

**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, October 19, 2004, 3:00 p.m.**

Mayor Smisek called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

**1. ROLL CALL:**

**Present:** Councilmembers Monroe, Schmidt, Tanaka, Tierney  
and Mayor Smisek

**Absent:** None

**Also Present:** City Manager Mark Ochendusko  
City Attorney Morgan Foley  
City Clerk Diane Shea

**2. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.** LT Wes Modder, Naval Air Station North Island, gave the invocation and Mayor Smisek led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**3. MINUTES:** The minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 5, 2004, 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 (Schmidt/Tanaka) moved that the City Council approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 5, 2004, as submitted**

**AYES: Monroe, Schmidt, Tanaka, Tierney and Smisek**

**NAYS: None**

**ABSENT: None**

**4. CEREMONIAL PRESENTATIONS:**

**4a. Presentation of Historic Preservation Plaques to Property Owners with Historically Designated Structures.** Historic Resource Commissioner Susan Keith, 801 Tolita Avenue, introduced the item. Historic Resource Commissioner Gerri McCartee announced the plaque recipients. Historic Preservation Plaques were presented to the following property owners:

Dr. Isley and Merrill	526 A Avenue
Mrs. Elledge (her daughter Leslie and her Ann Keyser	1244 Alameda Boulevard 721-727 D Avenue
Margaret La Grange	625 A Avenue
Mr. and Mrs. Wurzelbacher	629 A Avenue
Mr. and Mrs. John Weston	1005 Adella Avenue
Mr. and Mrs. Harold Myers	749 C Avenue
Dr. Mark Johnson	1504 Glorietta Boulevard
John and Sherry Oval	536 A Avenue
Mr. and Mrs. David Dolgen	1045 Loma Avenue
Tim and Tammy Cusick	1125 Flora Avenue
Patti and Roger Witalis	927 D Avenue 1025 E Avenue
Ronald and Barbara Sosnowski	1013 Adella Avenue
Pike and Jane Meade	1101 Star Park Circle
Susan and Mark Mulzet	1127 F Avenue
Anna Kirschner	1236 Alameda Boulevard
Martha Bentley Jordan	751-761 G Avenue
James and Margie Peltier	1015 Loma Avenue

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

Councilmember Monroe commented on Item 5c. He wants to be sure that when a person calls City Hall they will have a live person answering the phone. The City Manager assured Mr. Monroe that would be the case.

**MSUC (Schmidt/Tanaka) moved that the City Council approve the Consent Calendar Items 5a through 5d, with the addition of Items 10b and 11d**

**AYES: Monroe, Schmidt, Tanaka, Tierney and Smisek**  
**NAYS: None**  
**ABSENT: None**

**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. 10039060 thru 10039400, as audited and approved by the Audit Committee, provided there are sufficient funds on hand. **The City Council approved the warrants.**

**5c. Authorization for Acquisition of a Telephone and Voice Mail System and Issuance of Request for Proposals for Lease Financing.** The proposed new City-owned telephone system will provide access to improved voicemail distribution and paging features, and provide 180 new telephone sets to replace the outdated models the City currently uses. The system will also allow the City to streamline the number of incoming/outgoing lines necessary to perform City functions. This reduction will have immediate fiscal impact, allowing the City to pay the lease costs for the new equipment.

Staff is seeking authorization to acquire an NEC 2000 IPS telephone system, NEC telephone sets, and required miscellaneous equipment using a cooperative purchasing agreement with California's Department of General Services (DGS). The DGS manages a system which allows California local government agencies to "piggy-back" purchases on already existing competitively-assessed and cost-compared contracts. The program is termed CMAS for "California Multiple Award Schedules" and is commonly used by public agencies to purchase common items such as vehicles, maintenance equipment, office equipment, etc.

Pursuant to City Council approval, Administrative Services staff will release a request for proposals for the municipal lease to finance the system for five years. **The City Council authorized the acquisition of the telephone switch to be installed in conjunction with the move into the new City Hall and authorized the issuance of Request for Proposals for Lease Financing.**

**5d. Consideration of Establishment of the Major Special Events Calendar for the Year 2005.** The City of Coronado's Special Events Policy states that the City Council is to consider all major special event applications at a Council meeting in October and establish a final menu of no more than eight (8) major events, with three (3) bridge events being considered as one major event, for the following year. There are eight (8) major events before the City Council, with three (3) bridge runs counting as one major event.

All major event applicants and known interested parties were notified to submit a letter of intent to be considered at this Council meeting. The following letters of intent were received:

**On Consent Calendar, the City Council took the following action:**

**1) Approve four (4) traditional events:**

- **The combined Flower Show and Library Book Sale with Motorcars on MainStreet**
- **Coronado Promenade Sunday Concerts in Spreckels Park**
- **Fourth of July Celebration**
- **Chamber of Commerce Holiday Open House**

**2) Approve the three (3) bridge events, considered as one major special event:**

- **Liberty Run/Walk (Sunday, April 10), MWR Naval Base Coronado Bridge Run/Walk (Sunday, May 22), and "Do the Bridge" 8K Run/Walk (Sunday, October 9).**

- 3) **Approve the request of the United Warrior Survivor Foundation (UWSF) to hold its third annual “Coronado Honors Our Heroes Block Party” to be held on either Saturday, May 14, 2005 or Saturday, May 28, 2005.**
- 4) **Approve the request for Naval Special Warfare SUPERFROG Triathlon on Saturday, September 17, 2005.**
- 5) **Approve the request for the Silver Strand Half Marathon on Sunday, November 13, 2005.**
- 6) **Direct that all events reimburse the City for all services and personnel costs except Flower Show, Fourth of July Celebration and Holiday Open House.**

6. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

- a. **Ed Lehman, Business Representative for AFSCME, Local 127**, commented on the current bargaining with the City workers working in Public Services/Golf Services. AFSCME wants the City Council to authorize that its bargaining team return to the table with the authority to resolve several issues which he outlined. AFSCME members provide a superb level of service to the City, maintaining the City’s reputation as a prime tourist destination.
- b. **John Orlowski, 421 D Avenue**, spoke regarding Item 8a. He commented on affordable housing issues and cited California Constitution law.
- c. **Ginger Raaka, Public Relations Director for Coronado Historical Association and Visitor Center**, reported on the Visitor Center activities and announced the current exhibit, “Class of 1941: Service to our Country”, runs through the end of October.
- d. **Al Ovrom, 1701 San Luis Rey**, commented on the large representative check posted in Council Chambers. In the area of traffic in Coronado, this is a bold statement about what is trying to be done to alleviate one problem. This is not only just security on the base, but the cueing of the lines all the way back across town. He is very pleased to see this. He hopes that the public realizes that there is more to this election than the national scene. The TransNet Tax Extension is very important to the region and to Coronado. He urged everyone to support that measure.
- e. **Mayor Smisek** referred to the \$10,180,000 check mentioned by Mr. Ovrom. There was a ceremony yesterday at the Coronado Navy Complexes Coordinating Group meeting. Susan Davis, the local congresswoman, was present to give the good word that Congress has passed the Bill that authorizes the construction of the Third Street Gate. The design of that will start soon. There is not an anticipated date of completion yet, but one will be announced as soon as it is available. He also acknowledged the assistance of Duncan Hunter, through the auspices of Mr. Monroe, who has great contacts and gave his little push at the end.

7. **CITY MANAGER:**

- 7a. **Update on Council Directed Actions and Citizen Inquiries.** None

8. **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**8a. Public Hearing: Selection of Proposed Projects for Community Development Block Grant Funding, Fiscal Year 2005-2006, Projects Include Demolition of Properties at 578 Orange Avenue and 440-448 Orange Avenue in Preparation for Construction of Affordable Housing and Removal of Architectural Barriers.**

Scott Huth, Director of Public Services, explained that this item is coming before Council as part of the annual selection of projects for block grant funding that is in the amount of approximately \$115,000 to \$120,000 per year. In the past these have been used for the removal of architectural barriers in the community. That is still a component of this project, because there is an ongoing process of trying to eliminate those trip hazards and ADA ramps in the community that don't currently comply. In addition the best use for the City's CDBG funds would include the demolition of the then-vacant City facility at 578 Orange Avenue and five vacant apartment units currently in escrow with the Community Development Agency at 440-448 Orange Avenue. There are only certain uses that are allowed for CDBG funding. The funds can be used with either a housing program or removal of architectural barriers for ADA access related issues.

Councilmember Tierney asked how much of the Animal Care Facility, addressed as 1015 Sixth Street, property belongs to the police station and how much belongs to the Animal Care Facility.

Mr. Huth responded that it is all public property. There is a fenced in area that is currently being used for a containment area and the structure itself. The project before Council is really only dealing with the structures related to the police facility and removing those. Once they are removed the City will go to the 400 block and do the other project. It is not intended to deal with the Animal Control Facility.

Mr. Tierney asked again to have the City Manager's office or Engineering show him a plot line that shows exactly how much land is part of the Animal Control Facility. Mr. Huth added that as this moves forward there will have to be a site plan that will show which areas will be demolished. At that point there will be some perimeters of areas that are not to be touched.

Councilmember Monroe explained that one of the reasons the demolition is important when talking about affordable housing is that the state has a requirement that 50% of affordable housing needs to be new constructed housing.

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

**MSUC (Monroe/Schmidt) moved that the City Council selected the proposed projects**

**AYES: Monroe, Schmidt, 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.** Port Commissioner Robert Spane provided a report on Port activities. Coronado is about to receive \$500,000 for the repair of the seawall around the golf course. Today, at the Port meeting, there was discussion of the issue as to whether the State Lands Commission should exist. The current governor instituted a board called the California Performance Review Board to look at the government of the State of California and to recommend reductions, efficiencies, streamlining, etc. That Committee recommended that the State Lands Commission be disbanded. However, today, the Port voted to support the State Lands Commission. The Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan continues to be talked about. SDG&E has authorized the company to spend \$36 million to underground the utilities over at the power divide area into Chula Vista. The City of Chula Vista has put \$14 million into the project. The idea would be to underground those high tension power lines and then move the power plant to open up this whole Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan. That whole thing is approximately 500 acres with 160 acres of it is park land. The Port today only has about 140 acres, so it doubles the amount of park land that the Port would administer if this happens. This pivots on the ability to trade land – to trade Port land that is on the waterfront with inland land, and the State Lands Commission will have to approve. The next Port meeting is not until the 30<sup>th</sup> of November.

**10b. Approval of Recommendation from the Traffic Operations Committee to Install a Yield Sign on the Entrance Road to Bahama Village.** A request to install a stop sign on the entrance road to Bahama Village was received by Coronado Cays Homeowners Association manager, Jerry McDonald, and he asked that the Engineering Department analyze the location for stop sign applicability. This request was heard by the Traffic Operations Committee (TOC) on August 26, 2004.

The entrance road to Bahama Village is located approximately 900 feet south of the main entrance to the Cays, accessed via Coronado Cays Boulevard. The entrance road is the only ingress/egress access for approximately 114 residences within Bahama Village. Traffic counts taken the week of August 6-12, 2004 show a weekday average daily traffic of 960 vehicles. During the most recent three-year collision history (2001-2003), there were no reported accidents at the intersections of Coronado Cays Boulevard, Bahama Bend and the entrance road.

The City has established warrants for installation of two, three and four way stop intersections. Stop signs are typically placed on the minor street (as per City warrants) so that the least amount of traffic is forced to stop at the intersection. The entrance road to Bahama Village is not considered the minor street at the subject intersection since all traffic entering/exiting the Village must use this road. The subject intersection does not qualify for placement of a stop sign on the entrance road to Bahama Village since it is the principal street. Adverse impacts of placing a stop sign at this location may include queuing traffic into the traveled way of Coronado Cays Boulevard and creating general disregard for traffic control signs by installing signs at unwarranted locations. As an alternative to the requested stop sign, staff analyzed the applicability of a yield sign in this location. Yield signs are used to control right of way assignment at an intersection. As per traffic warrants used by the City, yield signs are warranted at those intersections where the conditions are such that the criteria for two-way stop control is 75 percent satisfied.

