

# **ORAL COMMENTS**

**(MINUTES FROM PUBLIC HEARINGS)**



communities. The objectives of that Plan were (1) to preserve the high residential character and attractive qualities of family living; (2) to continue to provide urban services and expand training and distribution facilities for the farm and ranch areas of the County; (3) to continue to provide a high type and quality of public services and facilities, including schools, parks and public buildings; (4) to develop a more complete central business district, consisting of small neighborhood shopping centers to serve more completely local and area shopping requirements with a high degree of convenience in service; (5) to provide for a greater measure of local employment and a varied and strengthened tax base for encouragement of attractive, acceptable industrial distribution, research, administrative and professional activities and developments; (6) to encourage the highest use of good agricultural soils and the development of acceptable agricultural industry; and (7) to realistically relate plans for the future to soils, water, drainage, topography, sewerage, and transportation advantages and limitations and to human resources and the wishes of the people in order that a sound and orderly development built on a sound economic base may be accomplished guided by a plan. He said the Plan further references that the Plan provides for a potential population of about 56,000 with provisions for second stage development located south and west of County Road 25 and 98, the Monument Hills area and north of Kentucky Avenue. He said this gives perspective on the City's General Plan update. He then opened the public hearing.

Larry Mintier (of J. Laurence Mintier and Associates, the City's consultant on the General Plan) commented on the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Plan. He said the EIR was discussed several weeks ago in a workshop session, but he felt it would be useful to review the organization of the EIR and some of the critical considerations in terms of the structure of the analysis. He noted that page 4 of the EIR describes the organization of the EIR. The first chapter is the project description which is simple and straight forward. The second chapter is an extension of the first chapter and that is where all of the "number crunching" is done. He said they have taken the land use diagram, turned it into acreage figures, turned those acreage figures into dwelling units using the multiplier of dwelling units per acre, and have also used FARs (floor-area ratios) to translate the commercial acreage and industrial acreage into square footage of development. He said they took those sets of numbers and translated them into population based on residential development and ultimately employees relative to the commercial/industrial development. He said the second chapter "number crunching" drives the rest of the analysis in the EIR. Chapters 3 through 9 are organized in essentially the same fashion as the Background Report and the Policy document. He said they used the same format to discuss the impacts. The outline of their analysis in each of the sections is laid out in page 5 (of the EIR). First they describe the environmental setting. Secondly, they describe the methodology for the analysis and also identify

the thresholds of significance that were used in the analysis. He said this next step is where this approach deviates from the approach used in most EIRs. He said here we look first at just the land use diagram and analyze the impacts of that diagram. In other words, we'll take the dwelling units or the square footage of industrial development and translate that into water demand or sewer flows or traffic. He said that is done without regard to any policy standards. It is a simple translation of the diagram into impacts on various resources or services, so we have reached some conclusions about how important or severe those implications are. The next step in the analysis is to bring in the policies from the General Plan Policy document to see now they address those implications. He said once we have those implications matched up with the policy we are in a position to reach some conclusion about whether or not we have a significant impact. He said they have characterized the impacts as significant, potentially significant, or less than significant, and the final step in the analysis is to identify any additional mitigation measures that could reduce those impacts or eliminate or bring them down below the level of significance. The whole strategy in their developing the EIR and Policy document together was to get to the point that they had everything mitigated through policies and programs in the Plan itself, so that they did not produce the Plan on one hand and turn right around and criticize it for all of its failures to deal adequately with these critical issues. He said they tried to do that in an integrated fashion so that there were very few cases where we say "on second thought maybe tweaking this policy or adding this policy would produce that impact below a level of significance." He said that is the standard approach they used through the substantive Chapters 3 through 9. Chapter 10 focuses on the alternatives, and he said in Chapter 10 they tried to simplify the comparison of the alternatives through the inclusion of several pages of matrices. Chapter 10 looks at project alternatives at first the no project/no development alternative, which is situation status quo. The second is no project/existing Plan, so what happens if the City just proceeds to build out its existing General Plan. Within the General Plan itself there are two residential growth scenarios for the southern part of the City, and those are the preferred alternatives, Alternative 1 and Alternative 2. Finally, they analyze a growth alternative that looks eastward. He said the tables in Chapter 10 are a concise and useful comparison of those alternatives.

