmental specialists under this process have looked at it, if I can, because I'm not an attorney and I'm not an expert on environmental, the easiest way for me to explain it is because ultimately we do not have land use jurisdiction. This is a plan that can be overruled by jurisdictions. It is then, when we develop our environmental process, that we keep that in mind as we move this forward. I don't know if that helps clarify anything...

Ms. Downey: It does, a great deal and I have to tell you, had we had the appropriate time to respond to this in the planning process I would agree with you, environmentally a neg. dec. would be the way to go. But you've just told us we get our comment period when we do the environmental review, but if you're doing a neg. dec. we're not having the full EIR/EIS comment period. So, unfortunately, you've boxed us in and we are going to have no choice but to pursue action environmentally, and I'll be happy to do that if we have to. But I don't want to go there. I hate, and this community knows, I hate using environmental statutes to get to what you should have done the right way the first time. So, we'll try to avoid that.

Ms. Downey: Now this may solve our problem. I think I have found a way to fix it and we can work together. Here is the difference that I see in the way the AICUZ plan worked and the way this plan works. You've mentioned, and I understand that it was probably easier to do, to take the AICUZ plan that existed and looked at where they talked about noise contours, versus APZ. Now let's make sure that the world understands. The Accident Potential Zone is what we are concerned about. We do not want buildings in the APZ, and nobody here wants to be in the APZ. But there is a difference between safety concerns building in the APZ and telling me I can't have my school, which by the way is in C right now because of noise issues. Our community may have issues about putting it on our deeds, and we'll have to deal with that as a council how we are going to do that, but there is a big difference. When you talked about that you took the AICUZ lines and studies how they'd already done that, right or wrong from '84, then I think the words you used were you "combined things" to make it easier. You pulled noise and risk level together. So what I'm trying to figure out is, the requirements in each zone that says what you can and cannot do, what's discouraged or not, should have been based on risk level; should have been the risk of crash as opposed to noise impacts. I'm trying to figure out and, I couldn't tell in the document, and I'm probably the only person in this room besides yourselves that have read the whole thing, I couldn't find in there anywhere that when it told me I couldn't have a hospital or I couldn't have a school in that zone it was because of the risk level. Because I can tell you our hospital isn't in the risk level from an APZ point of view – it is a noise issue. So, is that what happened when the new plans came out? When we put them together, which makes sense, it merely was based on noise contours more than the risk level contours?

Ms. Shafer-Payne: I'll let Ken address that, I think, let me just quickly remark that, in the state handbook, the guidelines allow for that combination. So I'll let Ken address specifically how that was put together.

Ms. Downey: I understand that. I'm just trying to figure out from this document and I couldn't tell from the document.

Mr. Brody: Clearly, I don't think we could rate noise over safety or vice versa, and depending on the community, each one is the predominant concern. Yes, we did do a composite within one of

the zones. It's a combination of both the APZs and the 65 Contour. In general, certain types of uses are not considered appropriate, even within a 65 contour level. Without going into details of where all the particular development is, yes, there is the potential that maybe we've ruled out something that you feel, based on AICUZ guidelines and so forth, ought to be considered acceptable. As was in one of the staff comments, we do have a section blank at the moment that's in the Plan that allows specifically for sort of fine tuning policies if you will. We had exactly that kind of situation in one airport where it dealt with their hospital that was in one zone. We came up with a compromise, and in that particular case it was the hospital would never be more than two stories tall. Just something that would mitigate the potential risk in that area, but still made it achievable for that use to continue and expand as needed. So those are the site specific types of things that we've built in the mechanism for those to be addressed and hope that we can do that.

Ms. Downey: That's exactly where I wanted to go. Because when we were at the meeting two weeks ago, that's what I thought we could do; we could come up with our site specifics. But then when I got back here and I talked to staff I was told, no, only if I get it to you in the next eight days, and by the way I have to state the different State provisions, which I have, in the Airport Handbook that says I can do that. I can't do that in eight days. So I guess my question is how do I go about, or does our community community, I'm just saying "I", go about getting this information such that we can do that and then have a plan we could adopt here and not have to override?

Mr. Brody: I think that the easiest way to answer that is to... we've received preliminary comments from City staff. We would like to continue to do so. We are meeting with our committee of our Board next week to address and identify some of the issues. We would like to present an outline to them with as many of these issues as possible. It is ultimately up to the Board to provide us the policy guidance as to how we move this forward. But I think we certainly have an understanding, and a better understanding today, of the direction Coronado would like to see this go. I think as I mentioned at the workshop we would like to get those comments in writing, pass them on to our board, and have them provide us direction. And, recognizing that when we put together the plans outside of county wide policy section, they are separate and distinct plans, so that we do have the ability, we hope, for airports where we don't have issues that need to continue to be resolved. We can move those airports forward and adopt those plans. It is our goal as staff, and it has to be the goal of staff to try to get this done by June 30th. But I also have a responsibility to report to our board on any and all of the jurisdiction and/or operators' concerns or comments with this process as we move forward. I would like to continue to receive that input and your thoughts. Next week is certainly not the first and the last time that we will be having this discussion with their Board over the next couple of months.