**Under Consent, the City Council adopted A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE INSTALLATION OF A YIELD SIGN ON THE ENTRANCE ROAD TO BAHAMA BEND VILLAGE AT BAHAMA BEND ROAD. The Resolution was read by Title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by Council as RESOLUTION NO. 8027.**

**11. CITY COUNCIL BUSINESS:**

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

**Councilmember Tierney** attended the Chrysler Classic Speed Festival, the Beans 'n Jeans Chili Cookoff, the San Diego Division of the League of California Cities meeting, the PAWS event at Azure Point, the dedication of the new Poway City Hall and the Schools' Foundation event at the Hotel Del.

**Councilmember Monroe** attended a number of candidate forums, the Metropolitan Transit System Board meeting, had two enjoyable meetings with the Sunny McPeete, the Secretary of Transportation, Housing and Banking, attended the AIRPAC reception, spent three days in Atlanta at the American Public Transit Association meeting, the SANDAG Transportation meeting and a meeting with Results, a group trying to end hunger and poverty in the world.

**Councilmember Tanaka** attended the PAWS reception and the CSF reception at the Hotel Del. He received a call from Duncan Hunter's office regarding the call he put in to the Conference Committee.

**Councilmember Schmidt** attended a MainStreet meeting, the Residential Standards Improvement Project meeting, and a Naval Complexes meeting. She asked that the presentation made on the cleaning up of the beaches be on the next Council agenda.

**Mayor Smisek** also attended many candidate forums, Vice Admiral Zortman's welcome party for the Chrysler Speed Fest, judged the Chili Cookoff, met with District Attorney Bonnie Dumanis and her staff with the other County mayors, a Library Board meeting, a meeting with the Chamber Board, the PAWS fundraiser, the Hospital meeting at the Yacht Club, the Navy Complexes meeting, the presentation on the Beach clean up and the Coronado Schools Foundation update meeting.

**11b. San Diego Association of Governments' Presentation on the Regional Shoreline Preservation and Monitoring Programs.** Tony Pena, Director of Community Development, explained that this is a program that is administered by SANDAG, a regional planning body, and has been ongoing for several years. Every year they look at it for ways to improve it and possibly provide additional funding as costs rise. That is one reason this is on today's agenda – for educational purposes, as well as address an upcoming request to provide additional funding for Coronado's share.

Councilmember Monroe commented that he sits on the Shoreline Replenishment program. The results of that sand replenishment program were terrific.

Ron Rundle, SANDAG Principal Regional Planner, gave a Powerpoint presentation to Council. In 2001, SANDAG, with cooperation from all the coastal cities, placed a 2.1 million cubic yards of sand on twelve beaches from Oceanside in the west to Imperial Beach in the south. The cost of this was \$117.5 million which was split between the U.S. Navy, who provided the majority of the funds, and the California State Department of Waterways. The coastal cities did pay a portion of the cost as well. The objectives of the Shoreline Monitoring Program are to measure the impacts of beach erosion over time and it documents the benefits, where they occur, of the Beach Sand project and it will help improve future beach sand projects. There are two components to the monitoring program. Specifically, the program measures the

impacts of beach erosion over time, documents the benefits of sand replenishment projects, and helps to improve the design and effectiveness of beach fills.

The funds for the basic monitoring program have been provided by the coastal cities since 1996. As part of the permit requirements for the Regional Beach Sand Project, additional beach monitoring activities were required. As a result, the Program was expanded to be carried out for four years, through FY 2005. In June 2005, SANDAG will no longer be required to continue the enhanced beach monitoring activities. The Shoreline Preservation Committee from SANDAG recommends that it continue the monitoring program because it provides valuable data to the whole Beach Restoration project. The goal is to keep the costs as low as possible to have the least impact possible on the coastal cities. The costs have been broken down according to miles of sandy beach in each jurisdiction, excluding federal lands. The cost for Coronado is \$6,724.

Brief discussion ensued with Mr. Rundle answering specific questions.

**The City Council accepted the report.**

**11c. Presentation of Potential Traffic Patterns and Impacts Resulting from the Opening of Glorietta Boulevard to Southbound Traffic by Way of a Left Turn at Fourth Street.** Ed Walton, Principal Engineer, Engineering and Project Development Department, provided the staff report for this item. At the August 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, Council directed staff to analyze the possibility of a left turn off of Fourth Street onto southbound Glorietta Boulevard. Staff has looked at this, and on the surface one might think this would be a fairly easy task to analyze the effect of doing this. However, this is a very complicated matter. One of the biggest challenges is in determining how much traffic volume will actually utilize this left turn onto southbound Glorietta. Staff has asked Parsons Brinkerhoff to give their best guess analysis, based on the traffic volumes and current conditions. These numbers that Darren Henderson will present to Council are for existing conditions. They do not reflect any growth or any traffic induced from congestion on I-5.

Darren Henderson, Supervising Transportation Planner for Parsons Brinkerhoff, reiterated that they have requested SANDAG provide some assistance in forecasting, using the regional model, what traffic could be if this particular alternative went ahead. SANDAG verified the configuration recently and they are still working on the analysis. Based on the fact that the information was not available from SANDAG, Parsons Brinkerhoff went ahead and looked at the count information that had been developed as part of the Major Traffic Study. One of the advantages of having this particular intersection is that the reverse flow is available to them. Since the northbound ramp onto Glorietta Boulevard is currently available to traffic, and they do see traffic use that particular movement, in addition there are northbound routes available at all the streets but Fourth Street. They are able to look at the counts of all of those locations and get an idea of what the demand is in the reverse direction and, consequently, give an indication of what the demand might be expected to be in the opposite direction – making a westbound left onto Glorietta Boulevard, as opposed to what currently happens when the traffic goes up Third Street to Orange Avenue and makes the westbound left and then proceeds southbound on Orange. They looked at that particular scenario. They figured out that, if one looks east of Orange, approximately half of the traffic that makes the current northbound right is generated south of the Glorietta/Pomona split down by the 5-point intersection. That is quite a significant amount of traffic. In addition, there is about another 40% of the traffic that makes that movement onto the Bridge, but it is coming from the neighborhoods into the City at this particular location. It is in the area of A, B and C down toward Glorietta and Pomona.