2-171 Don Sharp said he resides at 806 California Street, Woodland, and is representing the Woodland Chamber of Commerce. He then read a letter from the Chamber (attached as Exhibit A). He said the Chamber would like the Council and Planning Commission to consider their recommendations in their planning. He said there are a few items he would like to embellish on. On the land south of the City limits he wanted to reinforce that the Chamber does not want full development of that land. He said the Chamber does believe that Road 25A must be included in the General Plan processes from Road 98 to Road 102. The housing mix is something that was new in the

E-1-1  
(cont)

recommendations in the Chamber's letter than the previous two letters that the Chamber sent to the City Council and the Planning Commission. The housing mix of 35 percent multi-family seems to be a critical issue at this point. He said from his own experience the City has provided more and more services and generally those services relate to multi-family housing. He said that seems to be escalating at a very rapid pace. Law enforcement officials have expressed concern over that because of the number of calls they are receiving where high density is involved. The current vacancy factor along with provisions for multi-family housing in the Southeast Area more than adequately provide for our low income housing. He said we need not compromise our quality of life and service level providing an over supply of high density housing. High density housing is the most taxing on City services. In regard to the water issue, he said, water has become a critical issue almost everywhere. The Chamber believes that the City should explore all surface as well as underground supplies of water. The Chamber realizes that the City is not in a position to negotiate with all holders of water rights at the present time. Beginning upon the adoption of the General Plan the Chamber suggests that the City explore all of those options.

Vice Mayor Rominger said Mr. Sharp did not address the Chamber's position on the rate of growth.

Mr. Sharp said the Chamber's position on the rate of growth is basically that the market will determine the rate of growth. Setting aside the City putting in place definite parameters that would determine the growth rate, the market will determine the rate. In some years the rate will be low, and in other years the rate will be much greater.

E-1-2

David White, 1728 Del Rey Street, Woodland, said he has been a long term resident of the southwest section of the City (since 1969). He said he spoke to the Council/Commission some months ago about several things he would like to see if the southwest portion of the City is developed. After reviewing the Environmental Impact Report he said he is encouraged by the fact that many of the issues he raised were addressed by the Council and by members of the Urban Limit Line Committee. He asked who is to say the decision the Council is about to make in the near future is the correct one for Woodland's growth pattern for years to come with all of its ramifications. He reminded the Council that there are residents in the southwest area who would like to see development in that area. He said he is speaking as a single resident and not speaking on behalf of any particular group. He said in his opinion Alternative 1 will best suit the area to the southwest in the most judicious manner with regard to reduced traffic on Gibson Road, expansion of housing facilities, recreational facilities and educational facilities in Woodland. After watching the school measure fail twice he said the only way to rehab schools is to build new ones.

E1+3

Skip Davies, Parks and Recreation Commission, said the Commission has received the Report and is in the process of studying the report. He said the Commission has concerns. At the last meeting there were comments that maybe one way to balance was to reduce the number of acreage per thousand. He said the Commission constantly gets barraged by groups that do not have places to put their facilities, and the Commission is conscious of the costs and conscious of the acreage. He said we do need that kind of acreage. Secondly, he said in looking at the costs the Commission believes that the history of their groups show that both acquisition costs are high and development costs are high. The various recreation groups consistently come to the Commission to say that if they have the space they will build the field. He said the Little League and Adult Softball groups will put together facilities for fewer dollars than commercial acquisition and development. He said the Commission needs more time to study this and will try to review the matter this week and report back to the Council/Planning Commission. He said another thing the Commission is concerned about is that the Council and Planning Commission look at enough growth so that when we get an opportunity to acquire land it is in large enough pieces to solve their problems in recreation. Currently in the Southeast Area they received about 15 acres ±. The majority of that acreage is being used up by two Little League fields which does not leave neighborhood parks and other kinds of things, so there are some serious problems in the area of recreation. He said they are trying to work with Yuba College and the Woodland Joint Unified School District to solve those problems, but it comes down to the need for additional acreage. He said they need to work both with development and their groups to hold those costs down.

