

**MINUTES OF A
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF CORONADO
Police Facility – Emergency Operations Center
700 Orange Avenue
Coronado, CA 92118
Thursday, August 5, 2004, 2:00 p.m.**

Mayor Smisek called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL:

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

Absent: None

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

2. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None.

3. CITY COUNCIL BUSINESS:

3a. Public Workshop to Provide Information and to Discuss the Proposal to Further Regulate and/or Ban the Use of Leaf Blowers Within the City of Coronado. Scott Huth, Director of Public Services, explained that this came by way of a citizen petition to the City Council and to the City Manager requesting a ban on leaf blowers because of the affects of leaf blowers. They identified a study that was put together by the State of California that mentioned some effects dealing with leaf blowers. As part of that, staff did some analysis and put that information in Council's packet.

Mr. Huth described the leaf blowers that are out there in the community right now. There is a combination of gas, electric and battery powered leaf blowers. The benefit of the blowers is that leaf debris can be cleaned up readily as well as grass clippings. They are also used to clean up trash and debris over large areas. The same type of work can be done with a rake or a broom but would take a significant amount of time compared to using the blower. The City also uses vacuums, street sweepers and a whole arsenal of tools, but the blower is just one of those tools that are used to keep the community clean. Likewise, landscape professionals are using a variety of tools. By and large, the leaf blower is the most effective tool for collecting materials like leaves and litter in a very fast

method so that it can be picked up. It is also used to clean off equipment. They are used at the beach because of the huge amount of sand that covers the walkways. The time staff has to move that sand off so that it is a safe access way for pedestrians is very limited. Blowers are also used for blowing off surfaces and to drain pipelines. There are improper uses for leaf blowers. They should not be used around dirt or in a dusty area or while bystanders are in the area. Additional benefits are that areas can be cleaned up faster, they can get to hard to reach areas, they can be safer tools to use in certain conditions and they gather litter and leaves more efficiently than raking or brooming. The side effects of using leaf blowers are that there are exhaust emissions, noise and resuspended fugitive dust. There are actions that have taken place to try to reduce the side effects of leaf blowers over the years include: a State law regulating emissions; a State law regulating noise emissions; a Coronado noise ordinance requiring mufflers and limiting times of operations and decibel levels (limited to use between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., not allowed on Sundays or holidays); the industry is constantly improving equipment to reduce emissions and noise; and, the City of Coronado recent outreach efforts.

Mr. Huth went on to try to discern the real issue. It is the improper use of the blower. Exhaust emissions are similar to other lawn care equipment. The noise level is the same or less than edgers, line trimmers, some mowers, chain saws and outdoor vacuums. Fugitive dust can be resuspended by numerous other sources such as mowers, vacuums, vehicles and by brooming activity. Rather than banning the leaf blower, staff is suggesting education of the public as to the proper use in the hopes that will curb a lot of the concerns people have.

Mayor Smisek asked Mr. Huth to discuss the experiment he conducted comparing the cleaning of Spreckels and the Police Facility on what it would take to do comparable work without a leaf blower. To do the same job in cleaning actually resulted in a substantial increase in time when a broom was used rather than a blower.

Mayor Smisek also referred to the staff report and its mention of water quality. The idea is that an alternate method that would evolve from the ban on leaf blowers would be people hosing down the area to get rid of the debris and the hosing down would go into the gutter and into the storm drains. Mr. Huth explained that the blower coming onto the market was probably one of the biggest tools that prevented water waste. The City's stormwater program won't allow that to be done. There are still some violators in the City, but compared to the '70s and '80s when it was a common practice, the situation is much better.

Councilmember Schmidt asked for the cost difference between the hand held and the battery operated.

Victor Uyeji, maintenance worker, explained that the handheld blower costs around \$340 vs. the battery operated which costs around \$900. The vacuum runs around \$1300. Ms. Schmidt asked if the battery operated one is as efficient as the hand held. Mr. Uyeji explained that if one needs excess power to blow a little bit more debris that is piled up, the hand held has more power, but the battery operated one, at full throttle, can probably blow about 135 mph of air.

Mr. Huth added that the battery operated blower has a limited cycle out in the field. The gas powered can just be refilled, but the battery operated one needs to be recharged.

Councilmember Tierney asked if the Enforcement Officer could explain the ease or lack thereof in terms of enforcing this particular item.

Mr. Huth explained that, through their research, most of the communities (12-14) who have implemented the full ban have commented that they were really depending on residents to call in those complaints, but in all cases it was a headache to enforce because of the nature of the landscape industry. When he looks at the impact of a ban, clearly enforcement is going to be a huge impact on the City. The expectation is to absolutely not have any blowers in the community, and then the City will be bombarded by calls which will divert enforcement activity away from other things that are going on.

Mr. Tierney added that part of the problem, too, is the amount of money these people are thinking will be collected in fines will probably pay for the program, but that is not necessarily true.

Mr. Huth responded that his experience has been that most of the fine programs rarely collect enough revenue to deal with the program it is trying to enforce, with the exception of the parking meter program.

Mr. Tierney asked the Code Enforcement Officer what his opinion is as to how many tickets are likely to result from this.

John Swanson, Assistant Planner/Code Enforcement, responded that, as directed by Council previously, they would respond to written complaints on a case-by-case basis. The responsibility would remain with the property owner because they are responsible that the property be free of code violations at all times. The actual number would be a matter of how many complaints are received and are able to be verified.

Councilmember Monroe referred to construction sites. He asked of Mr. Pena could give some kind of education through the permit process.

Mr. Huth responded that in the Best Management Program under the Storm Water Program the City does not list the blower as being an option for moving material around on the site. They are told to use a broom, keep the dust down low and the whole purpose is not to move material around so that it gets in the storm drain system. The City's efforts have been totally away, in dealing with construction sites, from any activity that is going to create more dust and materials leaving the site.