Mr. Tierney: Will we be having a workshop in the community. Can the community rely on...

Mayor Smisek: Mr. Tierney...

Ms. Downey: Three more questions. The one thing you've talked about and I think you've answered my question but I just want to clarify. If our community proposed the change in the actual..., and we'll go through separately doing high risk versus noise impact, change to the contours based on the fact, as Mr. Tierney pointed out that our community is in there, so we wouldn't be able to have the schools and the hospital, such that it would allow us to do what we

need to do; is that the kind of input that you can see making into the plan so that when the plan comes out it will reflect what we've put in there?

Mr. Brody: It is absolutely. I just don't want to leave out the other player in this plan, which is, of course, the Navy and their input into this process.

Ms. Downey: One other question. One of the requirements under Section 21675, Land Use Plan from the Planning and Zoning Law Government Code, that you very nicely, and I appreciate you providing that in the draft, by the way in the document, it was very helpful having all the requisite statutes in there. It discussed that each group shall formulate an airport land use compatibility plan that will provide for the orderly growth of each public airport, which I understand what you are doing, and the areas surrounding the airport. And part of the problem is you pointed out we are a completely developed city. So, in order to have your plan help us figure out how to develop, it appears that it doesn't do that, or at least I couldn't see anywhere in here, other than telling folks, "you don't want to put a big development over here because it's in your landing zone." How did this plan do that for Coronado? I didn't see that in there.

Ms. Shafer-Payne: I think this is a situation where not having a past compatibility plan ever for this air installation and this jurisdiction, relying on an AICUZ that is out of date, and maybe it's the same information, and we would love to find out if there is any additional information, that's where there has to be some conversation and some give and take between what it is, what your development needs are going forward, what the Navy is comfortable with, what we ultimately then put in the Plan. What we want to put in the Plan is what the airport operator, the Navy, the jurisdiction, being the City of Coronado, is comfortable with and can live with. So, in this instance, we did not apply as we didn't in any of the airports outside of SDIA, our professional opinion, or any judgment, after receiving comments from the Navy, we just simply put it into plans as we did with all airports. Now what we're working on in these compatibility plans is receiving that input, saying that this doesn't work. We have a situation with one of the county airports where they have expressed to us that they want to see some changes and we are sitting down and working with them and trying to work through that and make those things possible as they go forward. We didn't apply any judgment, therefore it is just the AICUZ that is put in the compatibility plan.

Ms. Downey: Do you happen to know, or can I ask at a later date if you don't know it off the top of your head, can we get a copy of whatever it is the Navy submitted that ultimately wound up becoming this map?

Ms. Shafer-Payne: Yes.

Ms. Downey: I have nothing further Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Smisek: Thank you. Mr. Monroe.

Councilmember Monroe: (First comments were muffled due to the microphone being off.)

Ms. Shafer Payne: We are. We are a small staff and we have one person down there right now who's going to start it for us.

Mr. Monroe: Should we keep going, or should we honor the (time certain to follow). I'll probably be five minutes, but....

Ms. Shafer Payne: We will send two of our staff members, Ken Brody and myself, will stay to continue to answer questions.

Mr. Monroe: Thank you. First of all, I really hope we save the tape of this meeting. I heard you before and I love your talks. You have no authority over existing land use. You can't impose. You just sit. You want us to be comfortable and something we can live with. Then you have a little statement that says that after this is all done, you go back and you have to make your general plans consistent with our compatibility plan. Oh, well wait a minute. You come up with a plan and I've got to change my general plan to be compatible with your plan, or I have to come up with findings that can be argued with and if, in fact, I don't adhere to your plan, when we want to do something over here in terms of development, like the Del development, if we are not, if we have overridden your plan we have to keep going back to you and interact with you. It's just not as soft as you're describing it. I love the language, but this is not a love in. At the end you've got a great big stick and you can whoop Coronado. That worries me. We've only shown a little bit. I think you are usually very authentic and I'm not sure you are being too authentic with us today.

Ms. Shafer-Payne: I would like to certainly respond to that in that we are following the State guidelines.

Mr. Monroe: I understand that.

Ms. Shafer-Payne: The State guidelines tell us that, at the end of the day, as the ALUC, any jurisdiction can overrule what is in the Compatibility Plan. As I stand here today and, I think, as I spoke to one of your planners earlier, when called and asked the question, what are specific findings. I cannot define that. I'm not an attorney and I'm not familiar with past case law as to what other jurisdictions have had to put into play to overrule the ALUC. But I can stand here today in saying that we were given a job to put together plans within a short period of time. I would not be responsible staff, to my Board, if I didn't go back and tell them that we have issues that are being expressed by jurisdictions; there are time constraints that they are concerned about, and are seeking the Board's policy direction as how they would like us to deal with that. I'm simply providing you information directly out of the handbook.

Mr. Monroe: I understand that. That doesn't make me comfortable with something I can live with that seems to be one of your goals but certainly not the state mandate.

Mr. Brody: I can expand upon that a little bit. I certainly wasn't intending to be facetious in terms of bringing up the overruling process.