Mayor Sandy said in a conversation he had recently with Mr. Davies he mentioned that the cost for some of the park and recreation facilities were either inflated or just flat wrong. He asked if the Commission discussed that at all.

Mr. Davies said the Commission is in the process of reviewing that issue. He said the Commission does feel that development costs are in the neighborhood of \$150,000 per acre to have it done commercially. He said the Commission does not feel that is the way the City can afford to go. He said they were also faced with the purchase price in the Southeast Area of \$100,000 for park land, and that was very difficult for the Commission to do. He said we need to look at alternatives so that does not occur again; we need to acquire assets earlier using whatever means we can to do that. With respect to budget figures Parks Recreation and Community Services Director Tim Barry will be giving the Council a report in writing.

Dona Mast, President of Yolo County Farm Bureau (FB), said she resides in Esparto and represents 1,500 members of the FB, but not all of those members will agree with the position the FB has taken. She said she is in Woodland every day and most of the farm families

E-1-4 shop in Woodland. She said the FB Board would prefer Alternate 2 which she stated to the Council/Commission before. The land between East Street and Road 98 is some of the very best irrigated land in the country, and she said once it is paved over you cannot get it back. She said the balance of trade does not depend exactly on Yolo County agriculture, but it does to a degree. She said it is unconscionable to pave over this irreplaceable resource when alternatives are available. She said there is more than likely plenty of room for Woodland's needs with Alternative 2 without crossing Road 102 before there has been time to investigate the flood and the odor on the east. Road 25A is currently a major agricultural thoroughfare. She said they had Gibson Road and Kentucky Avenue to get their commodities from the west fields to PIRMI, Hunts, and Contadina. She said they do not have Gibson Road anymore because they cannot drive their trucks down Gibson Road any more. They can barely drive their trucks down Kentucky Avenue but they still do. She said it is getting dangerous with all of the homes there and the crossing. She said if Road 25A is made into a major freeway or entry way she does not know where the trucks will go. She said they do not object if the truck traffic is routed to State Route 113 or I-5 because that is probably the best place for it to go. She said they would like to establish Ultimate Urban Limit Lines from the west and south side of Woodland. She said Road 98 of course is sacred to them because the best land is there. There is also the best land to the south. Another point she said she wanted to make is that Davis' sphere of influence is Road 29, and if the City of Woodland goes to Road 25, how much land does that leave between the two cities. She asked how much agricultural land is there going to be with houses built to Road 25 and maybe to Road 29. She said it is hard to farm next to homes and schools. She said FB is sensitive to the plight of recreation, sensitive to the plight of the City needing to grow, and sensitive to the plight of the schools. She asked that the City be careful with its ag land.

Commissioner Friedlander said Ms. Mast mentioned the FB's desire for an Ultimate Urban Limit Line to the south and to the west on Road 98. He asked what the FB recommendation was with respect to an Ultimate Urban Limit Line to the south.

Ms. Mast said FB supports Alternative 2 which stops at East Street and goes no further south than where Woodland is now between Road 98 and East Street.

Vice Mayor Rominger asked if the FB talked about the rate of growth.