Mr. Monroe feels that there is at least another emphasis that could be made at Community Development. When people pull permits to do work and construction on sites it could be made clear, rather than down inside of Best Practices.

Mr. Huth explained that there is a Best Management brochure that goes out. It actually has a section on leaf blowers. This is the material that is going out to the landscape industry to deal with prevention measures. Leaf blowers are one of many issues that have to be dealt with. The construction one does not have a specific section on leaf blowers but it does have a specific section dealing with any debris coming off of private property and how to deal with.

Responding to a question of Mr. Tanaka, Mr. Huth answered by saying that most people blow the driveway leaf litter into a corner and then picks it up. Grass clippings and any kind of dust and debris that might be on the driveway they just blow back onto the turf. The stuff that is visible is what is really getting collected. The stuff that is mixed in with the turf is usually just blown back in. That is similar to how Public Services deals with it.

Steve Bruce, 564 ½ I Avenue, explained that pesticides are better left on the ground. The City received his committee's first letter five months from Sheila Lukin on March 4th, regarding the suffering some Coronado residents are experiencing from blowers. Sheila Lukin is in New York but she wanted him to relate a story to Council. She had a gardener who used a leaf blower. She asked him not to use the leaf blower. She was not home one day and came home to see the gardener using the leaf blower. It is the thinking of gardeners to mow, blow and go. That is what is happening a lot through the landscaping business in Coronado. If there were ever to be a ban on leaf blowers in Coronado, there would have to be fines and incentives for the blower to stop being used. In the staff report there were noted 9 California cities that had a full ban on all use of leaf blowers. Those 9 cities are Bevedor, Beverly Hills, Del Mar, Hermose Beach, Laguna Beach, Los Altos, Mill Valley, Santa Barbara and Santa Monica. Six of those places are very similar to Coronado in that they are beach communities. Coronado is a very tight knit community. Today, the City Clerk has received the original signatures of over 200 Coronado City residents all requesting a full ban on leaf blowers throughout the City. The Mayor, City Manager and each Council member have also received copies of the signatures. In talking about how difficult this would be to regulate, he can guarantee that there are some angry people out there and most of them have cell phones and would be happy to participate in getting leaf blowers out of here. Leaf blowers blow at speeds of up to 220 mph. On April 6th, he and Karen spoke to Council, citing problems with children's allergies from blowers in Coronado. In addition, on April 6th, Pauline Hall told Council of the problems with her breathing from blowers in Coronado. Personally, he has fallen ill five separate times from breathing in the fugitive dust caused by blowers. The most recent time was two weeks ago. One of those times, about two years ago, he was in grave condition. Portable vacuums cost as little as \$65. Vacuums would keep the junk out of the storm drains and out of people's lungs. Gene Malone, a neighbor of his, wanted Mr. Bruce to relate a story. About two months ago he was using a leaf blower. Mr. Bruce told him about the harms of leaf blowers and told him about the vacuums out there. About three weeks later Mr. Malone thanked Mr. Bruce for the idea. Mr. Malone had purchased a gasoline powered vacuum. They are very loud. He spent \$110 on his vacuum. It is not as loud as the mechanical devices from hell, but it gets the job done quicker. It is sucking up the debris. Mr. Malone is very happy with the change. Most people who own blowers only see one side of the issue. Most everyone else can see both sides of the issue. They absolutely see that this speeds up the progress of removing debris off sidewalks, parks and yards. They also see the other side of the issue which is that people are suffering from the stress of the noise, but that is not their campaign, but they are suffering and in some cases dying from breathing in the fugitive dust caused by blowers. Again, pesticides are better left on the ground. He read the petition for Council. "As residents of Coronado, we feel that leaf blowers are an annoyance, nuisance, detriment and causing injury to many of us. We would like to see the Mayor and City Council of Coronado enact an ordinance that particularly enforces the banning of portable leaf blowers, gasoline and electric, throughout the City of Coronado. Leaf blowers contribute emissions which cause health detriments to the public. Some of the airborne pollutants caused by leaf blowers is a mixture of gasoline remnants, animal droppings, insects, pesticides, fertilizers, dust and pollutants. This is becoming a question of liability, as scientific evidence states it is very unhealthy to breathe these airborne pollutants. He read a few of the names of the more than 200

Coronado residents and explained some of their complaints. After reviewing all sides, the Orange County Grand Jury concluded that the health hazards citizens are exposed to far outweigh any questionable economic benefits. This is a very serious health issue. Portable vacuums cost as little as \$65. Finally, they understand there will be some economic costs in switching from blowers to vacuums. In doing so, the City's storm drains and, most important, the health of citizens of Coronado will benefit.

Ken Mitchell, Coronado Chamber of Commerce, opposes the restrictions on leaf blowers and supports the City staff recommendation that no further regulation be taken on this matter. A review of the staff report shows that banning leaf blowers is a very expensive undertaking and has proven to be unenforceable in most California cities that are trying to take this action. The Chamber's primary concern is a regulation that appears to be both economically and politically unenforceable. City staff reports that California cities with similar restrictions have used terms such as "nightmare, expensive, and unenforceable" in describing their regulations. The health concerns brought up by the Coronado citizens on the petition does not appear to have documented scientific foundation to support their concerns, nor do state and federal restrictions discuss anything relating to fugitive dust. At the present time there are 68 business licenses in Coronado to perform landscaping services that require using leaf blowers. These businesses price their services at the time it takes to perform the service. City staff study shows that a task that can take 6 to 8 minutes to perform using a leaf blower may take 1 ½ to 2 hours to perform using a broom. The Chamber's concern, also, that any restrictions relating to leaf blowers will allow additional future restrictions to other landscaping items such as lawn mowers, weed whackers, and even some power tools that one may use in their garage. In many cases, restrictions on such items would more than double the time required to perform these services. These man hour costs will, of course, be passed onto the consumer – the Coronado residents. The Chamber of Commerce recommends that the City take no action and change the present standards on the subject. The Chamber fully supports a community education program and will provide assistance and guidance to their members on the subject.