Mr. Monroe: I didn't use "facetious".

Mr. Brody: No, it was my word. I wasn't intending to come across in that manner. Our goal, as consultants, in the many times we have gone through this process, is to work very hard to come up with a plan that is acceptable to you and therefore it's an easy matter for you to then, yes, you may need to make some of the changes to your policies, but to the extent that a large part of the city is really already developed and you are only talking about some potential redevelopment in some

areas; there is not a lot of flexibility that this whole process has. I don't mean flexibility from the aeronautical side, I mean really from what it can accomplish in terms of achieving compatible land uses. The uses exist. Therefore, we are not out to create a huge amount of non-conforming use and so forth. We would rather make some adjustments that reflect what your development status is and recognize where you may have some redevelopment in mind. As long as it's not totally off the charts in terms of what might be considered compatible development, we think there is a lot of flexibility in that aspect of it.

Mr. Monroe: I appreciate that, but as the Mayor said, R1-B, the use may exist but the actual houses on the ground may not exist today. So the question again comes up, could a house be built on the ground in that zone?

Mr. Brody: Yes.

Mr. Monroe: The use exists in our zoning, but the reality is we have a \$350 million development program with the Del in that very critical zone. We need to know as a council in working with you, what about that agreement? I had an initial question, or answer from you before but this map looks different from what I saw in Mission Valley. Did you change the C zone in Coronado?

Ms. Shafer Payne: No. We have not made any modifications to any of our zones.

Mr. Monroe: There were a lot more colors. I can't actually tell what is over on this side, if that is the D Zone or the C Zone? It really looks different from the one I had in Mission Valley.

Ms. Shafer Payne: There are several different compatibility maps for each one of the airports, all trying to highlight...

Mr. Monroe: My other comment is that North Island gave you an AICUZ study from 1984. Is that what you said?

Mr. Brody: Yes.

Mr. Monroe: I understand, but did anybody ask them, is that relevant today? Because, in 1999 we worked with them to change the flight path. It is 9 degrees off the runway now; comes over the lifeguard tower, turns.... Helicopters, we finally discovered they don't need to come up straight. They can come in like this and land. They don't need a long runway. So except for IFR conditions, everybody is off the beach for most of it. On weekends 18 and 36 is used for all the weekend traffic unless they are servicing runways or something like that. There are huge changes to this.

Ms. Shafer-Payne: We have not received those changes. We have asked all of the jurisdictions, or operators rather, and that is why we kicked it off last July. We need all the current information. In some instances operators were in the middle of airport master plan updates, forecast updates, so it just depended on that particular operator.

Mr. Monroe: I think we really need to make sure of what North Island information you have. You did site the number of operations per year still, so that may be current, but certainly the flight path has been changed. My last comment, and I guess it is facetious, is that a lot of the safety

information or the safety that you want to impose assumes that airplanes are going to crash. And you don't want to have a lot of people near there. It seems like the airlines have figured out they don't think they are going to crash and they run up to 500 people in an airplane. If they believe that airplanes are going to crash you wouldn't have more than thirty people in an airplane; to go along with your theory that you are trying to impose through the study. So, it is a facetious comment, but when we talk about 500 people in airplanes, they are saying that we don't think they are going to crash and yet you are imposing on the entire City of Coronado some restrictions based on the fact that you think they are going to crash.

Ms. Shafer Payne: Actually, and I just want to comment on that. That is, again, not our opinion; it is what we are following in the State handbook and the guidelines.

Councilmember Tanaka: I guess I'll be very quick. I think when someone asked you earlier about whether you drew your zones based on noise rather than accident potential; I don't really feel like you answered that. Maybe I am just not technical enough. But, it is important to me that if it were drawn, partially on noise, then we need time to look at that and to help redraw those lines. And that leads to my only other comment. It should be really loud and clear that we haven't had enough time to go through this, that this isn't a small document. Obviously it has dramatic significance for the City of Coronado and its residents. And I don't mean to be facetious either, but you've had since last July to hire your consultant and to do this. We are at the point where we don't necessarily have the technical expertise in a lot of this. We haven't even had time to hire a consultant and we feel like we are under the gun. Even if you extended the deadline from the Ninth to the Fifteenth, even if it was, if you met our request for the May 31. I just hope you understand that we, as a jurisdiction, we do need more time. And that it is seemingly ludicrous to us to expect us to really have thoughtful answers in such short a time. I hate to use the word ludicrous. But again, that is how dramatic the effects are on us. And the less time we have to really understand this and get help as we need it, then the less seriously we are going to take you in terms of having an honest process that gives us time to comment. So, I do get the impression that you understand that and are going to pass that on to your board. But obviously if your board doesn't extend that, and does expect substantial comments by May 15 or 30, you could, I hope, understand our frustration that we really haven't had enough time to examine your work thoroughly, especially if it took you nine months or eleven months to put it together and you expect us to digest it in one or two months. I just think that is entirely unrealistic.

Ms. Shafer-Payne: First, the zones, you are correct. They are a combination of both the safety and the noise to arrive at the zones. And, second, I don't want to go back and certainly prolong the discussion on the process. We were wholly reliant on when the airport operators provided us their data before we could begin development of the plans.