E-1-5 Casey Stone, 706 Buena Tierra Drive, Woodland, said he is disappointed that the Farm Bureau and the Chamber of Commerce did not come to terms on the General Plan. He said he was hoping they would have some compromise. He said he has heard some emotional appeals tonight, and we are not getting to the heart of what the meeting is set up for. He said we are supposed to go over the

Plans, and the problem is the lack of time. He said the Fiscal Analysis just came out last week, and he does not even have the Policy Document. The two documents represent about five inches of reading material, and the average worker, particularly those in agriculture because this is one of the busiest times of the year, do not have the time. He asked what the rush was on the December 5, 1995 deadline to make a decision. He said the General Plan has been dragging on for the last two years, and now that all of the documentation is in front of us, hundreds of thousands of taxpayers' dollars have been spent on this, and the City wants to rush the approval in a months time before people have time to digest the information. He said he wanted time to review the documents and make comments on the Plan as he can look at the documents. He said the public hearing is good but time is needed after the public hearing before the decision is made to digest the information.

Mayor Sandy asked Mr. Stone how much time he wanted.

E-1-5  
(cont)

Mr. Stone said on behalf of the Farm Bureau that the documents came out on October 16, and the FB meeting was two to three days after that. The information goes through the Tax and Land Use Committee, then to the Executive Board and then to the General Board much like the Chamber of Commerce functions. He said it is about a month and one half to two month process. He said the FB cannot come up with a response in the time frame available, and he said he would like to see the comment time extended at least a month. He said the water issue is barely touched in the Plan, and that is a major factor that needs to be addressed. There is a huge water potential east of town and the Chamber of Commerce is saying we should wait until after the General Plan and then take a look at it. He said that is a big mistake. There are permanent water transfers going on right now with Pope Ranch, and what is to stop Conaway from doing the same thing and the City loses out. He said Woodland has really not identified any other water sources, except ground water. Eventually, the City is going to have subsidence and the City will have to find some additional sources. He said the Farm Bureau would like to have a month to review the documents.

Vice Mayor Rominger asked how Mr. Stone felt about the rate of growth.

Mr. Stone said he felt 2 percent growth rate was too high so he would advocate 1.5 percent growth rate. He said he works out of a property management office and sees many vacancies now. He said all of the growth is just reducing the home values of those who currently own real estate in Woodland.

Mayor Sandy said the fact is that the City has been growing at a 1 percent growth rate per year. He said in 1987 and 1988 the City had its greatest explosion of growth and that was 12 percent. Since then the market has dropped off. He said the City needs to manage its growth rate so that in the event there is pressure for

a 12 percent growth rate, the City has a way of slowing that down and a mechanism in the General Plan for accomplishing that.

E-16  
Dudley Holman, 11 West Casa Linda Drive, Woodland, said he is concerned about the sense of urgency in completing the General Plan. He said he knows the time line was set some time ago. He said it appears that the objective has become to complete the General Plan, one way or another. He said this does not give serious and adequate consideration of some concerns. One just mentioned by Casey Stone was water potential to the east. He said he is increasingly concerned about that possibly slipping away, and he said Woodland's growth in the future is going to depend on an adequate water supply. Woodland has been fortunate for a number of years to have adequate water underground, and none of us can predict how long that will be the case. Without adequate water growth is a moot point at some time in the future. What concerns him, he said, is that although there is great potential of water to the east, there are no signals being given to the property owner out there that Woodland is really interested. He said there was some mention at an earlier time of getting together and talking about water, but that was postponed. He said at this point that property owner has some interest in continuing discussions with the City but those have been cut off. He said he feels that is terribly unfortunate. That same property owner has property owner interests in other areas and could well divert its attention and plans to another area, in which case the water potential that we see there now may be lost to us forever. He said he thinks it is irresponsible that the leaders of Woodland to not seriously consider and look out for the possibility of acquiring water to cover our needs of the future. There may well come a time when occupants of the City will look back at this group and ask why didn't they, and why didn't they more seriously look after Woodland's future. There have been times in the past when Woodland had other options for other water supply. Going back to the late 1940's and early 1950's as Monticello Dam was being planned there was an option for the communities in this area to share in that water supply. They chose not to do it. University of California at Davis did and they do have a significant supply coming from that source. There was a later time about ten to twelve years later when the Tehama Colusa Canal proposal offered water sources to the City of Woodland; that too was turned down. He said the Council needs to ask itself how many more opportunities will come our way or has the City just about exhausted them. Although the Plan calls for immediately upon adoption to explore possibilities to the east, he felt there should be some signals sent rather than vague promises that we will seriously look in that direction again.

