

**Woodland City Council Minutes  
Council Chambers  
300 First Street  
Woodland, California**

**June 26, 2000**

**CITY COUNCIL  
SPECIAL SESSION/CLOSED SESSION**

The Woodland City Council met in special session at 6:30 p.m. in the second floor conference room of City Hall in order to convene a closed session. Before the closed session the Mayor in the City Hall Council Chambers announced the closed session topics.

At 6:35 p.m. Council discussed the public employee appointment (Sec. 54957) of the position of Administrative Assistant to the City Council/City Clerk. Council Members present for the closed session were: Steve Borchard, Martie Dote, David Flory, Jeff Monroe, and Neal Peart. Absent Council Members: none. The Council also had a conference with legal counsel regarding anticipated litigation (one case).

Also present for the entire closed session were City Manager Rick Kirkwood and City Attorney Ann Siprelle. Assistant City Manager Phil Marler and City Clerk Jean Kristensen attended the closed session portion dealing with the public employee appointment of the Administrative Assistant to the City Council/City Clerk.

The special session and closed session were adjourned at 7:03 p.m.

**CITY COUNCIL  
ADJOURNED REGULAR SESSION**

Mayor Borchard opened the adjourned regular Council meeting at 7:07 p.m.

**CLOSED SESSION ANNOUNCEMENT:**

Mayor Borchard advised that Council just concluded a closed session to discuss anticipated litigation regarding one case and the public employee appointment of the Administrative Assistant to the City Council/City Clerk. He said no action was taken.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

Mayor Borchard invited all in attendance to join him in the pledge of allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

**ROLL CALL:**

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Borchard, Dote, Flory, Monroe, and Peart

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES  
JUNE 26, 2000  
PAGE 2

COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT:           None

STAFF PRESENT: Richard Kirkwood, Phillip Marler, Jean Kristensen, Ann Siprelle, Heidi Tschudin, Steve Harris, Terry Brown, Ellasion Phillips, Margaret Vicars, Gus Bush, Bruce Lecair, Gary Wegener, and Greg Moutinho

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Council Member Peart introduced Joyce Hunter who was a co-chair with him for the 4<sup>th</sup> of July Celebration. He announced the itinerary for the day's activities. He thanked the major sponsors for the event: V. Santoni and Company, Nugget Market, The Daily Democrat, Teichert Construction and the City of Woodland. Other sponsors were Kraft Brothers and Young Rau Investments.

City Manager Rick Kirkwood distributed to Council a copy of a letter he planned to deliver to the County Board of Supervisors tomorrow, June 27, 2000, at 9:30 a.m. to deal with item No. 38 on the Board's calendar regarding planning and funding recommendations contained in the Facilities Master Plan. He said he received a copy of the County Facilities Master Plan last week and after review he determined that the County and the City need to develop a partnership arrangement to deal with the critical shortage of parking in the downtown and government center area. He said the letter he prepared deals with the future needs of County-owned facilities, leased facilities, etc., and asks that the County, as it considers any expansion in the downtown area, include parking. He said he attached to the letter a copy of the administrative draft on parking strategy that staff has been working on for the past year and which was discussed at the last County/City 2 x 2 meeting. He said he is asking that this parking strategy be considered as a supplement or annex to the County Facilities Master Plan so that when they consider any expansion that the County first consider parking. He said there is a serious deficit of parking in Woodland and we need a new parking management strategy as well as consideration of new ordinances to be put into place that requires new construction in the downtown area to make parking a part of their planning process.

Council Member David Flory said today he had a conference call with Buck Williams from the local union that represents the employees for the Spreckels Sugar plant, and they are in Washington DC with other union members lobbying congress to pass the farm bill that they hope will allow the beet growers to purchase Spreckels Sugar plant to keep it open. He said the union representatives requested a letter from the City of Woodland that needs to be faxed to them in Washington D.C. because they will start their meetings with Congress tomorrow morning at 7:30 a.m. He read a letter into the record and he requested Council concurrence in sending this letter to Washington D.C.

By consensus Council concurred in sending the letter to Washington D.C. with the Mayor's signature.

PRESENTATION ON CITY WEB SITE DESIGN:

Finance Director Margaret Vicars listed the following committee members who had been working on the City web site design: Barbara Schlundt, Library; Diana Puccetti, Parks, Recreation and Community Services Department; Mini Paredes, Police Department; Heidi Hopper Finance Department; Nell Hessel, Public Works Department; Brian Grattidge, Community Development Department; Ernie Fatta, Fire Department; Amy Buck, Human Resources/Administration; and Gus Bush, Information Systems Manager. She said these people have been working continually to bring our web page up to date.