Story Vogel, 350 D Avenue, uses an electric leaf blower. He is an asthmatic. The real problem is that the sound effect or dba of these is around 60 dba. The State Senate passed a muffler law that allows 95 dba, which approaches that of an aircraft. Those who live between 3rd and 4th or anywhere where there is traffic today, live in a constantly assaulted environment. He was thinking that gasoline powered vacuums pollute the air as much as gasoline powered blowers. Perhaps the Council could consider a temporary program or an ordinance insisting on electric leaf blowers.

Larry Will, Echo Inc., manufacturer of these leaf blowers, explained that they take this as a serious issue. They have spent millions to create quiet blowers and they are available. They have also done many things to reduce emissions. He thinks that one of the major problems is education. A public institute in Alexandria, Virginia has created a manual to teach contractors and operators the proper way to use the blowers.

Mayor Smisek commented that Mr. Bruce's primary focus appears to be on raising dust. There wouldn't be much of a benefit from the noise angle with a transition from gasoline powered to an electric type of blower. The other piece of it has to do with the pollution angle from the emissions of the gas powered blower, but that didn't seem to be the emphasis. The instances Mr. Bruce mentioned about the dust were all cases of misuse. He feels that the gentleman who spoke from the manufacturer and his point on education was right on. Mr. Huth said the same thing as did Mr. Swanson. It all appears to be an education enforcement issue that needs to be honed in on to be able

to resolve at least most of the problem. The City has to weigh the cost, not only to the City but to the small businesses that are incorporated to do these kinds of things. Mayor Smisek doesn't see a justification at this time. He would really like to see the City Council get into this discussion to see if Council can work towards the staff recommendation of some type of added enforcement, mainly through an education process, but also through the use of citizens who turn in the people who are using the leaf blower incorrectly.

Councilmember Schmidt commented on pesticides. She encouraged people not to use pesticides. She doesn't use them and has no problems at all. She also commented on the dirt and debris that Mr. Bruce talked about. She washes down her fruit trees once a week. The dirt that comes off those trees comes from 25 to 30' in the air. The dirt is coming out of the sky and from the airplanes, etc. She doesn't feel that gardeners are the big culprit in air pollution.

Councilmember Tanaka began by saying that Admiral Halsey said that a rule that you can't enforce is a bad rule. He thinks this is a very good example of where, if Council would pass this ordinance, it would be very difficult to catch these people in the act. He heard the Code Enforcement Officer say that the City probably wouldn't even go that route, but would rather respond to written complaints. That would make it even more contentious and even harder to really apprehend the person or to make it a clear cut case. He thinks this is another classic example where outreach would do more to limit or curtail misuse of leaf blowers. The two things he thinks would make sense in terms of improving health in Coronado and improving the abuse of leaf blowers would be that the City knows who operates them in the City of Coronado. They could be mailed something short and direct. He would also support having two staff members occasionally go out at times when leaf blowers are likely to be operated and use a person to person outreach. If there are cases of abuse, the most direct way of getting those things stopped would be to have someone from the City talk to them. He would be much happier to support something in terms of outreach because he thinks it will address the problem better.

Councilmember Tierney reported that each Council member was given the California Environmental Protection Agency Air Resources Board's report to the California Legislature on the potential health and environmental impacts of leaf blowers that was put together in February of 2000. The State Legislature asked the ARB to include recommendations for alternatives in the report. At the point when this report was put together the ARB pointed out that they did not have sufficient information nor support scientifically to come up with a ban of leaf blowers or that they were causing various problems health wise. They did state that fugitive dust emissions are problematic. The leaf blowers are designed to blow relatively large materials which require enough force to also blow up dust particles. Banning or restricting the use of leaf blowers would reduce fugitive dust emissions but there is no data on fugitive dust emissions from alternatives such as vacuums, brooms and rakes. In addition, without a more complete analysis of potential health impacts, costs and benefits of leaf blower use and potential health impacts of alternatives, such a recommendation is not warranted. They have suggested, much of which has already been discussed, that those who use leaf blowers professionally should be trained in the methods that reduce pollution and potential health impacts to both owners and themselves. He thinks if the California Environmental Protection Air Resources Board has not been able to come up with conclusions to support such a ban, he doesn't think that the City is in a position to move forward on the evidence that they have gathered and the evidence that has come forward here. It is a situation that would probably take a little bit more time. As has been pointed out, companies are going forward in an effort to technologically develop more alternate, quite leaf blowers and to develop

vacuums that are quieter and do a lot better job. In the long run, that is the only option the City has considering the high cost of moving to other items like brooks, rakes, etc. He thinks this is an educational thing. He thinks the City is going to have to make sure that when a contractor comes in and gets a business license that they receive the various brochures.

Councilmember Monroe thanked Mr. Bruce for his many phone calls and messages. He spoke with Crystal Crawford, a Council woman in Del Mar, and her immediate reaction was that they have it on the books but that it is not a very effective ordinance. They do not cite the property owner. She encouraged Mr. Monroe to talk with another Council member who was on Council when they passed the ordinance. He did that. Her take was that she felt the ordinance generally isn't that effective. It causes heartburn when it is tried to apply it. Mr. Monroe was surprised to see in Mr. Bruce's testimony that he left noise and emissions out because there are other areas that cause noise and emissions. Mr. Bruce kept referring to this report as a scientific report. Mr. Monroe read this report and he doesn't think it is a scientific report. It is a report on the information that is out there, but it is far from a scientific report. From the report, the introduction says that as City staff discovered, in some areas such as exhaust emissions, much is known. In other areas, such as fugitive dust emissions, we know very little. For both fugitive dust and noise there are few or no data specifically on leaf blower impacts. The next paragraph is filled with the word potentially. The idea that something is potential is not a scientific fact. It says, "the number of people potentially exposed to emissions..." and "laws that seek to control emissions are summarized." Section 3 reviews health hazard identifying the range of potential negative health outcomes of exposure and there are potential health impacts that may be experienced by those exposed to exhaust emissions, fugitive dust and noise from leaf blowers. For exhaust emissions, the number of people potentially impacted is as high as the population of the State of California. He read a paragraph on fugitive dust. Data on fugitive dust indicate that the pm10 emissions, impacts from dust suspended by leaf blowers, are small but probably significant. Previous emission estimates range from less than 1 percent to 5 % of the state wide BMP indicators. They say it is significant, but they also say it is between 1 and 5%. He is not swayed that this is the cause of so much of the problems that are being discussed. He would support that the City continue the education and take a hard look at the noise levels that exist in the community.