Mayor Sandy said he needed to set the record straight based on Mr. Holman's comments. He said first the City did meet with that group many times, and he said he can go through the itinerary with him all of the meetings that specifically focused on the City of Woodland and Conaway's water supply, as follows:

E-1

1. July 27, 1994, meeting with the Mayor and Conaway representatives regarding land and water development issues
2. August 9, 1994, staff meeting with Conaway representatives to discuss process to study issues
3. September 9, 1994, meeting of staff and Conaway representatives to review the working committee and joint study outline
4. September 12, 1994, revised draft for the outline received
5. October 18, 1994, another meeting was held reviewing the revised draft of the outline, inserted in the draft was a statement that the results would have to be reviewed for compatibility with an amendment to the General Plan
6. November 2, 1994, meeting with Conaway representatives and staff representatives to review the outline
7. November 7, 1994, received modified draft of the outline
8. November 15, 1994, Council expressed concern that a separate study would interfere with the General Plan
9. November 30, 1994, City staff and Conaway received new outline and time plan.

Mayor Sandy said these meetings went on and on and in May 1995 Conaway started preparing their own reports without any input from the City and giving them to the City. He said Mr. Holman is trying to paint a picture that the City has somehow relinquished its responsibility. To the contrary, he said the City terminated its conversations with Conaway when they sent the City a letter from Tim Tarrin, their corporate attorney, threatening the General Plan with a lawsuit. That veil of silence, he said, was pulled by Conaway not by the City. He said he will provide Mr. Holman with this documentation. He said the City has policy on record as approved by the City Council to work with them to discuss water. Termination was their decision not the City's. He said Mr. Holman knows from his time on the Council that a letter from an attorney threatening a lawsuit tends to chill conversations, and that is why none have been going on.

Mr. Holman said he merely wanted to state that apparently there are no discussions, and Woodland is content to leave it on that basis.

Mayor Sandy said that Conaway's attorney sent the City a threatening letter, and since then there have been no further conversations.

E-1-7 [ Dan Pollock, 720 College Street, Woodland, said he spent ten years in Stanislaus County in the City of Modesto from 1970 to 1980, and during that time he was active in the agricultural community as well as within the metropolitan area serving on the Mayor's Farm City Committee which tried to mitigate problems which arose between those who lived in the City and those who lived on the farms. He said he also served on the Air Pollution Control

E-1-7

Hearing Board which worked very closely with agriculture and monitored some of the problems with air pollution. Being familiar with the agricultural side of the valley in which he lived for the last few years he has been dismayed by the growth on agricultural land in Stanislaus County. He said the City of Modesto implemented a sewer restriction area issue which helped control some of the growth around the City, but many of the smaller towns were not affected by that. As a result there has been an ensprawling growth throughout very fine agricultural land in that area. Because of his concern with that over the years, he became concerned with the same kind of thing happening in Woodland, particularly with development on the land south of where they live. He said he has appeared before the Council/Commission before and expressed a great deal of concern about the utilization of not just prime agricultural land but "story 100 agricultural land" which is very rare land and land which should be a real preserved trust both for the community and the nation as well. Also he said he is concerned about the effects of transportation difficulties that he and his neighbors would experience living on College Street and many of the other streets that run between Gibson Road and Main Street. He said it is difficult now to get out of the driveway, and he said he could perceive that if development were to occur in Alternate 1 without having a really good plan for getting people through town some would have a very difficult time just getting out of their driveways at certain times of the day. He asked the Council to consider the impact that would have on those who live there and enjoy Woodland very much.