As a result, they were able to use that indication of demand to look at what sort of volumes might be expected to make that westbound left. There are about 1,450 vehicles, during the peak hours, make a westbound left currently at Third and Orange. The numbers who could make this westbound left could be as high as 1,000 vehicles per hour. How traffic is allowed to go down Glorietta Boulevard will have an impact on the demand. Specifically, this is about how traffic is allowed to access the neighborhoods off of Glorietta Boulevard. If the ability to make the right turn off of Glorietta Boulevard is restricted and access isn't allowed into some of those residential neighborhoods, that will reduce the demand for this particular turn. However, if the City doesn't allow the traffic to make a southbound right turn off of Glorietta Boulevard onto 5<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup> Street, the demand will be reduced by about 200 or 300 vehicles per hour because that is what is being generated by this particular neighborhood. If they are not allowed to make that turn, they are going to have to continue up Third to Orange and then come in the back way, which is what is going on right now. Similarly, if that is continued down the line, the traffic will be reduced by maybe as much as half. In conclusion, there may be around 700 to 800 vehicles per hour as sheer demand to make that particular turn. Drivers make decisions based on time savings. If that demand is applied to this intersection it will create a delay of about 200 seconds for everyone that sits in that westbound turn lane. That is more than three minutes. Many drivers will not sit and wait for that turn. Looking at sheer demand, the intersection just is not going to work. As was already pointed out, there will be 3 ½ minutes delay when making the westbound left. Similarly, there will be about 3 minutes of delay for the eastbound traffic that is coming along Fourth Street. The intersection is already at level of service F.

Next they took a look at it from a different perspective. If the signal were optimized to allow or sustain a relatively good or acceptable level of service along eastbound Fourth Street, what types of volumes would result to be able to accomplish or accommodate making that westbound left. They figured there would probably be about 120 vehicles an hour to make that turn at a left turn lane without having a substantial negative impact on the eastbound traffic along Fourth Street. If the City provides for that it will give a very quick left turn cycle and would provide those westbound turners with about 165 second delays. That is the best that can be hoped to be accomplished.

Mr. Walton moved on to discuss some of the possible downstream effects. Once the traffic is on Glorietta Boulevard there could be no restrictions at all on Glorietta Boulevard. That would allow vehicles turning off the Bridge to make the right turn onto 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup> Streets, San Luis Rey, Visalia. This would work well for allowing access to the Village and from the Village to Glorietta, but what it does is impact neighborhoods. The traffic could make all those turns or continue on Glorietta to Five Points and on to SR75. The next thing they looked at were some sort of turn restrictions. They decided to prevent turns onto 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Streets. This could be done by turn regulation signage or there could be a frontage road up to that point. The traffic could still turn on San Luis Rey. The frontage road would restrict vehicles from making that turn physically, and it would also make a restriction from people exiting the Village trying to get onto Glorietta to the Bridge. That gets really complicated when that is timed with a backup on 4<sup>th</sup> Street. It is fairly complicated to try to implement this type of thing. They went one step further and looked at having restrictions all the way down to Vista. This would keep all the traffic off the Bridge, onto Glorietta Boulevard and then onto SR75. It would restrict people wanting to make the turn to access the Village. Staff didn't really try to distribute this volume because they don't know what the volume coming off the Bridge would be and where they would be going without that regional model. Another thing that wasn't analyzed was continuing that frontage road on past Five Points and making it only access to SR75 with no access to the Village area. In conclusion, this simple little turn movement has a lot of implications and it is very difficult to analyze. Staff needs to know how it is going to be implemented before they can get more into analysis.

Councilmember Tanaka asked approximately how many cars can make that turn during a light cycle. Council discussion continued and there was a rough estimate of 6 cars.

Councilmember Tierney asked how many cars coming off of Orange onto Fourth make the turn on those two left hand turn lanes. He asked how long that signal cycle is. Mr. Tierney feels that number is important because the numbers of vehicles that are going and making that left turn are considerably more than what these numbers have come up with. That leads him to believe that, with the signal system locked into that same pattern down at 4<sup>th</sup> and Glorietta, there will be more traffic.

Mr. Henderson explained that there is a big difference between the light at the intersection at 4<sup>th</sup> and Orange and the way the light operates and the intersection in question. The traffic approaches the 4<sup>th</sup> and Orange intersection is relatively balanced in the three directions that approach it. The majority of traffic comes from south on Orange, northbound, and it makes the right turn onto 4<sup>th</sup> at that location. So, they find that the traffic that is coming from all three approaches at the Orange and 4<sup>th</sup> intersection, then heads down towards the Bridge and is three times what is on any one of the approaches at the Glorietta intersection.

Mr. Tierney suggested taking the number of seconds that the light turns green on that arrow to turn from Orange onto 4<sup>th</sup>, the amount, volume wise, should equal the same amount, volume wise, as there is coming off the Bridge with the signal at the same length of time. This is because the signal on Orange and 4<sup>th</sup> will have the exact same timing at Glorietta making that left hand turn. The sequence of both of those lights has to be in sequence.

Mr. Monroe commented that the key is in the statement that the desire is to keep the Level of Service at F or D on the 4<sup>th</sup> Street traffic going east. Once it is decided to make that LOS D there has to be a much shorter left turn at the Bridge.

Mr. Henderson explained that the difference comes from the fact that there are 1,000 vehicles coming on each of the approaches – 1,000 making the southbound left off of Orange onto 4<sup>th</sup>; 1,000 coming along 4<sup>th</sup> from the Base; 1,000 making the northbound right off of Orange onto 4<sup>th</sup>. They all combine to give between 3,000 and 4,000 and then continue eastbound on 4<sup>th</sup> Street. The same cycle and timings cannot be used with that 4,000 and the cars at the intersection at Glorietta Boulevard. The amount of time for that left turn needs to be reduced so that the eastbound through traffic time is extended.