Mayor Smisek: Are there any comments from the public at this point? Please go to the microphone; give us your name and address, and hopefully limit your comments to about three minutes.

Dominique Cano-Stocco, 474 D Avenue: My question, and you guys might know it is - Who is on the Board? Are they statewide or countywide or neither?

Ms. Shafer-Payne: I can address that. The Board is made up of six regional representatives. I'm sorry, a total of a nine member board: six regional representatives, three representatives are

appointed - one by the Governor, one by the Sheriff of San Diego, and one by the Mayor of San Diego. The remaining Board members are appointed either by, one is actually the Mayor of San Diego's seat on the board or a designee. There is a second Mayor of San Diego appointment who is a private citizen. The we have most populous city, East County, the most populous city in the north county, most populous city in the south county, most populous city in north inland and along the coastal cities. The representative for Coronado, as I understand it, is also the representative that was appointed by the mayor of Chula Vista, Paul Nieto.

Mayor Smisek: Any other comments? Thank you. I think we've kind of gone through all of our concerns. My own personal feeling is the best plan of attack here is for us to have an extremely active dialogue in the next two weeks with the Land Use Commission and see how well we do there with the objective that if we aren't satisfied with the results that we get we would take some other action. And go from the extreme of legal action to actually using our assembly placeholder bill, which we have in place up there. But, I would like to go with the idea of the benefit of the doubt and to work with the Land Use Commission, express our concerns at staff, and I would be happy to participate in some manner just because of my aviation background, my AICUZ background, working with the Navy. I also would make the gesture to the Navy with Captain Alexander to get a representative from them to work with us and our staff so that we are all working together so that you will have the input both from the operator and from the community and see if we can iron this out. I agree with you that I think that a lot of the AICUZ stuff we are already very familiar with. We've worked with that for years. It's just been an advisory thing and we've kind of disregarded it, and just gone along with our General Plan and worked in that fashion. But if we can make those two compatible, all the better, and then we are all on the same page and working together. I think that would be much more productive than in an adversarial relationship But believe me I can tell by listening to the council here that they are ready to go to war if they have to. So, I hope that we can avoid that. I'd like to see a recommendation for, on page 137, for item 1 and item 3 at this time, and hold off on CEQA until we find out a little more information and we can press on with that because we will have the period of time for the Initial Study comment period, but if we believe that we need a full environmental impact report that we could advise at that time to do that.

MSUC (Tanaka/Smisek) moved that on numbers 1 and 3 of the staff recommendation that the City Council authorize that a letter be sent to the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority that: incorporates the City's concerns, issues and recommended Plan changes detailed in this staff report; and, requests that Coronado be given more time to review the Plan and to consult with Authority representatives to facilitate the development of a more appropriate draft Plan for Coronado

AYES: Downey, Monroe, Tanaka, Tierney and Smisek
NAYS: None
ABSENT: None

The City Council went into recess at 5:15 p.m.

The City Council reconvened at 6:10 p.m.

11c. Approval of the Formation of a Tennis Advisory Committee Per the Tennis Professional/Manager Agreement for Services. Linda Rahn, Recreation Director, explained that the Recreation Department is requesting approval to form a Tennis Advisory Committee to clear the contract with the current tennis pro, Mr. Phil Hopkins, which is March 1, 2004 through August 30, 2005. The contract indicates that, in order for Mr. Hopkins' contract to be extended, he has to meet several criteria. One of those is evaluation by a Tennis Advisory Committee. This committee can be a standing committee, much like the Golf Committee. It can be an ad hoc committee to do this evaluation. It can be appointed by the City Council or Council may direct that this be appointed by the Park and Recreation Board.

Mayor Smisek thinks that because Council imposed the requirement for the evaluation period, it would be appropriate that Council choose the committee. His recommendation is for an ad hoc committee at this time because the City doesn't have standing committees for swimming pools, etc. The only real reason there is one for the Golf Course is because it is an enterprise fund. Ms. Rahn commented that one member went on to do that position, if so appointed. Others would certainly be welcome. One did indicate the desire to serve.

Discussion continued about the make up and size of the committee. There was a suggestion that there be one representative from each group to create a more manageable size committee with equitable distribution and an odd number. The committee would consist of one representative from the City Council, one from the CTA, one from the City Manager's office, one from the Parks and Recreation Board, and the Director would be the chair. Councilmember Monroe was recommended from City Council. Consensus was that it should be an ad hoc committee.

Councilmember Monroe commented that there has been a lot of email traffic about this subject.

Ms. Rahn explained that a group of the CTA is very vocal about sharing their views about tennis, enough so that it would tend to make one think that view point is predominant. She would like to see the interest of all tennis players be represented. An advisory committee would certainly be helpful, especially one where all views are expressed.