Council Member Steve Borchard said he sees some contradictions in some of the statements made in the Chamber of Commerce letter presented by Don Sharp. He said paragraph 3 asks the City to change its housing element from the current 35 percent multi-family to 15 percent. He said in order for that to occur we need a 60 or 90 day period of time for the State Housing Department regarding appeals. At the same time, he said the last paragraph in the letter the Chamber recommends adherence to the current time line set by the City Council which provides for a December 5, 1995 hearing. He said that seems to be two conflicting statements.

E-1-8

Mr. Sharp said that may be true because the Chamber is not privy to the State guidelines and what is required to get that accomplished. He said the Chamber's only concern was that the percentage of multi-family housing recommended in the current Draft General Plan compromises the quality of life in Woodland and creates a burden on services in the City. The compromises are left to the City Council and the Planning Commission as to how they handle recommendations and implement them. He said the Chamber is only recommending what they perceive to be in the best interests of the community.

Council Member Borchard said the tax incentives for apartment buildings have decreased since 1987, and the market forces are not providing apartment buildings. If the Council decides it wants an

85 percent single family and 15 percent multi-family housing mix, actual realization of that may not occur because of the market. He said if the ratio is 35 percent multi-family and 65 percent single family, the market may not permit it because of the lack of tax incentives. He said market forces drive the housing mix.

E-1-8 Mr. Sharp said that is what the Chamber's hope is, but as long as there is a 35/65 ratio in the policy document the Chamber's concern is that the City would apportion the land 35 percent for multifamily and 65 percent for single family. The 35 percent would not be developed as low density housing because it would be set aside for high density housing. He said that is why the Chamber made the recommendation. Speaking as a realtor, he said at the present time investment properties such as high density housing do not support themselves with the rent they generate in the current market place to support the cost of building them. However, if the City does set aside that much land and the State, the Federal government or some other entity provides incentives that would subsidize the rents to allow apartment owners to rent the properties then the City will draw tenants from not only Woodland but from elsewhere to benefit from the subsidies provided. He said that is a major concern of the Chamber of Commerce, that the City is not only providing affordable housing for residents of our City but are providing it for the County and even Sacramento County in some instances.

There were no further comments.

Community Development Director Janet Ruggiero said the City received about ten additional letters and comments on the Policy Document, and comments were received on the EIR. She said staff is preparing a report to be presented at the next joint meeting with responses to the ten letters received, and staff will identify if the comments received are simple ones that can be made in the document or are policy questions. She said staff will also have responses from comments made by Council and the Commission, including a response to the 65/35 housing mix ratio and how that compares to other cities. She said the hearing will be continued on the EIR to the next meeting. She said written responses are welcome from anyone if they are hesitant to speak at the hearings. She said the next public hearing will be held on November 16, 1995, at 7:00 p.m. on the draft Environmental Impact Report as well as any comments received on the Policy Plan. Copies of the Fiscal Report are available in the Community Development Department office of City Hall. A hearing will be held on November 28, 1995 for final formal comments on the draft EIR as well as the Policy Plan. The Commission after the hearing is closed will have a discussion on recommendations they will make to the Council regarding the alternative selection and any other comments they wish to make. She said the comment period on the Draft EIR ends at 5:00 p.m. on November 29, 1995, so any written comments will need to be received by her Department by 5:00 p.m. on that date to be considered as part of the final EIR. The recommendations from the Commission

will then to go the Council at their meeting of December 5 for discussion and determination. After that determination, she said, the final Environmental Impact Report will be prepared as will the final Policy Plan and the Background Report for final adoption by the Council.

Commissioner Tony Fernandez inquired about adding a month to the time line.