Mr. Tierney asked what the flow would be if there was unencumbered and there was an underpass area there, leading from the toll booth station. Mr. Henderson responded that it would be more in line with the demand numbers that were given in line with 700+ vehicles during the peak hours.

Mr. Henderson added that the demand number given doesn't assume any downstream impact that is being created. For example, if the Five Point intersection isn't able to accommodate that amount of traffic the demand will spread itself to balance out.

Mr. Tierney continued by discussing the Five Point intersection. Another idea is to make the traffic light on Glorietta in the Five Points area favor the traffic that comes down Glorietta. That would also add to the smoothness of the traffic flow and keep it from moving onto the side streets.

Mr. Walton added that the numbers being put out are based on some assumptions. The regional model will give a more refined number and will be a better number to go by.

Story Vogel, 350 D Avenue, commented as the proponent and organizer of the signature drive that resulted in Proposition L. In terms of the analysis presented by the Engineer, he pointed out that it is all forecasting without any real ability to know how many cars will use it. The opening of the left turn on Glorietta would only present an option to distribute the traffic that wants to go to southeast and give it another way to go as opposed to going up to 3<sup>rd</sup> and Orange. This is not a panacea. It is not a cure. It is an attempt to enable traffic to go where it wants to go in the southeast part of town without having to go down to 3<sup>rd</sup> and Orange. There used to be a traffic light right there in front of the toll booths coming into Coronado. The discussion, while very technical, tends to obscure the fact that this has been done before in different ways and the potential of a left turn at Glorietta and 4<sup>th</sup> is a matter of management and a decision on whether or not the forecast model being used is accurate enough. He reminded the audience that whether or not people turn left and decide to go right at 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> are all matters to be decided down the road. The issue to be addressed today is what the forecast would be if traffic could turn left. It is known that it would take some traffic off of 3<sup>rd</sup> and Orange because obviously all those people who turn southbound at 3<sup>rd</sup> and Orange, then at some point if they are going to the southeast part of town, then turn eastbound on 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> to go home. All that is being asked is for them to be able to go home in the opposite direction. Right now, everybody who lives in that section of town, in order to get home, must go down Orange, must go down 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup>. If A, B and C were open they did go down them.

Al Ovrom, 1701 San Luis Rey, is one of those people who lives down there. He comes down 4<sup>th</sup>, to Orange and turns left on either 5<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup>. When he does that he is coming from San Diego and usually is sitting on I-5 in a state of disrepair. He questions the analysis done by Parsons Brinkerhoff because it doesn't appear to show how to factor in traffic that might be generated by people who are trying to beat the traffic jam on the other side of the Bridge. He agrees with Mr. Pena's theory that traffic goes to the path of least resistance. If it is an easier way to go for people who are trying to beat I-5, how does that get cranked into the analysis?

Mr. Henderson feels that is a very valid point. The forecast that they developed did not take into account the induced amount that might come from I-5 traffic who now finds this as an easier alternative. The first analysis they did was based on actual count data that exists for the area, taking that information and gearing it to the opposite direction. The second calculation used another hard number that is calculated based on the number of cars who are currently using 4<sup>th</sup> Street and how short a cycling that would have to be maintained in order for that traffic to continue to have a level of service.

Mr. Monroe commented on the map that shows the traffic coming all the way down with restricted turns. He asked what the thinking was and how it will affect Five Points.

Mr. Walton explained that this particular drawing stopped the frontage road or turn restrictions at Vista. This wasn't analyzed in detail because of all the complications on how this would be implemented.

Mr. Monroe returned to a discussion of a frontage road at least past 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> to make sure the traffic doesn't turn there. Is it implicit in there the argument that says that they are trying to relieve Orange Avenue traffic, the southbound traffic, but may in fact be increasing Orange Avenue traffic, or A, B and C traffic northbound to 4<sup>th</sup> because of the backup seen on 4<sup>th</sup>?

Mr. Walton agreed that it certainly is possible. If there is a physical barrier that separates Glorietta Boulevard and blocks off 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> from the eastbound or exiting movement, the traffic that is currently utilizing the Glorietta free turn movement would have to go elsewhere. That could be Pomona, A, B or C.

Robert Spane, 748 H Avenue, asked what the basis for the criteria for which streets traffic will not be allowed to go on. It needs to be a number of cars decision.

Mr. Walton explained that what he demonstrated were possible traffic patterns with the various scenarios of turn restrictions, free movement, etc. The actual implementation will be a policy decision.

**The City Council received the report.**

**11d. Update on Library Construction Project and Request for Supplemental Appropriation.** The project is in its last quarter of the second phase. Phase II was originally planned for eight months. This schedule was aggressive and could not be achieved when so many unforeseen repairs to the existing building were revealed and extended the schedule four months. Lead-based paint has been removed completely from the inside of the Spreckels Building and portions of the exterior. A contract has been initiated for the balance of the lead paint removal. While expensive, removal at this time will mean future Councils and staff will not have to deal with this issue again. The asbestos pipe lagging found in the crawl space of the Spreckels Building has been identified, removed and certified clean for the follow-on work by the electrical subcontractor. The repair to the cracked concrete roof beams surrounding the historical skylight was awaiting the completion of asbestos and paint removal. This work will start soon. The simplest method to repair the exterior stucco on the south side of the building will be implemented. Completion of repairs for the various unforeseen conditions resulted in additional contractor overhead and delays in original contract work, additional architect and subconsultant work to design repairs and extended periods for contract administration. The cumulative impact has extended the schedule to mid-January 2005.

Approximately 80% of the construction has been completed. The repairs and changes to the finish work will now extend the date of completion to mid-January 2005. Assembling the finishes in the remaining four months will cause more clarifications of the drawings and potentially more changes. While none are identified at this time, the construction industry in general continues to encounter material shortages and may have an additional impact on schedules if they occur here. **The City Council reviewed the updated cost projection and authorized a budget increase of \$468,000.**

**11e. Review and Comment on an Environmental Impact Report for Coronado Unified School District Proposed Pool/Tennis Courts/Palm Academy Project.** Mayor Smisek announced that this item is heard concurrently as Community Development Agency Item 5b.