Richard Yamagata from Virtual Market Enterprises (VME) and Gus Bush, Information Systems Manager, made a presentation on the Web Page Design. Mr. Bush said at this point the plan is to have all pages on the City's web site designed by one vendor (VME), but he said they had not resolved the issue of maintenance of the site, keeping the information updated. He said a presentation will be made to Council at a later date on that decision.

MEASURE H PROGRESS REPORTS/PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACTS:

The City Manager Richard Kirkwood gave a report on the spending plan for the four projects which appeared on the March 7, 2000 ballot as advisory measures for use of Measure H sales tax dollars. By priority the projects were ranked as follows:

Priority 1	Road Repair and rehabilitation	9,099 votes (80.1%)
Priority 2	New Police Station	7,425 votes (65.6%)
Priority 3	New Community/Senior Center	6,685 votes (59.9%)
Priority 4	New Softball/Soccer facilities	5,753 votes (51.7%)

He said the Measure H Spending Plan for all projects totals \$34,300,000, which includes sales tax revenue (\$22 million) and development fee revenue (\$12.3 million). He said approximately \$4.9 million is anticipated from development fee revenue for the Police Station with \$5 million in Measure H sales tax giving \$9.9 million. For the road repair there will be no development fee related dollars, and just \$10 million in sales tax dollars. For the softball and soccer facilities he anticipated utilizing \$5 million in development fees to match \$2 million in sales tax revenue for a total of \$7 million. For the community/senior center it is anticipated that development fees utilized will total \$2.4 million with \$5 million in sales tax revenue for a total of \$7.6 million. He said staff anticipates developing a needs assessment with the project managers, and staff will bring the issue back to the Council in September. He said the Police Chief recommended that because the Council had previously authorized the services of Leach Mounce Architects for the police station, he recommended authorization to proceed with that firm. He said he understands that the Council may be interested in looking at other firms that might have an interest in performing needs assessment and

project management. Regarding road rehabilitation work, he said eventually staff will be looking to have project management to validate our road assessment. With respect to soccer facilities, softball facilities and community/senior facilities he said all will need a series of consultant services, including needs assessments, location and project management. He anticipated that if the Council agrees staff would like to move forward with the identification of those various consultants so that the recommendations can be made to Council in September.

Council Member Flory asked if there will be a report from the City Manager about what might be done with the current police station and City Hall. He asked if there is any possibility of locating a parking structure at the Police Department and if the location proposed was the best use of the land in the current economy and the state of redevelopment.

The City Manager said the Council previously did identify the Lincoln and Fifth Street site as the site for the new police station, and that is the site that staff has been moving forward with. He said it is a Council decision if the Council would like to change that location. He said it is appropriate that if the Council as part of the needs assessment and site analysis the City takes another look at that. He said the next question would be the potential uses of the existing police facility. He said based upon the preliminary work with consultant Bob Grandy on looking for potential sites for a parking structure the current police facility site and the adjacent parking area is probably undersized and it would not be cost effective for a two or three story parking structure. He said that is something that would have to be verified if the Council wants staff to move in that direction.

Council Member Flory said the second site considered for the new police facility was at the northwest corner of College and Court Streets. He said if the City is looking at spending hundreds of thousands dollars to buy that corner site, it may not be prudent to look at revisiting the area for a police station.

The City Manager said in his past experience with new police stations the first priority is doing a needs assessment. The first preference is trying to locate the police facilities adjacent to or in close proximity to the city government center. He said there is no need to site a police facility because of the dispatching of the officers; they respond from their vehicles. He said in his experience there has always been an interest in locating their police facilities in the general city government area. He said, however, that Woodland does have a Redevelopment Area, and there is some economic benefit to creating an investment in that economically depressed area.

Mayor Borchard said looking at prior Council's direction the City paid over \$1,000 for a site selection study that dealt with seven locations throughout Woodland between 1994 and 1996. He said he would like to look at that report again which included the Epperson site (College and Court Streets). He said there have been some changes over the past four to six years, and he said maybe the current Council

would agree with the prior Council's choice of the Fifth and Lincoln Street site for the new police facility.

The City Manager said he will report back to the Council on the site selection criteria at the next earliest meeting, which will probably be in September.

Council Member Peart said he is pleased that the Council is talking about building a police station again. He suggested that the Council consider the design build construction management method. He said there are ways this can happen; it can make construction happen much quicker than the typical design bid.

The City Manager said he will look at that as well. He said the City does not currently have legislative authority from the State to do a design build project such as the one that occurred in the City of Davis. He said, however, the construction management processes can be analyzed, and staff can bring a report back to Council.