Mayor Smisek has heard all the comments and Council consensus is not to seek further regulations of leaf blowers. The education can be increased to those who use leaf blowers. The City can also try to enforce, through a reactive process, and follow up on complaints made about offenders. Mayor Smisek thanked Mr. Bruce for bringing this to Council's attention.

3b. Update on the City-Wide Major Traffic Study and Guidance to Staff on Policy Direction for Identifying and Analyzing Congestion Relief Measures. Jim Benson, Director of Engineering and Project Development, provided the staff report on this item. He explained that the City is constantly and increasingly impacted by traffic. Incremental growth is attributed to at least the following: increased Navy operations and functions at the bases; popularity of the City as a destination resort both on a daily and overnight basis; cut through traffic diverted from I-5 as I-5 gets increasingly congested going south and north; increased density of City residences; society and the love affair with the auto goes on; the reduced amount of school bussing that is going on; the increased use of on demand delivery of goods. As traffic patterns change based on these congestion increases the City has struggled to anticipate what driver responses are going to be. The City also goes through trying to do things like regulatory efforts such as stop signs, yields, turn restrictions,

etc. Many of those come back to police as a challenge to enforce. This is not something unique to Coronado. All cities are basically challenged with evaluating the impact of actions. A traffic consultant is employed on almost all of those. It is expensive. It is difficult, from a staff perspective, to get them consistent from one to the next because the methodology is a little bit different as is the situation. One of the ideas that came up through this Major Traffic Study is creating a model of the City's circulation element that is a tool to assist in evaluating the impacts of different alternatives. Parsons Brinkerhoff was selected through a competitive RFP process with this contract effort to create this database. The information selected by PB is already being used by the consultant for the EIR on the semi diverter removal. That is one example where the City has already avoided the cost by the data that has been collected. The data also will be used in the EIS/EIR for the Congestion Relief Working Group project. Signals on 3rd and 4th are probably the most important elements of the CRWG. Darren Henderson is a Supervising Transportation Planner with Parsons Brinkerhoff.

Councilmember Monroe referred to the CRWG. That really is the 3rd and 4th Street study that came out of about a year's effort with the neighbors of 3rd and 4th Streets. All their recommendations have come to Council, most have been approved by Council and are being worked on with SANDAG and Caltrans.

Darren Henderson, Parsons Brinkerhoff, began by reviewing the Study's purpose. It is to quantify the existing traffic conditions, develop an evaluation model, identify short term traffic problems, evaluate short term mitigation options and provide a mechanism for ongoing monitoring and evaluation. The presentation today will bring Council up to speed up with where they are in the study. PB is looking to Council for some guidance as to exactly which way it wants PB to go. He will go over the evaluation methodology, evaluation scenarios, evaluation results and policy issues. They have been coordinating with Engineering staff and the City Manager on where they are in the study right now and some of the alternatives that are open to them at this point.

The first step in the evaluation methodology is to collect a detailed inventory of the conditions that exist within the City. They hired a counting firm that specializes in traffic data collection. They collected traffic counts at a variety of locations (50 to 60). They also collected grid lock counts. That gave a really good look at exactly what the traffic was within the City at that particular point in time. The period of time was July and August 2003. In addition to the count data itself, they also coordinated with City staff and Caltrans to get intersection layouts, traffic signal controls, timing plans, etc. That was used to feed into the evaluation model so that PB could get a realistic look at how the system operates and there could be some dynamic analysis done. They are using a state-of-the-practice evaluation tool called Synchro®. This model provides a snap shot of traffic conditions as they are today because it is based on actual data collected in the field. This allows PB to analyze a variety of things. They can look at signal timing or change the configuration of the intersection direct turn lanes, take turn lanes away, etc. This is not a dynamic problem. If a change is made by removing a link or adding a link to the system, the model does not automatically adjust traffic to show what the impacts might have been with that additional link in place. It is a static model. It takes the count data that is put into the model and looks at how those operations are on the system that exists. For pinpoint specific things like a signalized intersection where the timings can be changed, it will give an indication of how that affects the system. For something like the semi diverters, if one is put in place or taken away, it won't show how demand is going to change or where that traffic that is now blocked might divert to. For that they need to look at SANDAG and their regional model which is a dynamic model. The two pieces really need to be melded together.

They are two different tools. Another aspect of the Synchro® model is that it allows PB to run micro simulations of actual traffic circulating on the system.