Councilmember Tierney disqualified himself from hearing this item as he owns property in close proximity to the project site. He left the Council Chamber at 3:30 p.m.

Tony Pena, Director of Community Development, gave a presentation on this item. He explained that one aspect of this project that is somewhat complicating is that the proposed uses, for example swimming pool and tennis courts, are not fixed at this time. There are still some decisions to be made by the School District as to the final location. However, the principal project indicated that the swimming pool is going

to be at the D Avenue site and the tennis courts would remain on Sixth. That is not necessarily the preferred alternative, and the EIR analyses the situation where the swimming pool would be switched to Sixth and the tennis courts to D Avenue. Both of those combinations have a variety of different impacts. The traffic circulation portion of the EIR has been deemed inadequate by staff. For one example, the Orange Avenue, Third and Fourth intersections have not been analyzed for traffic impacts and staff is recommending in the letter that the EIR incorporate such an analysis. There is no analysis of the tennis courts at the Palm Academy site area on D. There will be a great variation in usage in terms of the actual participants in the water and tennis activities, but there will be a variety in space from viewers. That will create an undetermined amount of traffic and other issues that need to be more detailed in the EIR. Parking is another area that needs to be looked at to accommodate the number of people who will be visiting for short periods, many overlapping. It is detailed further in the draft letter. The School District indicates there are three parking lots that will be used to service these activities, but it doesn't specify location or the number of spaces that will be actually available for the uses proposed. In one area, they indicate that on-street parking will be available for support, however, that may take parking away from the residents which is a major concern. There is also a possibility that there may be a decal parking program that would be applied to that area in the future. It is indicated that the lighting of the tennis courts will be subdued enough that it will not interfere with surrounding uses, however, at the D Avenue site there is a proposed City affordable housing project as well as other projects along that half of the block that would be directly affected by lighting and nighttime activity. On the other hand, it is desirable to have night time lighting. Noise was another area examined by staff. The EIR indicates that there will be significant but unavoidable noise effects. However, staff is not convinced that the mitigation would be appropriate. Staff wants the EIR to expand the study to include something like that.

Mayor Smisek complimented staff on this terrific presentation. Staff went through this with a fine toothed comb. This gives the City the ability to be able to make sure it does its job and there will be a better EIR as the final outcome.

Councilmember Monroe referred to page 94, the last paragraph. The last sentence reads, "Constructing the courts without lights is not an acceptable option for the tennis community." He recommends that the words "for the tennis community" be stricken. He would like it to simply say that it is not an acceptable option.

John Orlowski, 421 D Avenue, commented that Mr. Pena mentioned affordable housing next to the site on D Avenue. He asked for elaboration on that and when the voters approved it.

Mayor Smisek responded that the referred to project was Senior Housing that will be on the old police station site. It has not been determined whether that will be low income housing.

George Powell, 569 E Avenue, asked that the City's request to expand CUSD's CEQA analysis include the following:

1. A general statement that reads – throughout the report, conflicting times for different user groups are given. The instructional pool usage and hours are not given. The 12 special events mentioned are significantly less than those proposed in another known document, as are the expected hours for public use. To adequately analyze traffic, parking and noise, a clear and concise business plan must be included.
2. Page 5.1-4: PM peak hours used were 4:00pm – 6:00 p.m. and are incorrect. The 6<sup>th</sup> and F intersection PM peak hours are 2:00pm – 4:00 pm.

3. Under traffic (High School Option), a 20.5% increase in traffic (400 ADT/1950ADT) in a school zone must be considered significant and the impact cannot singularly be made less than significant by the existing crossing guard at 6<sup>th</sup> and F.
4. Page 5.1-4 Existing parking – An analysis for parking counts done on one early release school day is inadequate to determine an average parking supply.
5. Page 5.1-21 – Off-street parking analysis should include a statement that the project decreases off-street parking 19% in the high school area
6. Table 5.1-7 – Parking supply (high school option) is incorrect as two streets (E Avenue between 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Street between Orange and E) exceed the 2 block limit. Accordingly, all follow-on analysis is incorrect.
7. Table 5.1-16 – Parking supply (D Ave. option) is incorrect. Errors include counting spaces (6<sup>th</sup> between Orange and E Ave), streets exceeding two block limit (E & F between 5<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup>), and omissions (Palm Ave between D & E, D Ave between 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup>, and Orange Ave between 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup>). Accordingly, all follow-on analysis is incorrect.
8. Page 5.1-20 Add- City Zoning Ordinance 86.58.030 Off Street Parking, Paragraph O, would require a 40+ space off-street parking lot for this project.

He further stated that he is confident that the current school board will claim mitigation to less than significant levels, certify this EIR and proceed with the project. He urged Council to retain the village atmosphere is a priority, please use the means available to stop this project.

Jean Narding, 426 Palm Avenue, complained that her scooter got caught in the gutter near 5<sup>th</sup> and the parking lot for teachers. She is before the Council to speak against the proposed Pool/Tennis Courts/Palm Academy Project. She called Council's attention to remarks made by George Powell, the previous speaker, and referred to his remarks at the School Board meeting on September 20, 2004 concerning the EIR. She urged Council to study Mr. Powell's statement.

She lives on Palm between F & G, across from Triangle Park. There is already we have North Island workers and school activities people parking in front of our condos using the park. She noted all the pools already in Coronado and this City does not need more. Let's get real about our limited property in Coronado. Existing pools have always been sufficient. Let's keep it that way.

Margaret Richardson, 435 G Avenue, read a letter she wrote to Council. Hundreds of residents live in the neighborhood surrounding the proposed Aquatics Facility. I am one of them. The noise, traffic and congestion that we would be subjected to under this plan would be intolerable. Indeed, CUSD's draft EIR states: "noise IS a significant and unavoidable impact." According to page 3-4, the EIR states: "the pool would be open to the public for lap swim from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m." However, not one additional parking space is provided in the plan to accommodate this commercial enterprise. For page 5.1-29 of their EIR to state: "Analysis has concluded that impacts [of traffic] would be less than significant..." is false and misleading.