On motion of Council Member Monroe, seconded by Council Member Dote and carried by unanimous vote, the City Council received the Measure H progress report; authorized negotiations to commence with professional services contracts, needs assessments; and project management services for the Measure H related projects; and Council directed staff to consider the benefits of design build project management services that relate to the design build concept.

CITY'S HOME FIRST-TIME HOME BUYER ACQUISITION PROGRAM:

Community Development Director Steve Harris requested Council approval of two agreements with Rural California Housing Corporation (RCHC) to administer two HOME grant programs. He said these are two grant programs that the City received from the Department of Housing and Community Development. One is in the amount of \$500,000 to provide assistance for First-Time Homebuyers in the City for households of affordable incomes. He said this would allow \$500,000 minus the administrative fee for RCHC, leaving \$473,000 to provide low interest loans for second mortgages to assist the homebuyers. He said staff anticipates this would go toward the assistance of 25 homebuyers (25 families) in the City. He said the money that would go to RCHC would go toward the cost of setting up the program, to monitor, to provide all of the loan documentation, all of the qualifications and background checks and to assist them in buying the homes. The second contract with RCHC is for a grant the City received in cooperation with the development of Sycamore Pointe apartments in the amount of \$885,000. This contract assists in the construction costs for 11 of the apartment units. He said there are ongoing monitoring requirements for the renters and for the project itself.

On motion of Council Member Dote, seconded by Council Member Monroe and carried by unanimous vote, the City Council authorized the City Manager to execute the contracts with Rural California Housing Corporation (RCHC) to administer the City's

HOME First Time Home-Buyer Acquisition Program and monitor the 11 existing HOME assisted Sycamore Pointe Apartment units.

COUNCIL MEETING SCHEDULE FOR AUGUST 2000:

The City Manager recommended that the Council table consideration of its Council Meeting schedule for August 2000 until the end of the June 27, 2000 meeting because the Council may want to consider additional meetings.

PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING THE TURN OF THE CENTURY (SPRING LAKE)  
SPECIFIC PLAN:

Community Development Director Steve Harris said this is the first scheduled public hearing for the Spring Lake Specific Plan (formerly known as the Turn of the Century Specific Plan). He said this is a draft plan that is coming to the Council from the Planning Commission as recommended. He said this public hearing will be continued to tomorrow June 27, 2000, and at the conclusion of tomorrow's hearing the Council will need to make a decision on scheduling additional public hearings or further direction to staff for the next meeting. He asked that after the Specific Plan is presented that the Council focus on land use and circulation issues. He then explained the process to be followed for tonight and tomorrow night's hearings.

Michelle Carotenuto, Chair of the Planning Commission, reported that there were 11 Planning Commission meetings on the Spring Lake Specific Plan and two community design workshops were held at which there were well over 100 participants from the community. He said the Plan is not perfect but the Commission felt was a plan that reflected the vision and the direction of the community. He said staff will give an in depth presentation of this plan. He said the Plan before the Council tonight has been subject to many hours of review, discussion, comments and changes. He said he felt it was the best effort of the community, the various developers, planners, the Planning Commission, property owners and members of the community. He said the plan is not set in concrete but it is one that has evolved over time and will continue to do so as it moves forward to become a reality. He pointed out that the Spring Lake Specific Plan involved nine different property owners, all with concerns and issues regarding the project. He said the Council has the job of trying to satisfy all of the property owners and resolve all of their concerns. He said the Planning Commission feels that it provided the community an opportunity to step forward and voice their concerns, so the Plan before the Council is a consensus of all of those issues.

Heidi Tschudin, Contract Planner, said Council received a staff report that contained the latest action by the Planning Commission. Staff displayed an aerial of Woodland delineating the Spring Lake Specific Plan Area. She then showed Council a graphic which was presented to Council in early 1996 to sell the idea to Council of doing a specific plan, and she said the Plan today is substantively consistent with that graphic but there were some things that have dropped out along the way. In February of 1996