In conducting the evaluation PB looked at two scenarios. The first was existing traffic conditions in the City, again, based on actual count data. That was done for the a.m. peak and the p.m. peak. They developed a short term forecast condition to look at what conditions on the system might be like in three to five years. In coming up with that assumption, they basically increased the City's traffic by 3% across the board. That was intended to take into account just the natural growth that is occurring in the City. 10% was added to the traffic to and from the Base. Once those two scenarios were developed, PB found that there was a little anomaly that needed to be addressed. That was particularly for the p.m. peak conditions. Their existing and short-term were based on an hourly, peak hour count at each of the locations. They found that, if one looked at activity at the Base at 15 minute intervals, there seemed to be certain times where a large influx of traffic was leaving at 4th Street. This is probably when the shifts end. They saw a huge spike of 30% in traffic that comes off the Base at that one point in time and it wasn't being reflected in the short term forecast because it was averaged over an hour period. The impacts of that spike weren't being reflected in the network. They developed a modified, short term scenario for the p.m. peak to reflect that spike in the traffic. This has helped to give more realistic results for the p.m. peak that reflect the impact of that saturation of traffic on 4th Street and then how that relates to things at Orange and some of the other locations along that particular corridor. Mr. Henderson reviewed some of the evaluation results to include: directional traffic peaks on SR-75 between A and B Avenues; extreme peak flows on Glorietta Boulevard between 4th and 5th Streets; consistent weekly peaks on SR-75 at the Bridge Toll Plaza; peaks reflecting NASNI Gate activity at McCain Blvd at NASNI Main Gate and at 1st Street at the NASNI Gate; NASNI activity impacts overall traffic on SR-75 at the Bridge Toll Plaza; traffic has increased moderately as seen by the SR-75 average annual daily traffic from 1989 to 2001; truck volumes are varied; existing conditions; and, short term conditions.

Councilmember Schmidt is not hearing about the traffic that is coming off of Highway 5 or up the Strand. Mr. Henderson explained that to the extent that the traffic that comes over the Bridge comes from I-5, that traffic is addressed. If the question is how much of that traffic is cutting through the City and getting from 5 down the Strand, that is something this study really can't address.

Mr. Henderson discussed truck volume briefly. In terms of numbers, for an urbanized area, the share of truck traffic that Coronado has is extremely low. The percentages range from 1.8 to almost nothing. That is below the statistical significance that they use when doing analysis. If one looks at the Highway Capacity Manual, their minimum threshold for truck percentages as part of a traffic analysis is 2%. From a numbers point of view, the truck traffic is quite low. However, in a residential environment, one truck could be too many. They are keeping that in mind as they move forward with the evaluation in looking at whether they need to address truck circulation in certain areas. The interesting thing is that if one looks at the amount of truck traffic that is going through SR-75 at the Bridge Toll Plaza, about 450 trucks per day, about half of that truck traffic is heading to the First Street Gate at NASNI. From a numbers point of view, the percentage of truck traffic is relatively low, but it represents the significance of truck traffic at that particular location and the impact that it has on the surrounding residential communities.

Council discussion continued as to the current truck routes and how the numbers will be different. Questions were asked as to whether there will be accurate counts for 2004 or not.

Based on the results, Mr. Henderson moved on to discuss the problem statement. There is increasing traffic on City streets for a number of reasons. There is a poor LOS along key arterial streets. Arterial traffic is spilling over to local streets. That leads to a traffic performance trade-off. He also reviewed the transportation goals that are currently in the City's Circulation Element. There are a dozen goals or so in the General Plan and they are often conflicting. To try to focus in on what the issues are, they simplified the goals down to three. These are what they have observed from what is in the current City policy. The first is to alleviate adverse impacts of traffic. The second is to minimize traffic intrusion into the neighborhoods. The third is to facilitate safe interaction between modes. This doesn't just mean cars on cars, but it also means cars on pedestrians, cars on bicycles, etc. It is important to be providing access to the transportation system to all users. PB is really focusing on these three goals as they move forward and try to come up with solutions to what they are seeing in terms of problems on the system.

Before moving forward, Mr. Henderson explained that PB needs to understand where Council sits in terms of what it would like to see done with the City's transportation system. What does Council want to do in responding to these goals? How much does Council want to stand by these goals? Does Council want to go in an entirely different direction? To try to illustrate the differences in the three policy statements he will show Council, there are some illustrations to show what that would mean. They are not intended to be plans.

Policy Statement Option 1 is to maximize the existing arterial system while reducing intrusion into neighborhoods. This is probably the most consistent with the City's current goals. It really looks to utilize the arterial corridors the City has, 3rd and 4th Streets and Orange Avenue, and to focus all the arterial type traffic that is coming to and from the island onto those streets to facilitate getting them off the island and at the same time doing everything possible to prohibit that traffic from entering into the residential neighborhoods. What is the trade off? The trade off is some inconvenience for City residents. If the City starts to introduce traffic control devices like semi diverters, roundabouts and things like that to discourage people from cutting through residential streets, the reverse side effect is that residents are not allowed to take direct lines between certain locations. In order to ensure that the City is maximizing the arterial system and that all arterial traffic is directed onto that system, there needs to be a street plan that makes it difficult for people to cut through. The only effective means of doing that is to use different types of traffic calming and traffic control devices. At the same time, in order to ensure that the traffic can get to and from those arterials, the City needs to look at other locations where it should strategically put signals, etc. to allow traffic from the residential areas to get into the arterial flow or to cross the arterial flow.

Policy Statement Option 2 is a hybrid of the first one and looks at expanding the arterial system to allow additional options for traffic to circulate around the island, but at the same time standing by the principle of focusing traffic on those arterials and reducing the impact on the adjoining residential neighborhoods by using traffic calming or restrictions of some kind. This would require the City taking a look at the current Circulation Elements, identifying where it is most appropriate to have not just primary arterials, but secondary arterials at certain locations, that would be designed to deal with slightly higher traffic volumes and facilitate traffic along those corridors while ensuring that the cut through traffic on adjoining streets is minimized by traffic control devices.

Policy Statement Option 3 is kind of a do nothing. It would leave the system as it is today, remove the semi diverters and let traffic go where it will. The advantage of this is that the City would

maximize the streets available to cars. Traffic will go where it needs to go to get the most efficient movement. The disadvantage is that there will be cut through traffic into residential neighborhoods. The negative of that is the conflict that has with pedestrians, particularly in the vicinity of schools. This would be the most distant from the City's current General Plan policies and goals in terms of preserving quality of life and reducing intrusion into residential neighborhoods.