For the Coronado Unified School District to claim exemption from City ordinances pertaining to traffic and parking while proceeding to construct an Aquatics Facility which is, by their own admission, clearly a commercial enterprise, not a classroom for students, it is certainly contrary to law and must be challenged and corrected. She asked Council to do all within their authority to ensure that parking, traffic and noise problems are adequately resolved. Do not allow this project to ruin our residential neighborhood.

Julie Grazian, Coronado School Board representative to the Community Development Agency, joins the Council/CDA Board at the dais.

Jean Landon, 555 H Avenue, hopes that Council will approve the concept of the Aquatics Complex at the High School. She suggested that traffic will be decreased in town with all the aquatics athletes not having to drive to and from the municipal pool. The increase in traffic from when other teams come here to play will be negligible because there is very poor attendance at water polo games and swim meets. If that is compared to the kind of attendance that there is at Friday night football games, it is really minimal. Parking should not be an issue, because most events will happen after school hours, so those parking spots that are used by students during the day will be emptied and can be used. The High School pool will have use of the three parking lots within a block of the proposed site. Concerning noise, she asked what noise mitigation the City Council approved for the new community pool. The School Board has agreed in concept to use whatever the City had planned for noise mitigation. Please do the right thing for Coronado's youth and approve the concept of the Aquatics Complex.

Rebecca Montag, spoke on behalf of Habib Motlagh, 755 Margarita Avenue. As contract city engineer for three cities and consulting civil engineer for several other municipalities in Riverside County, he has read many EIR's and their analyses. From the tone of the analysis of the CUSD aquatic complex EIR made by city staff, it is obvious that the author was directed to "nitpick" the report prepared by CUSD consultants and focus only on the negative aspects of the project. Social/economic benefits of the project to students and residents of Coronado were not discussed.

Furthermore, the impact of 100 or even 200 spectators on occasion that may visit the school during special events (swim meets and polo games) will be during off-peak hours as these events are normally held on weekends/evenings. If on rare occasion, these events were held during peak hours, it would still not make the significant impact as portrayed in this analysis. I can agree with the analysis author that Third and Fourth Streets and Orange Avenue have traffic more than six hours per weekday. I would say, given my experience, those intersections are operating at service level F. No aquatic event would cause traffic to back up along Third and Fourth Streets and even over the bridge as currently occurs frequently.

The author also questions the use of parking at Crown Kindergarten Center which is only five blocks away. When he has attended games at other schools, he walked many more blocks.

He has lived at four addresses in Coronado, one within earshot of the municipal pool, and can attest that there is no such thing as a quiet neighborhood in the village. Every quadrant is impacted by traffic and noise; it is the price that is paid to live in this otherwise wonderful community. He further questioned the concern about adults and children using locker rooms at the same time and asked if that was different than at the municipal pool.

Furthermore, one issue not addressed was the impact of upwards of 50 students driving or bike riding across the island twice a day, once at 4:45 am. It was obvious that the old municipal pool did not have enough parking for events and doubts there will be much more parking at the new facilities.

He support the CUSD aquatic complex project at the school. He hope that more youth in our great community will be able to participate in these character building sports and requests that this body chose alternative 3, Support the Concept and the environmental analysis.

Mike Chase, E Avenue, urges Council to build the facility.

Resident, 625 Alameda, asked Council to make sure all pool participants' needs are met.

Martha Jay, 700 B, wants Council and CUSD to work together to work out the areas in conflict.

Jane Brown, 601 Coronado Avenue, supports the project.

Deborah Goldblatt, 921 Balboa Avenue, supports the project.

Judith Smith commented on available parking at the Police Department and Orange Avenue. She supports the pool at school.

Tamara O'Brien, 500 Alameda, supports the EIR.

Candy Kraiser, 949 F Avenue, supports the project.

Terry Stacy, 640 B, supports the project.

Jan Iwashita, 522 G Avenue, has a problem with density, more traffic, more noise, parking problems – there is not enough room for the pool project.

Alexandra Bry, 600 block Pomona Avenue, supports the project.

Elizabeth Sakablochi, 10 Port Royale, supports the project.

Mayor Smisek amplified the situation that Council is in at this time. Council can respond and comment regarding the EIR. The City Council really doesn't have a voice in whether there is going to be a swimming pool or not. That is a School Board decision to make. As the Community Development Agency, the CDA is the responsible agency and their primary concern in that capacity would concern the funding and whether the funding is being used appropriately and legally. That is mainly an administrative type of function unless there is an obvious derelict use of funds. The Council's comments are really more tailored around the legal document of an EIR. The EIR is the City's responsibility as a City Council to comment on the ordinances, rules and regulations that each and every one of us have to abide by as far as their own homes are concerned, or the way the City operates. That includes things like parking, noise, traffic, etc. Most of the other areas of the EIR have been satisfactorily addressed. This is more of a technical type of thing at this point.

Councilmember Monroe commented that he has no problem with moving the tennis courts from where they are to the D Avenue location. He echoed Mayor Smisek's comments in that Council's responsibility is to work with the School Board and the community to see what can be done to mitigate any neighborhood impacts. He thinks that the City must link the business plan to the EIR. There can be an advantage to doing that. The City needs to look at similarly timed events – a swim meet the same night as a football game – and part of the mitigation could be that the School District can sign up and say that they won't schedule like events at the same time. There clearly is a way to mitigate some of the parking situation by the way rules are imposed, etc. to get agreement back and forth.

**MSUC (Monroe/Smisek) moved that the City Council approve the draft letter to the Coronado Unified School District with the removal of “for the tennis community” from page 94**

Councilmember Tanaka personally thinks the City would benefit from a second pool, but he agrees with Mayor Smisek that is not really the purview of Council at this time. Council needs to focus on the environmental document. Mayor Smisek said correctly that Council has a job to do in terms of looking at the EIR to make sure it is adequate. He feels that the comments staff made in response to the EIR are relatively accurate. The way the process works, that doesn't hurt the pool project, but rather it strengthens the EIR because these aren't points that are unique to the City but are professional points that were pointed out by City professionals. The letter that was drafted was appropriate. It doesn't change the fact that the School District is the lead agency. Their job is to take those comments and either act or not act on them.