Mayor Sandy said if there is a reasonable time line by which the Farm Bureau can get back to the Council/Planning Commission he would be willing to look at moving the time frame backward to accommodate more public opinion. He said it would be absurd to move the time frame back indefinitely because the Commission and Council has worked on the General Plan for two and one-half years. He said two Planning Commissioners' terms will be ending on December 31, 1995, and three Council Members will be up for reelection in late March 1996. The City has spent thousands of dollars on the Plan, and it would be absurd to hand the Plan over to an entirely new group of people.

Dona Mast, Farm Bureau President, said the problem they are facing is that they just received the draft documents, and they need to look at them. She said they are not trying to stall the process and appreciate the City's position. She suggested compromising between a month. She said the Farm Bureau Board will be meeting on December 4 in Monterey, but she said they could call a special meeting.

Council Member Slaven suggested a two week delay.

The Community Development Director said the Council could hold its hearing on December 19 instead of December 5, 1995.

The Council agreed that it intended to vote on December 19. The Community Development Director said the Planning Commission will meet on December 7 to make recommendations to the Council. The public comment period on the EIR still will end on November 29, 1995. The comments on the Policy Plan could come in after that, and she said she would need those comments by December 7. She said at the joint meeting of the Commission and Council on November 28, 1995, they will receive last comments on the EIR. The Commission would then have some additional time to take in all of the comments received on December 7, and the Commission will make a recommendation on the alternatives at that time.

Planning Commission and Council agreed to still hold the joint meeting of November 16, 1995.

The Community Development Director said staff and the consultant still need to go back and prepare the final document based on the direction given by the Council, and the Council will take formal adoption action in January.

Commissioner Schwartz said he knows the City Council has met with the involved party regarding the water situation on occasion, and he received a copy of the communication from Conaway's attorney which he considered "threatening." He said as long as there is no dialogue nothing can get any better. He said he sensed from receiving the letter from their attorney there was a level of frustration on their part, and there is probably equal frustration on the City's part. He said it will take the City writing a letter back threatening to counter sue all along the points of their suit to bring it back to a level playing field. This brings the matter back to a level to agree to disagree, and he said he felt this is important. He said he is not advocating that this particular item be included in this General Plan and is not advocating that this matter be taken up under a General Plan amendment, but he felt something needs to happen in the way of dialogue.

Council Member Flory said recently the Mayor did send a letter to the President of PG & E wanting to discuss some of the issues with PG & E Properties, but they decided at this point not to for different reasons. He said the Mayor did extend the invitation.

Mayor Sandy said if Conaway was serious about continuing dialogue, they could withdraw their letter but have not chosen to. He said if they wanted to make a good faith effort they would be present at this meeting.

Commissioner Fernandez said the Planning Commission really has difficulty with Conaway and the issue of water and all that it pertains to. He said on behalf of his position on the Planning Commission and his position on other boards he applauds the Council's decision to deal with an entity that not only has a valuable resource in water but also in land and to force them to come to the table and deal with the City on our terms. He said when you look at the history of California some of the worst development and some of the biggest problems are created when a single entity has not only control of the water but also control of the land. He applauded the Council for the position it has taken. He said his personal opinion is that Conaway can do whatever they want with their water. The City does not really have anything to say about it. He said it would be a long hard battle to fight, and he said he was not sure if this is something the City wants to get involved in. He said he felt the Council was doing a good job.

Commissioner Moore said long term thinking down the road, the only people who are going to lose are the residents of Woodland. He said eventually this water is going to become a very valuable asset to the City if the City had control of it. The long term loser will be the City, and he felt we do need some dialogue.

Council Member Flory said he agreed with Commissioner Moore. He said his concern has always been that we do not allow them to

use this as a trump card to allow them to develop 3,000 acres. There have been plans where they are talking about massive growth. He said he could almost be willing to tell them to "go pound sand" before he would let them use this as a threat.

ADJOURNMENT:

At 8:25 p.m. the meeting was adjourned.