Mr. Henderson explained that PB needs Council to consider which of those policy options it would like to pursue. The reason they ask for that is that it is difficult for them to come up with specific recommendations until they know where Council wants to go. If Council wants them to focus on the arterial system as it exists today, it means different recommendations from the other options. Based on the City's preferred policy position, PB will identify appropriate mitigation measures, analyze the effectiveness of mitigation and present a package for ongoing monitoring.

Ms. Schmidt asked about Policy Statement Option 2. PB did not direct its attention to Highway 75 at Pomona Avenue, coming off Glorietta, crossing Five Points and entering Highway 75. Mr. Henderson reiterated that these were just intended to show what the different alternatives might mean to the City's circulation system. PB needs to know if the City wants to focus on this approach so they can look at those problems and make recommendations.

Councilmember Monroe doesn't appreciate the characteristic of the third option as do nothing. Do nothing doesn't give credit to all that is currently going on. The City is in strong support of the Navy and the Third Street Gate, is in constant contact with Congresswoman Susan Davis about the taxi, bus and truck inspection situations there. The entire CRWG is working with Caltrans and SANDAG and is already doing an environmental assessment and design for lights at Alameda and potentially at B and F along with bulb outs and landscaping and additional trees in those corridors. He doesn't think that characteristic does justice to the City's efforts that are currently going on.

Mr. Henderson apologized and explained that it was definitely in context of recommendation for this particular study in terms of dealing with specific locations and the problems at specific locations.

Mayor Smisek asked if Council understands what staff is asking Council to do. The do nothing option is not a do nothing but rather a remove all obstacles and use the whole grid. This is counter to the City's General Plan. Council needs to hone in on the working part of this, not what is in effect at this time and what things are going on already. The idea is that the City has a problem. It now has a mechanism to address the problem. What direction does Council want them to pursue to come up with results that will help fix the problem?

Mr. Benson pointed out the observations made if the left turn pocket was extended on Orange, southbound. It would be a tweak of the existing system but the more staff looks at that, the more they think it has merit. The biggest challenge will be to get Caltrans to do it, even if the City wants to pay for it. The other thing to look at is the initiative. The City has the ability, although the application would be much tougher, to go back in and start working on the Glorietta initiative. He thinks staff could start working on that with the objective of trying to provide feedback to the community prior to the election.

Councilmember Tierney explained to the public that the lights in the City are not top of the art, synchronized, computer run system. To control the traffic, they get reset. Once they are set, they

follow the same pattern that is set as opposed to a highly synchronized, state of the art system that can be put into place that mutes and changes the whole pattern of how traffic accesses from signal to signal within various parts of the City. He has been told that this type of system, which is available, can probably or might probably solve a good portion of Coronado's traffic problems. It would be able to program a better movement of traffic. He thinks the City should be looking at this as to what it would result.

Mr. Benson clarified that the City signals are on a synchronization system. They are set up and have the synchronization in the morning and afternoon to move the traffic along. They are not smart signals and the Traffic Management Center in San Diego doesn't have access to anything other than 3rd and Orange and 4th and Orange. The problem is that they are not there yet in terms of the ultimate system. They really need a camera at the Traffic Management Center where they can tell exactly how signals are working. Synchronization can only go so far. When too many cars or too many pedestrians are put into the system, that causes problems.

Mr. Tierney explained that he would like education on this, but not necessarily at this workshop. The other item he wanted to point out is that the evaluation didn't seem to include the Cays, the military housing area, and it seems to be all centralized or centered into the Village. He would like to have an evaluation based on peaks where traffic is backed up on any given day and then see what the counts show on the counters. The waver is the only person to control the traffic at Alameda. There needs to be some human intervention into the system to make it work. Whether this Council wants to go this way or not, the public does not want any more part of diverters. Blocking off streets, keeping certain streets blocked off – things that cause traffic to flow into other traffic are not a solution. The only solution he sees is that Glorietta somehow has to be used to pull some of that traffic. He is asking staff to look at that realistically so that there is a fair evaluation of this and not a political evaluation.

Mayor Smisek reassured Mr. Tierney that staff does not have a political bent.

Scott Aurich, 734 Glorietta, thinks that the question is already being called of Council, based on the initiative, to look at options of whether the City continues with the T circulation plan or expand it. This is basically what Mr. Riley has been proposing for 30 years and is to open up the whole island for an arterial system that better moves traffic around the island. He thinks that, at this time, he is not an advocate of that. He believes in funneling traffic to the major arterials of 3rd, 4th and Orange. The community is going to vote on something in November. He thinks it is real important that an appropriate question to ask is not whether to build on hypothetical spin traffic onto Glorietta without considering all the ramifications of that, which is what is being proposed to the community. If Council goes ahead now and takes the lead role in evaluating what the other option is, which is looking at whether or not the community wants to open up all the island in a better arterial system and reevaluate the arterial system in the first place.

Story Vogel, 350 D Avenue, asked about the CRWG and the bid for the lights at B and F and Alameda and 4th. He understands that there was no bid placed, in a competitive sense, and the Engineering Department has to go and select someone. He is a proponent of the two initiatives on the ballot. He feels responsibility. The issue of whether or not Glorietta should be added to the arterial system that already exists with First and Ocean and Alameda is the question. The previous speakers' comments are well taken to the extent that further routing in any town that has a grid system is standard practice. He thanked Council and particularly Mr. Tierney for putting forward

the idea of this study. Now the City has an overview handle on what it is facing. He hopes Council will take into account the fact that the T or couplet as being the way of moving traffic on and off Coronado has failed the City and has now disproportionately impacted many parts of town. He is glad Council is looking at a larger system that will route traffic in a way that will spread the burden onto everyone.