MSUC (Tierney/Tanaka) moved that the City Council approve the formation of a Tennis Advisory Committee per the Tennis Professional/Manager Agreement for Services. The committee will be an ad hoc committee with one representative from the City Council, the Parks and Recreation Board, the City Manager's office and the Coronado Tennis Association. The Recreation Director will serve as the chair. Councilmember Monroe will be the City Council representative to the Tennis Advisory Committee

AYES: Downey, Monroe, Tanaka, Tierney and Smisek
NAYS: None
ABSENT: None

11d. Acceptance of Major Traffic Study Report and Recommendation to Pursue Future Implementations.

Ed Walton, Principal Engineer, Engineering and Project Development, introduced the Major Traffic Study Report. The issue before Council is to accept the Major Traffic Study that has recently been completed and to direct staff on any of the recommendations it wishes staff to move forward with. As part of the Major Traffic Study there were four main components to it. The first one was collecting data to know exactly what traffic conditions there are: quantified volumes; turning movements. In July 2003 the City's consultant went out and did a series of traffic counts. Probably 90 locations throughout the City were simultaneously counted so that there could be a good snapshot of what traffic was at that point. The second thing that was done was to look at short term forecasts. The consultant worked with SANDAG on the Regional Traffic Model to get estimated growth and work with known development, for example, the Hotel Del and their master plan has traffic impacts that are somewhat known. The model then identified levels of service and problem areas. Lastly, and most importantly, the Study makes recommendations on how to relieve some of the congestion that the City is experiencing.

Darrin Henderson, consultant, Parsons, Brinckerhoff, Quade & Douglas, gave a Powerpoint presentation. He reviewed the primary objectives for doing the Study. It was done to try to quantify what is out there today and establish a relatively robust database; to create an evaluation tool for trying to analyze what that all means; developing short term forecasts; looking at solutions to deal with the problems that were identified; and, to use this as a basis for developing ongoing programs so that in the future the City has a tool to use to analyze things and sort of track changes over time. In August of last year he was before Council and there was a lengthy discussion on the problems they had identified. More important for today is that he wants to talk a little bit about the analysis that was done, the results of that analysis and where that leads them in terms of recommendations for City action in the future. He showed an exhibit that depicted the levels of service that were calculated based on the actual counts that were reported in July and August of 2003. There are some level of service problems, primarily on the arterial streets. They then factored in some traffic growth and then some specific increases in traffic that may be incurred by levels of development at the Base itself. Clearly, there is an increase in traffic on City streets. As new development occurs, although it is limited within the City, traffic will grow as traffic growth around Coronado occurs and creates congestion in some of the surrounding communities. There is some traffic coming into Coronado as a means of getting around congestion on I-5, for example. It is expected that there will be growth in traffic volumes on City streets. There is a lot of traffic that is being forced onto local streets to try to bypass this congestion. This all leads to the trade off between providing that flow on the arterial streets and maintaining level of service and, at the same time, preserving the community and not creating a split in the community but still allowing them access in and out of the community to preserve the quality of life in Coronado.

The main action taken at the August meeting was to review three different policy statements or policy positions for transportation that really set the guidelines that they used to identify specific alternatives to evaluate. The one that Council adopted was to maximize the existing arterial system and, at the same time, try to reduce intrusion into surrounding neighborhoods. That is really emphasizing the key arterial corridors that exist in the community and trying to use a variety of mechanisms to reduce the impact of cut through traffic in the neighborhoods to preserve that quality of life.

The first alternative that was looked at was specifically identified in the City's last resolution. It was a prelude to the action that was taken in the November election, which was a ballot item. It looked at and evaluated the effect of providing a westbound left turn at Glorietta Boulevard that would allow traffic that is heading westbound on the Bridge to make a left turn to proceed southbound on Glorietta Boulevard as an alternative to continuing down to Orange. In analyzing this alternative they did that with a signal placed at that location to only provide for that left turn. Also, that included peak out turn restrictions at other intersections that could potentially be affected by this.

The other alternative that was analyzed was a little bit more comprehensive, including a number of different projects. This was building on the policy statement that Council adopted at the last meeting. It included signaling a couple of key locations along Third and Fourth Streets to allow better cross traffic flows. This alternative considers the provision of the Third Street Gate into NASNI as a very important part of this alternative and as a result of that, switching traffic flows along the block of Alameda between Third and Fourth to two way traffic, extending the storage problems on Orange Avenue at Fourth Street to help reduce some of the blocking that occurs there, maintaining the peak period turning restrictions in the absence of the semi-diverters to limit the amount of traffic that can penetrate into the neighborhoods on C and A and then looking at the potential for signals at some location east of Orange, between Orange and the Bridge, and finally some extending storage problems for a couple of locations down by the Naval Amphibious Base.

Mr. Henderson went on to summarize the results. For Alternative 1, the westbound left on Glorietta, has the benefit of reducing some of the traffic that occurs on Orange and shifts some of that impact back to Glorietta Boulevard. The first problem with Alternative 1 is that the results were being announced before the improvements were analyzed. The second problem is with the analysis of the improvement with anticipated traffic shift as a result of that. Clearly, it has a major impact on the areas south on Glorietta Boulevard where it forced that extra traffic. To try and see what is necessary to resolve those issues, they tested different mitigation measures, different types of improvements, that might help resolve that problem. By providing stop controls and improvements at some of those intersections along that route, they were able to improve the level of service, with the exception of the intersection at Glorietta itself, where, if all of the vehicles who might want to make that turn to actually make it, it really becomes an impediment to the traffic that is moving in an easterly direction on 4th Street.

