MINUTES FROM JOINT MEETING OF THE WOODLAND CITY COUNCIL AND WOODLAND PLANNING COMMISSION REGARDING PUBLIC WORKSHOP ON THE TURN OF THE CENTURY SPECIFIC PLAN July 15, 1999

The City Council and Planning Commission were called to order.

City Manager Rick Kirkwood gave an introduction to the meeting.

Contract Planner Heidi Tschudin gave a presentation to the Council and Commission following the outline provided in the agenda:

Background and History of Project

Overview of the Specific Plan – Plan documents, policies and land uses, circulation

Proposed infrastructure (presented by Contract Engineer, Nick Ponticello)

Public Review Process – EIR, fiscal impact analysis, financing plan, infrastructure plan, annexation

Schedule – EIR, hearings, annexation, financing, backbone infrastructure, subdivision, site preparation

The workshop was opened to the public, and the applicant was invited to provide a presentation. Tom Lumbrazo of Turn of the Century gave an overview of the background, and identified several outstanding issues from the applicant's perspective including whether a full fire station is needed, the location of the sports park, the bikeway proposed for CR 101, grid vs curvilinear streets, affordable housing and multifamily housing, mini-parks and greenbelts, and cost of infrastructure.

Other public members were invited to provide their comments or ask questions.

David Wade indicated he represents 360 acres. He believes there are serious problems with the TOC plan. Plan A has no focus. There is a center mix of uses, but no cohesive pattern. The proposed Plan is a hodge-podge of uses with no identifiable center. The neighborhoods lack focus. There is no particular pattern to the proposal. Regarding Plan B, it has the same flaws. It creates a large suburban area. Pushing the town center to the west has merit. Plan B defeats the overcrossing. The community needs crosstown traffic circulation. Plan B drivers will all go to Gibson which already has problems. Putting a school and park by CR 102 is not advised. A park across from the regional park does not make sense. He proposes a new Plan C and D that has a true core area the size of a typical city block. It is larger than a standard suburban shopping center and allows the bikeways to connect to the town center (unlike Plan A). Plan C has a rectilinear street pattern, and three distinct neighborhoods are created. The sports park is just

"hanging there" in Plan A and B. It is a good idea to have it linked with the high school and middle school, but the idea is not fully executed. He believes that the overcrossing should be built and that it s a major and important component of the plan. The Russell property requires detention and pumping, and it is also in the Williamson Act. It should not be in Phase 1. It will be the most expensive property to develop. Phase 1 should wrap around the college. As proposed Phase 1 does not include the high school or middle school. The elementary school along CR 102 is in an artificial location intended to force the Russell development.

Putting a lot of single-family development into Phase 1 is a good approach because it will drive the rest of the plan. But asking the other properties to bond to build the Russell property burdens them for a long time. The debt service can not be supported.

The financing plan is ambiguous. More details are needed. He is advising the property owners not to participate under the proposed structure. Their concern is that TOC will develop their own subdivision and move on. The Specific Plan would subsequently fail. The 43 percent of the property owners that he represents do not concur with the TOC plan and have been shut out of the planning process.

Penny Polete is the daughter of the Hollmans who own 88 acres and they do not agree with the TOC plan. Please consider the Wade alternative (Plan C/D) presented by the previous speaker.

Loren Polete does not support the TOC plan. Please support the alternative plan.

Dudley Holman – The overcrossing is critical. The City almost deleted the Gum overcrossing in the Southeast Area Specific Plan, which would have been a mistake. Try closing the Gum Avenue overpass today and see what happens. Gum is in the middle of a one mile length of highway. The TOC overcrossing would be in the middle of 1.5 miles. The City needs to keep the overcrossing. What happened to the golf course? It was supposed to have been on the Russell property. A golf course on that property would not result in a need to bring it out of Williamson Act.

Kate Merritt Murphy -- She represents the 155-acre Merritt/Jones/Van Tassel property. She clarified that they were given an opportunity by TOC to submit land uses for their land, but none of their suggestions were reflected in the TOC plans. They offered to pay for one plan and were told by Lumbrazo that they were too late. She knows they are late to the table, but would like consideration. A cost of \$22 million for infrastructure translates into \$20,000 per acre or \$5,000 per unit. The TOC phasing starts at the proposed City limits and works back to the existing City . Their ownership is talking to the School District about sale for the high school and middle school.

Bruce Bailey – The Oyangs are not a part of any group. This is the City's plan. Do we want to promote development of the first phase on floodplain or on agricultural land that could come out later through the normal process? Do we want to promote leap frog development? What is wrong with progression from Gibson Road south? The City needs a new high school. The Jones property was identified in an EIR 8 years ago for a high school or junior high. The

high school should not be in Phase 2. The concept of the TOC plan is neighborhood service use. Why this use when there is already commercial planned north of Gibson just waiting? He likes the Wade plan better than the TOC plan.

Mildred Heidrick – She owns 45 acres in the project area. It will be out of Williamson Act in 2000. She does not like the TOC plan and can't afford it. Please consider Plan C/D.

Mike Beeman – How will Plan B be implemented when all the roads lead to the Master Plan area. There is no way the Plan could be built. Staff (Tschudin) explained the roadway assumptions. Mr. Beeman indicated he is not receiving public notices .

Staff (Tschudin) indicated his address is on the list and agreed to check it for errors.

Tom Murphy – Brother of Kate Murphy. Believes the TOC plan is flawed.

Dave Taormino – Oversees infrastructure issues for TOC (the applicant). Feels Wade addresses some good points regarding infrastructure. There is no capacity in Gibson (except for water). The back bone infrastructure will cost \$22 million. It will cost another \$80 million for the rest of the infrastructure. He wants to keep the total cost under \$100 million. It will take \$8 million in infrastructure just to get service down CR 102. They did not assume that other property owners would participate, so they had to define the first phase to include those that would pay. If you cut one inch off a pipe you save \$5.00 per foot. They are looking at alternative materials. They are looking at alternative engineering practices, different sizes, and different directions.

In response to a question from one of the Commissioners regarding phasing, Mr. Taormino indicated that Woodland needs good schools and parks. Therefore, when you drive into the TOC area that is the first thing you will see. TOC land is closest to where infrastructure will come from. The high school can not be served from Gibson. The Woodland Christian School has a temporary holding tank and they pump into the City system during off-peak hours.

In response to a question from one of the Commissioners regarding "what happened to the golf course", Mr. Taormino indicated the idea was conceptual and right now there is a glut of golf courses.

Councilman Borchard referred back to a Council meeting in February regarding the budget for the Specific Plan. At that meeting, Taormino said he would only build to code if their requested budget was turned down. Mr. Taormino responded that that was not his intent or statement. The issue was fairness – whether certain expenditures should be made. The developers are ultimately responsible. They are negotiating with the School District to pay more fees than are currently required.

No additional speakers came forward to offer comments. The Council and Commission directed staff to review the Wade proposal (Plan C/D) and come forward with a recommendation regarding what to do with it, who should pay for any analysis, and whether CEQA analysis is needed. Staff was asked to include in the future financial analysis of the Plan, the cost-per-acre

as compared to other competitive areas.

Councilman Flory indicated he likes some of Mr. Wade's ideas.

Staff was asked to urge the School District to attend future meetings regarding the Plan.

The meeting was adjourned.

These summary minutes were prepared by Heidi Tschudin, Contract Planner (July 29, 1999).