Danny Green, 1020 Glorietta, lived at 1634 Pomona until six months ago and grew up at 1401 Third Street. She pointed out that there is a really challenging traffic situation in Coronado. She is concerned and wonders why the City can't run to the Governor's office and plead with him to start the Bridge toll again. She doesn't know of any place in this town that isn't impacted by traffic. It is only going to get worse. The City needs to protect itself. She appreciates the City doing this traffic study and urges Council to get the toll back on the Bridge.

Barbara DeMichael, 1536 Glorietta Boulevard, agrees that the community does need to know what the impact of an arterial route on Glorietta would be. She urges Council to have the Engineering Department look at what the impact will be at some of those intersections. She is also disappointed that the City won't be doing the traffic origination study. She thinks that is one of the few ways that the City has to learn where all this traffic is coming from. She urges Council to try to find out what is the origination of all of the traffic the City is experiencing today.

Sharon Scharff, 1310 Fourth Street, explained that this is an emotional issue. This is about people and neighborhoods, not about level of service and how fast cars can be moved through town. When she hears "minimize the traffic impact on neighborhoods" it strikes her because she lives in one of those neighborhoods on Fourth Street. The impact is huge and she knows Council knows that. She urged Council to keep the human part of the issue at the heart of its decision.

Mayor Smisek commented that the tolls are regulated by SANDAG, not the Governor. Any attempt to get tolls back on would have to be a vote of SANDAG, which the City lost last time. SANDAG removed them. He also addressed the other comment on traffic counts to the south. Council instructed last time to ensure that the specific license plate count is not looked at but rather gross counts of numbers of cars. Staff has already been directed to do that. Everyone feels there is spillover and staff is looking for an increase in southbound traffic in the p.m.

Mark DeMichael, 1536 Glorietta, referred to Mayor Smisek's comment that SANDAG makes the decision with respect to the toll on the Bridge. He is wondering, with respect to the initiative on Glorietta, if that is an advisory to Caltrans. It is not binding on Caltrans. The decision to make whatever modification would have to be made at 4th and 3rd would be Caltrans' decision.

Mr. Benson further clarified about the counters. Staff is constantly putting counters out. No matter how many counters there are, staff doesn't end up with the data it wants. Part of this study is to go back out and look at the new technology that exists in that area. Staff will look at how to best maintain the model and give a constant counting capability. He also commented that the question that was raised about the CRWG was accurate. There were a number of people who were interested who showed up for the pre proposal, but they weren't interested. When there is a proposal situation like that, the City then has the ability, under the contracting code, to go back out and solicit proposals from specific people. That is being done.

Mr. Monroe referred to the counts being taken over July and August and that there were a number of intersections. He asked if it is true that they spent one day at each intersection. Mr. Henderson responded that they were taken over several hours in the morning and several hours in the evening. There were seven to ten where there were longer duration counts at the intersections and there were a handful where there were seven day counts taken. He referred to Mr. Benson's earlier comment and said that there is a really fine line between enough data and too much data. They strived to at least give a snap shot to start with. The trick now is to come up with a compromise in terms of what is the appropriate amount of information needed to supplement that 2003 data to allow PB to monitor changes in the future. He also recommended to Council to be somewhat cautious about being too overreaching in the amount of data needed to validate some of those things. Some sampling at some strategic locations with longer duration counts will go a long way in answering some of the types of questions. He explained to Mr. Monroe that 5 to 10% would be a typical variation. 20% would be a real extreme case.

Mr. Monroe asked about Mr. Henderson's comment that, under micro simulation, they could change the sequencing at 3rd and Orange. He asked if they can do two lights at once. Mr. Henderson added that this program, Synchrono, was specifically designed to deal with that question. That is the primary purpose of that software package. It allows one to test different signal synchronization programs to get maximum efficiency out of the signals that are in place. One of the issues that is dealt with in Coronado, although the system is synchronized, it is being maxed out over time.

Mr. Monroe pointed out an anomaly on the chart. PB is reading Orange and 3rd at Level C. Everyone knows that from 2-4:30 p.m. the level is worse than that. Discussion continued on this issue.

Mr. Tierney asked for further definition of traffic restrictors. Mr. Henderson responded that restrictors would be anything that would prohibit full turns at intersections. PB is not recommending, at this point, any particular approach, but is suggesting that if that is the direction Council wants to go, those are the types of drastic measures at some of those locations Council would have to take.

Mayor Smisek suggested the elimination of an option in order to narrow down the discussion. Is Council going to stay with the basic T with modifications, or is it going to open up the whole grid?

Mr. Tierney thinks that if Council is going to go with the T, it should be asking what the impacts are in terms of what has to be done considering the initiative and how that is going to impact the change.

Mayor Smisek thinks that Council could eliminate #3 and use a hybrid concept of 1 and 2.

Mr. Tierney would be very leery of moving in the area of traffic restrictors. At this point, with those restrictors, they do nothing but move traffic to other areas and then inundate those areas by their very nature. He would like to see a hybrid of no restrictions on those streets other than traffic light changes.

Mayor Smisek pointed out that Mr. Tierney is talking about techniques. Mayor Smisek is more interested in whether Council wants to continue with a policy of funneling cars to some streets in a street system of arterials and collectors or does Council want to open up the whole grid.

Mr. Tierney responded that he would prefer the arterials and collectors system.

Mr. Monroe added that the first two goals of the City's General Plan are in conflict with each other. The first was to alleviate the adverse impacts of traffic. That means that the City wants to make sure that traffic moves effectively and efficiently throughout the town, wherever it wants to go. The second is to minimize traffic intrusion into neighborhoods. That is in conflict with the first one. It is not an easy thing. It is a real balancing act. A traffic engineer wants to get from A to B as fast and as quickly as possible. That is not what the City wants. He proposes that Council move toward the options Mayor Smisek is suggesting. He thinks the City will probably stay with the T system. There are two actions to take. The first is to start, again, the single lane all the way back to 3rd, between 3rd and 4th on Orange. The second is to analyze what will happen with the initiative and opening up of Glorietta from a left turn off the Bridge. That is such a big answer that the voters will tell Council, but he is not sure that the other questions are all that relevant.