The last alternative tests a scenario where signal timing in the afternoon is used to limit the amount of traffic that can actually make that left turn, thereby controlling the demand that can actually turn onto Glorietta Boulevard, which benefits both Glorietta Boulevard because there is a lower volume that is progressing southbound, but at the same time benefits the intersection at Glorietta and 4th because you are able to provide most of the green time for that signal to the traffic that is moving on 4th Street.

Alternative 2, again, tested a more broad set of improvements. He showed a table that included both an a.m. and a p.m. analysis. The columns provide the results for alternative 2, simply putting the improvement in place, then testing what particular measures are necessary to achieve acceptable levels of service. Mr. Henderson continued discussing the results of the testing and.

Mr. Henderson listed the recommendations. The first set of improvements involves the signalization of the intersection of Alameda and First. No major action at this intersection should

be taken until after the Third Street Gate is constructed and the resulting traffic patterns are evaluated. Second, is the implementation of the NASNI Third Street Gate and a signalization of the Alameda at Third intersection with a minimum of three westbound through lanes proceeding to the NASNI gate. Third, there should be a signal at the Alameda and Fourth intersection. This proposed traffic signal is currently being advanced as an element in the PR-ED. Fourth, the traffic on Alameda Boulevard between Third and Fourth Street should be reverted to two-way traffic. Fifth, is the addition of a traffic signal at H (alternatively F) at Third and Fourth Streets. These are being advanced as an element in the PR-ED. Sixth, additional capacity is required to accommodate critical movements at the intersections of Orange and Fourth. Seventh, the extension of the southbound left turn storage and the addition of dual southbound left turn lanes at Silver Strand and Rendova are necessary to mitigate the poor LOS at this intersection. Eighth, additional storage capacity is required on each critical approach at the intersection of Silver Strand and Tarawa to mitigate the impacts of the high traffic demand. Finally, there need to be modifications to the City's designated truck routes.

Mr. Walton reviewed the study's recommendations and provided staff's advice on how to implement the recommendations if Council approves. He began with the recommendation for signals at Glorietta, Pomona or B. There is currently a project report on the signal at Third and Fourth and B. Staff recommends that the City continue with that process and take that through the environmental phase.

Regarding the signal at Alameda and First, staff agrees with Mr. Henderson that no action be taken until the Third Street Gate is implemented and the resulting traffic patterns can be analyzed.

With respect to the implementation of the Third Street Gate, staff is continuing to work with the Navy on getting that project completed, which is anticipated some time in the first half of 2007. Staff has reminded the Navy that they need to work with Caltrans on the Coronado side of the blue line. They can't do the project on the Caltrans side, so they are going to need the work of Caltrans to get that fully developed.

The signalization of Fourth and Alameda is another recommendation that the City has under development. Staff recommends continuing with the project.

The reversion of Alameda to two way traffic between Third and Fourth Street hinges on the other pieces of the program before this can be implemented.

The signalization at H and F is still being studied as part of the PR-ED for congestion relief.

There is a need for additional capacity at the intersection of 4th and Orange. Because of the tight constraints, staff is only recommending that the City move forward with the southbound turn onto Fourth from Third Street and work with Caltrans.

The next two suggestions deal with increased capacities at the Naval Amphibious Base. Staff recommends that the City pursue those further as a future capital improvement project, working with both the Navy and Caltrans.

Council directed that the Study look at the City's truck routes. This wasn't specifically mentioned in the conclusions and recommendations, but in the text of the report it is recommended that, when

the Third Street Gate is fully implemented, that truck route #4 and #5 on First Street and Glorietta be dropped by an ordinance of Council.

Mayor Smisek commented that he didn't see under the recommendations traffic calming, bulb outs, metering at the toll booth, etc. Are those things that the City should start doing on a separate scheme as part of the Working Group or should they be in this report also?

Mr. Walton explained that the traffic calming on the state highways is being done as part of the Working Group. Bulb outs are being looked at along the corridor, as well as traffic metering. One of the things Parsons Brinkerhoff was asked to do was relieve congestion, but not necessarily to provide traffic calming, so they didn't look at putting in speed humps, traffic circles within the intersections, etc. They were looking to try to do better with moving the traffic through the City.

Mayor Smisek concluded that it would be contingent upon the Council through a Capital Improvement Project (CIP) process to come back with a priority system and a timing of when the City wants some of these things and then adding these other pieces, depending on finances, etc. Mayor Smisek complimented Parsons Brinkerhoff on the report. There are a lot of facts and figures in it, which is what the City needs to be able to do future planning. He would like to see Council discuss accepting the report. Also, the Council could consider accepting the recommendations, with the idea that staff comes back to Council with two or three of these in a priority system that need immediate attention and funding numbers. That way Council can look at them, but also need to remember to look at them in the context of the overall plan so that Council doesn't get locked in with a piece or two that it doesn't like. That approach will probably be more successful and will give a much better feeling for the public from expectations of when these things are going to occur and how much they will cost.