Councilmember Schmidt agrees with everyone's comments. She does think that parking is important. Traffic mitigation needs to be examined closer. She thinks Council should definitely send the letter that was prepared.

Ms. Grazian, representative from the CUSD School Board, clarified that the School Board did approve building a pool a year and a half ago. There are several conditions upon building the pool, the EIR being one of them. There are several hurdles to go through to mitigate this EIR. The final one will be voted on at the next School Board meeting on November 15<sup>th</sup>. After that there will be a business plan that needs to be approved, depending on the outcome of the EIR. She appreciates all the input from Council because it is important for the School District to be exhaustive in their research. This is a civic project – it is not just for the School District, but for the community also.

**AYES: Monroe, Schmidt, Tanaka, and Smisek**  
**NAYS: None**  
**ABSENT: Tierney**

12. **CITY ATTORNEY:**

**12a. City Attorney Analysis of City Council Policy No. 9: Reconsideration of a Matter Upon Which the City Council has Voted.** Morgan Foley, City Attorney, explained that at the August 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting Council discussed the reconsideration of the lifeguard tower design. At that time Councilmember Monroe was concerned about the use of Policy No. 9 for reconsideration of the matter as it was previously decided by the Council. He believes that the reconsideration was appropriate at the time, based on Policy No. 9. His recommendation, based on review of that, is not to change Policy No. 9 unless Council wants further clarification to secondary or substitute motions in dealing with reconsiderations. If Council does, he would go to Robert's Rules of Order to follow their guidance, which is once Council votes on the main motion it couldn't come back and reconsider a secondary or substitute motion. He doesn't think this is something that has ever been a problem with this Council. Policy No. 9 has been adopted, has been amended at least once, but was really intended to bring some finality to matters. It is a good policy and it is important for Council to have such a policy.

Mayor Smisek has a concern about the substitute motion. His concern is over a scenario such as the following: a substitute motion is made which takes a priority in voting; it is voted 3-2; the two don't like

the answer; the main motion is voted on and is passed 5-0; the next meeting comes up and the two can bring back that motion again as voting in favor of it and put the substitute motion back on the table again. He would like to see Council handle substitute motions the same way they handle main motions, because they really have equal weight the way this Council and community use them. The substitute motion is usually the opposite motion of the main motion. Consequently, it is a nice ploy to be able to use that technique and say that they will vote for the main motion and bring it back later. The other thing that needs to be addressed is that there needs to be a timeline where reconsideration can no longer be brought in effect. As Mr. Foley pointed out, when the City starts carrying out the actions from the main motion there can't be a contract let and then have reconsideration of a motion. There needs to be either a time or a number of months/weeks or time frame or some kind of a milestone. The City Council doesn't really follow Robert's Rules of Order on reconsideration. Robert's Rules state that the next meeting is the deadline for reconsideration. This Council has been much more lenient about that to include members who have been absent, members who have not been on the Council at the time, etc. His request is to handle substitute motions the same as main motions so that the substitute motion is voted on and the majority could bring it back at the next meeting.

Councilmember Monroe agrees with Mayor Smisek on the substitute motion, but he is not sure he agrees with Mayor Smisek's language that everything that has happened is totally opposite to the main motion. He is a little worried about the time limit. He would clearly support a time limit for the City Council, but he doesn't know how that could be carried to a new Council after an election.

Mayor Smisek pointed out that Robert's Rules wouldn't allow for a new council to have a reconsideration option anyway. He suggests tying it to a milestone. For instance, on construction projects, if action is started based on a decision by Council, then reconsideration is not an option.

Councilmember Tierney has no problem with that. It sounds very reasonable and very fair. Otherwise it stretches and stretches. He would like to see that examined by the City Attorney.

Mr. Foley would like to take a look at it. The idea of a substitute motion is to, in some cases, eviscerate what is in the main motion. It could be a sentence. It could be the whole motion. There are some ideas that reconsideration ought not to be allowed on a substitute motion at certain points in time or over certain decisions.

Councilmember Tanaka agrees with the recommendation that the City Attorney put together that the Policy, in its present form, is adequate. He feels that way because he doesn't think there has been an abuse of the current policy in this community. He doesn't feel this change is necessary because it hasn't been abused, it isn't likely to be abused and if it were abused, the majority would have the power to not allow the reconsideration. His concern with Mayor Smisek's timeline idea is that it doesn't take into account the possibility of making a mistake and needing to make a motion to stop. He reiterated that the policy is adequate.

Mayor Smisek pointed out that since he and Mrs. Schmidt have been on Council there have been those who have used, a number of times, voting with the majority in order to bring it back. According to Robert's Rules, that is abuse. Because of City rules, it is not abuse. The example Mr. Tanaka brought up with the School District is not really appropriate because there was a new event that occurred – it was not really reconsideration. Mayor Smisek just wants to keep it clean. He has always considered substitute motions as having the same stature and validity as a regular motion.

**Council consensus was to send this back to the City Attorney for clarification and timeline. Further discussion can take place at that time.**

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

The City Council recessed into closed session at 5:48 p.m.

**14. CLOSED SESSION:**

**14a. CLOSED SESSION: CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL  
EXISTING LITIGATION**

**AUTHORITY: Subdivision (a) of §54956.9**

**NAME OF CASE: City of Coronado v. Mark D. Blumenthal, et al  
San Diego Superior Court Case No. GIC 829675**

**14b. CLOSED SESSION: CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL  
EXISTING LITIGATION**

**AUTHORITY: Subdivision (a) of §54956.9**

**NAME OF CASE: Gerardo Munguia v. City of Coronado, et al  
San Diego Superior Court Case No. GIC 826220**

The City Council returned into open session at 6:15 p.m. and reported that direction was given to legal counsel on both item 14a and 14b.

**15. ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 6:17 p.m.

Approved: November 2, 2004

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tom Smisek, Mayor

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
L. Diane Shea, CMC  
City Clerk