Mr. Tanaka thinks it is very difficult to make a policy decision today. It comes down to policy statements 1 or 3. Does the City try to make the T system better? Mayor Smisek suggested that option 2 is basically an alteration of the T system. That has been Council's task for the last 30 years. The voters are going to tell whether they want the City to go with option 3. He thinks it is very clear that if the Glorietta and diverter initiatives both pass, then the voters of the community are sending a very clear message that they want access to all streets. As far as policy decisions go, the two issues he sees as the biggest policies regarding traffic are: how can the City most efficiently route traffic in and out of the island and what is fairest to the residents? Historically, when one talks about the T grid, the City is trying to do both. He is frustrated by democracy by initiative because it is an atomistic way of governing. When the people are asked yes or no on an issue, that does not really give them the opportunity to see the whole picture and to vote on the whole picture. Hopefully, every citizen will educate themselves on what the traffic grid is and what a circulation element is and what has been done in the past. He doesn't think initiatives are particularly fair to the voter, because it assumes they do all that. That isn't really what happens. Council will have to get together and make policy out of those results. He is happy to vote on a policy today, but he thinks that there is a very good chance Council could vote on a certain policy and have the voters overturn it in November.

Mayor Smisek explained that Option 1, the basic T, has been modified over the years. When the spillover occurred, when the diverters were put in, to D and E which was a residential area that had not experienced that kind of traffic. And it wasn't just D and E. Council has already voted to remove the barriers. The only big difference with the basic T is the Glorietta piece. He doesn't think that, if that passes, is an automatic change to Option 3. He thinks it would be great PR to say that is what it would mean to try to discourage people voting yes on Glorietta.

Mr. Tanaka feels that the problem with Option 2 is that it goes back to fairness. He can believe in the T grid because one of his goals is to get people to and from the Base quickly and efficiently. He thinks there are a lot of residents who don't like all the turn restrictions the City has put out to try to support the T grid. He thinks Option 1 is what the City has always been doing – tinkering to try to make the T system work. The City either needs to say that is the best that can be done and that it

needs to be stuck with because it saves as many of the City's neighborhoods as possible. Or citizens are going to say that they want all the streets to share the burden. He thinks that the interesting thing to get out of the initiative is that if they both prevail by heavy numbers, to him that is an indicator that they want to share the burden. If the diver one prevails and Glorietta fails then he is more confident that Council, as the policy making body, can use its judgment about what it thinks is necessary. He thinks it is fair to say that there are a number of residents who aren't happy with what has been done, particularly with the no turns and the diverters. He thinks it would be wise to get the public input and then use it towards a policy making decision.

Councilmember Schmidt has listened to this discussion for years. The reason that the City has persisted, over the years, in a basic T, is because the City is not protecting cars, or people driving through town, but rather the residents of Coronado. The General Plan says "...to preserve and improve Coronado primarily as a beautiful, pleasant, residential community in which to live, work, shop and pursue leisure time activities." That is what Council is trying to do. No matter what it does, there will be traffic.

Mayor Smisek recalled that those who have been following this Bridge thing and the tunnel concept for years and years and years, the initial figure was 22,000 cars a day coming over the Bridge. The 3rd and 4th Street couplet could handle that quite easily in those days. When he first came on Council in '92 he remembers the big discussion about making sure that they didn't take too many cars off of Orange because the businesses were worried about that. He has been convinced that Option 1 is where the City is really at. The only thing he would like to do would be to do the Option 1 with the suggestions that Mr. Monroe made and Mr. Tierney that the City at least look at the possible impacts of the initiative. He thinks that, because of the EIR requirements, the City is looking at the A, B and C removal. That would be the only added thing and then would continue with the current policy. This would remain consistent with the past.

Mr. Tierney agrees with Mayor Smisek but added that when one puts a signal into an intersection on 3rd and 4th, then the street that is left and right of that takes on additional traffic. He would be leery about putting additional traffic lights onto 3rd and 4th. He is not sure why one would want signals on 3rd and 4th at these various other points.

Mayor Smisek reiterated his interest in getting down to Council's policy statement. He would like to see Council target Option 1, based on everyone's comments, with the items Mr. Monroe suggested. He asked Mr. Benson if all the CRWG things are being evaluated as part of the EIR. Mr. Benson responded that is part of the CRWG EIS/EIR.

Mr. Monroe would like to ensure that everyone understands that Option 1, today, includes the lights at 3rd, 4th and B, 3rd, 4th and F, 3rd, 4th and Alameda. They are being studied in another issue, but they are in Option 1. The thing that is also in Option 1 that needs to be looked at are the traffic restrictors that may go along the corridor in conjunction with the lights. He thinks the City should either minimize or eliminate the restrictors as shown currently in Option 1.

Mayor Smisek commented again that Council should not hone in on what is in the diagram. The statement is what should be honed in on. Option 1 is "Maximize existing arterial system while reducing intrusion into neighborhoods." Option 2 is "Supplement existing arterials with additional options while reducing intrusion in most neighborhoods." Option 3 is "Provide accessibility to all

streets to offer maximum route options.” Those are what is being discussed. They are policy statements. The particular specifics shown in the diagrams are not at question.

MSUC (Schmidt/Tanaka) moved that the City Council adopt Policy Statement Option 1 with the understanding that the City will look into and explore both ends of Glorietta Boulevard and extending the left hand turn lane on 4th

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

4. **ADJOURNMENT:** The Special City Council meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Approved:

Tom Smisek, Mayor

Attest:

L. Diane Shea, CMC
City Clerk