Councilmember Downey talked about the lights at Third and Fourth. Obviously they will impede the traffic going out. Did the report look at not just putting the lights so that they were receptive to moving traffic in all four directions, but having it activated for pedestrian crossing? How does that factor in?

Mr. Henderson responded that at some locations where they know that there is a high volume of pedestrian traffic, particularly on the south part of Orange, pedestrian hits are included on the signals as part of it, because they can actually become the worst part of the intersection performance because such a lot of green time needs to be provided to allow pedestrians to cross some of these wider streets. The same situation exists down by NAB. It is factored into the model that was used. The one location where that probably wasn't done a whole lot was at F, which is part of the evaluation that is going on right now. The other thing to point out is the fact that they have set up this model now. It allows for changes to these scenarios and will recalculate. One of the values of this program isn't necessarily what is gotten out of it today, but it is a resource for the City to allow these things to continue to be looked at and as new issues come before Council.

Councilmember Tierney hopes that they took into consideration the impact some of these alternatives will have on the residents. He thinks it sounds good to say that B and Fourth might deserve a signal, but he is leaning to the point that once the cars pass Orange there are only a few more blocks to the Bridge and they leave as opposed to bringing them to a standing halt with all the noise and pollution that is associated with that. It is important that Council look at that. At first he was opposed to signalization at Alameda and Fourth, but he realized that if a signal is put

in that it can always be shut down and the waver can be brought in. He is leaning in favor of that. If more of the median between Third and Fourth is taken out to put even more cars in there, what does that do for traffic flows that doesn't exist now? He doesn't want to see any more of the median taken out for more vehicles to park. He doesn't see any benefits of moving the traffic any faster. Why does this need to be done? Why can't they wait on Third rather than take up that median?

Mr. Henderson responded to Mr. Tierney's question in two parts. The first part is simply dealing with the storage on the southbound left turn lanes that exist today. One of the things that you will see out there today is that, because of the way the traffic cycles between Third and Orange and Fourth and Orange, there is a situation where folks that are coming down Orange and looking to make their left turn onto Fourth get trapped by the traffic that is either coming off of Third Street and is stopped by the light at Orange and Fourth. It cues all the way back up to Third. Why should it have to cue all the way back up to Third? It just has to cue far enough to get to end of that storage pocket and then those southbound turns come into the storage pocket. What is happening right now is when the light gives the green arrow to make that southbound left, cars that are in the storage clear the intersection and then it sits green with no one going through it for a few seconds. What extending that storage pocket will allow to happen is more of those cars will be able to get around the cue and get into that southbound storage pocket so that when the light actually does turn green more cars can be cleared through the intersection. The second part of it goes even further to really blow out the intersection and adds additional capacity in all the directions. That allows the City, by providing an extra lane of through traffic, for example, in the southbound direction; more cars can be gotten through the intersection when the light actually turns green. That reduces the cycle lengths and the theory is generally that the shorter the cycle length, the less the average delay for the intersection. The issue there becomes how much does the City want to destroy the aesthetics of the intersection in order to provide for this traffic flow. Those weights and balances will be examined in the environmental document.

Councilmember Monroe is glad Mayor Smisek talked about some kind of plan to give when and what year. He has heard many, many times that things are being studied. He started working with Dick Scharff and the Group in 2002. He also said that somewhere on the 10th Street light needs help. In the afternoon it backs all the way up to 7th.

Mr. Henderson explained that they have made recommendations on a few of the specific locations that they have looked at, but in doing the analysis there are a lot more intersections that they discussed what the problem is at an intersection. They have made some general recommendations on things the City might look at in order to improve it. One of the problems at one of the intersections down there is in the cycling. Another such thing is the truck routes.

Mr. Monroe thinks Council needs to be really clear about what it is talking about between Third and Fourth to create that extra area. When this idea first surfaced, he thought the City was going to leave the two lanes that exist for left turns on Fourth and just extend one lane back all the way, which would permit cars to fill up the reservoir. Right now the reservoir is empty a lot of times. He agrees that one more lane needs to be created off of that median that is a totally left turn lane. He thinks that can be signed properly and effectively. He was surprised when Parsons talked about extending the two lanes back further to create more of a reservoir, but not one lane all the way to let people get in there. Right now, most of the day and even during rush hour, he sees plenty of reservoir, but people can't get to it. He is not interested in taking two lanes.

Mr. Henderson responded that the concept is to provide better access for people to get into it. Certainly, taking one as far back as possible and a second one not quite as far would work. Mr. Monroe doesn't want to take a second one anywhere. Mr. Henderson feels that the biggest issue the City runs into, with the scenario described, is that there are some operational problems. First of all there is a significantly higher volume of traffic that makes the left turn off of Third Street and goes south. This could lead to as many people trying to get into that lane as trying to get into it in a short space of time. This creates a bigger problem. The other issue that Caltrans doesn't typically like is starting a lane at a location like that because then there will be people cutting across the intersections in the middle of an intersection. They typically don't like to get into design practices where there is a certain number of lanes at the far side and a different number of lanes on the downstream side because that in itself creates confusion to motorists. From a pure traffic engineering perspective, his recommendation would be to take it back as far as you can get it, but you would still need to have a small bulb out or something there that would force people to go through the intersection before they can get across into that lane.