---

City Clerk of the City of Woodland

Council Chambers  
300 First Street  
Woodland, California

E-2

November 16, 1995

The Woodland City Council and the Woodland City Planning Commission met in adjourned session at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Mayor Sandy opened the meeting and invited everyone present to join him in the pledge of allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

ROLL CALL:

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Sandy, Flory, Rominger, Slaven

COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT: Borchard (Mayor Sandy said that Council Member Borchard will not be present at the meeting because of a conflict of interest.)

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Agostini, Moore, Friedlander, Sieberth, Hicks, Fernandez, Schwartz

STAFF PRESENT: Ruggiero, Nies, McDuffee, Siprelle, Winnop

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Tim Leathers commented on surface water.

PUBLIC HEARING - GENERAL PLAN:

Mayor Sandy said the City Council and the City Planning Commission is meeting again jointly to hold a public hearing to receive public input on the General Plan Policy Plan, the Background Report, the Draft Environmental Impact Report and the Fiscal and Financial Analysis.

The Mayor opened the public hearing.

E-2-1 [ Pat Murray said as a 30+ year resident of Woodland she is very much interested in preserving the flavor of our community and the preservation of farm land surrounding it. Of the two plans which she has studied she favors Alternative 2 because it takes less farm land.

E-2-2 [ Lois Linford said she supports Alternative 2 and would like to see growth as slow as possible. She said there are many homes for sale, and if she had a choice she would not pick either Alternative. With respect to water supply she said it is to the City's advantage to protect the source of potable water that we now

E-2-2  
(cont)

have, and she would like to see the City become more actively involved in issues along Cache Creek so that we can better protect our water supply. She said she did not believe it is to the City's advantage to look to Conaway for a source of water. She felt their water would come at a great expense to Woodland citizens. Surface water will require an expensive treatment plant to be built, and our water bills will really soar. Woodland Citizens need to be aware that a water treatment plant has been suggested to be built between Woodland and Davis so that both cities could share in the cost. She said Davis has a much more immediate need for such a plant than Woodland. She said Woodland's water is still good quality and with vigilance can remain that way for many years to come. She said also that Woodland's population might almost double if residential growth occurred on Conaway property.

E-2-3

B. J. Ford said she is also a 30 year resident of Woodland and supports Alternative 2. She said she supports building to the east and not south onto prime ag land; however, she did not feel the Conaway property should be considered at this time. She said time is needed to consider relocation of the sewer treatment plant, especially when additional residences are built in that area. She said Cache Creek should be the focus of water supply for Woodland, and it should be monitored to insure quality as well as quantity.

E-2-4

Kevin Haarberg, local businessman, said he favors Alternative 2 because the southern border of Road 25A allows for a commute between State Route 113 and I-5 which is important for the future of Woodland. He said there is a definite need to bring in new business which appears to be more feasible with Alternative 2. There is a need for more single family and executive housing in Woodland.

E-2-5

Dave Taormino addressed conservation easements. He said a 236 acre conservation easement program was just completed on Road 29 and Road 102. He said there were actually two different conservation easements, one for ag land and one for the Swainson Hawk, on the same property. He said this was the result of development requirements by the City of Davis with one acre per one acre of development. He said it took almost two years to put the program together and was the first one in Yolo County. The location was of a particular value because it is comparable to the City of Woodland in terms of it's current Urban Limit Line and Road 25A, approximately one mile south of Woodland, and Road 29 is about one mile north of the City of Davis. The land values are comparable. He said conservation easements were purchased for about \$1,500 per acre, and if the land were closer to the City the cost would have been greater for the same amount of land. One lesson to be learned from this, he said, is that it was not a heavy financial burden for the developers to put it together since the land was purchased far enough out of town. Another special feature of the easement is that the property was purchased in pieces even though it is one large parcel. One obstacle was the time, and the property owner had to be patient because it took a long time to