Mr. Monroe would still like to try to fight the operational problems. He is not interested in two lanes, but is very interested in one lane as far back as possible.

Councilmember Tanaka needs more time to digest this. He is prepared to accept the report, but he is not personally ready to make any direction to staff.

Pat Miller, 310 J Avenue, thinks this is a very good, thorough report. Again, it reiterates all the problems that exist. Hopefully, this report will be the last one and the one that makes things happen. She encourages the Council to use the report along with the CRWG recommendations, the maximum speed of 25 mph and do the things all together.

Mayor Smisek agrees with Mr. Tanaka that more time is needed. He emphasized that the Council is still looking at items that are not on the recommendation list such as traffic calming, metering, and the 25 mpg speed limit. The good news is that Caltrans now realizes they have the authority to implement the lower speed limit under their own authority.

MSUC (Smisek/Tanaka) moved that the City Council accept the report and direct the City Manager to bring back some of the suggestions prioritized as staff feels is appropriate.

AYES: Downey, Monroe, Tanaka, Tierney and Smisek
NAYS: None
ABSENT: None

11e. Consideration of Request from Councilmember Tierney Regarding Pacific Animal Welfare Society, Coronado (Paws of Coronado) Event During Flower Show Weekend. A written request from Councilmember Tierney asked that the Pacific Animal Welfare Society, Coronado (PAWS of Coronado) be authorized by the City Council to use a portion of Spreckels Park during the week of 16-17 April 2005. The purpose is to show animals now in the City's animal care facility and also presently in temporary foster care in an attempt to

get them adopted while the Flower Show is underway. **Under Consent, the City Council approved the request.**

Robert Hutton, Director of Police Services, suggested that Council suspend the Ordinance, or Council has the option to simply approve a permit issued by the Manager and then not have to suspend the Ordinance.

MSUC (Tierney/Monroe) moved that the City Council give the authority to the City Manager to waive the Animal Ordinance restrictions that exist for Spreckels Park for the period of the Flower Show.

AYES: Downey, Monroe, Tanaka, Tierney and Smisek
NAYS: None
ABSENT: None

11f. Approval of a Resolution Approving the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan's (CIWMP) Summary Plan and Siting Element. The proposed Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan is basing its commitment to meeting the requirements of the Act on the following core assumptions:

1. An average of 50% diversion for all San Diego County jurisdictions is reached in the year 2005.
2. The proposed Gregory Canyon Landfill site will open in the year 2006, providing an additional 33.4 million tons of capacity.
3. The approval of the expansion of the Sycamore Canyon Landfill site in the year 2005 will add an additional 116.6 million tons of capacity.

As the countywide diversion rate in 2001 was 46%, the 50% diversion rate goal by 2005 appears to be reasonable. The core assumptions related to added capacity may or may not be optimistic. The draft Siting Element itself emphasizes the fact that these proposed new and expanded sites are not yet approved, stating that 'all proposals for new landfills or expansions require extensive permits, which include but are not limited to, local land use approval, environmental review, and state solid waste facility permitting procedures.' Should these two sites not be approved in the timeframe anticipated, the County of San Diego will 'run out of the ability to accept all of the waste destined for disposal in 2007.' (Siting Element, p. 12) The draft Siting Element does not address in any detail other options available, including exportation of waste out-of-county. The draft Siting Element states: 'if neither landfill proposal [Gregory Canyon Site of Sycamore Canyon expansion] is approved without using other strategies, the region may need to export up to 55% of its waste in 2017.' (Siting Element, p. 50) This 'worst case' scenario would have a significant impact on the costs of solid waste disposal, both for the City and for the City's ratepayers.

Approving the Summary Plan and Siting Element does not commit the City of Coronado in any way. Staff is aware of the potential long-term concerns with the core assumptions, and continues to monitor the situation. **Under Consent, the City Council approved A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING AND ADOPTING THE FINAL DRAFT COUNTYWIDE SUMMARY PLAN AND**

COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT. The Resolution was read by Title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by Council as RESOLUTION NO. 8055.

12. CITY ATTORNEY: None.

13. COMMUNICATIONS - WRITTEN: None.

The City Council Recessed into Closed Session at 7:14 p.m.

14. CLOSED SESSION:

14a. CLOSED SESSION: CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATIONS

AUTHORITY: Gov. Code §54957.6

CITY NEGOTIATORS: Mark Ochendusko, City Manager; Pam Willis, Assistant City Manager; Leslie Suelter, Director of Administrative Services

EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATION: American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Local 127

The City Council adjourned from closed session at 8:00 p.m. Mayor Smisek announced that directions were given to the City's negotiators. The Council then adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

15. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

Approved: April 19, 2005

Tom Smisek
Chair

Attest:

Linda K. Hascup
City Clerk