the General Plan was adopted, and in December of 1997 the Council approved the petition from the Turn of the Century Limited Liability Company to initiate a plan process in the area. She said subsequently specific plans were received in February of 1999, and the Council directed staff to look at two plans, Plan A and Plan B. Both were developed by the Turn of the Century applicant and were similar, but Plan A was a grid pattern and Plan B was primarily curvilinear. Subsequent to that process at a workshop that was held in July of 1999 the City received from some property owners in the area another version, called Plan C. Plan C was intended to be more consistent with the General Plan with more of the grid pattern and distributed different densities throughout the community a little more. After that there were several other plans, and then community workshops were held with Mr. Bottomly who did a slide show on design concepts. She said there were 100 people at the first workshop and 90 people the next night, and these were people spread from all over the City. She then displayed a graphic which was called the community consensus plan which was put together by Terry Bottomly and was the outcome of everyone's comments, ideas and design issues. She said this is the Plan before the Council at this time. She noted that there is a four-volume EIR for the Plan. Also three documents were submitted by the applicant. One is a market review dated October 1999; one is a financing infrastructure plan preliminary draft dated November 9, 1999; and one is a fiscal impact study dated November 10, 1999. She then gave history on the timeline. She said staff is asking the Council to give an intent to approve this Plan. Once that is done staff will begin other activities which are necessary to bring the document back to Council for final action. She said first we need to revise the final infrastructure plans. The current plan has preliminary infrastructure exhibits for water, sewer and drainage, and revised plans are needed to reflect the specific plan with accurate detail. These revisions will allow going into the financing by phase and by type of infrastructure. A revised financing plan will also be needed to help us understand what it would cost to implement the plan in case there is a desire to make adjustments based on that information. Property owner commitment is also needed. To this date one property owner has signed to commit to the financing and no others. To change that we need to let the property owners know what the land uses are likely to be and the cost of those land uses. A revised traffic and circulation analysis is also needed as well as a final fiscal impact analysis as required by the General Plan. The adequacy of the EIR needs to be confirmed, and Ms. Tschudin felt at this time that will not be an issue. Lastly a final approval package will be submitted to Council including those documents as well as the appropriate resolutions, ordinances and findings of fact. She said minimally staff feels it needs approximately eight weeks to do that and several documents will be prepared by consultants who also have time schedules. This timeframe would bring the final package back to Council in September. She said the Spring Lake Specific Plan will guide development of the 1,097 acres shown on the map, and the Plan area is located primarily south of Gibson Road and east of State Route 113 and immediately south of the City limits. The Plan establishes development policies, land use designations, zoning, development regulations and design standards in one document for the development of that area. The build out is assumed to be a 15-year period, which would take through 2015. The proposed development based on the June 2000 draft would be 3,948 dwelling units on 704 acres,

11 acres of neighborhood commercial, 290 acres of public and quasi-public land uses, 32 acres of park land and 60 acres of other land uses. These are gross density numbers, and overall the gross density would equate to about 5.6 units per acre. The Plan will result in a population at build out of about 11,023 people. She then gave the key features of the Plan (page 1-4 of the Plan). She discussed how some of the key issues are addressed in the Plan. With respect to **phasing of development** she said the recommendation of the Planning Commission and the community was that the major factor in phasing should be logical extension of services. The phasing would radiate out from the College (Woodland Community College) and that would enable neighborhoods A or B or A and B to go at the same time. The Plan also talks about when one neighborhood gets started you would have to finish that neighborhood to the extent that the land is within the Specific Plan. That deals both with the issue of phasing and contiguity. The issue of a **growth cap** is related to phasing and also related to absorption. General Plan Policy 1.A.9 states that "The City shall manage residential growth at an even and reasonable pace so as not to exceed a population of 60,000 in the year 2015." The General Plan text further indicates that the expected citywide population at full build-out (2020) will be 66,000. The current specific plan as proposed would allow about 11,000 people. In Sycamore Ranch there are about 940 remaining units, which would result in an added population of 2,625. These numbers would result in a 2015 population of 59,248, which is consistent with the General Plan requirements. Ms. Tschudin said the average building permit issuance per year in Woodland has been about 250 to 260 permits per year, and the absorption figures will work in our favor. On the issue of **single family and multi-family ratios** the Housing Element establishes the objective that ". . . 35% of all housing units shall be multi-family." "Multi-family" relates to density. Densities above 8 dwelling units per acres (du/ac) are considered multi-family, whether detached or attached, and whether rental or for sale. Because that number was identified as an objective and because of the Planning Commission deliberation of testimony that was received, the Specific Plan reflects a split of 75%/25%. The Commission felt this was a more appropriate distribution given the testimony, the conditions of the area and the existing multi-family and single family split in the community. Related to this issue is **affordable housing** which is discussed in the General Plan and a by-product of an ordinance regulating how much affordable housing is required. The requirement is about 20%, and that is reflected the Specific Plan. The Spring Lake Specific Plan ends up with a range between 790 to 839 affordable units with that calculation. **Design requirements for small lots** was also a topic of many of the hearings before the Commission. Page 2-20 of the Plan shows examples of some existing development throughout the City. Currently the Plan would require 168 in the form of corner duplexes. The Plan does not require any apartments, and the maximum number of units under the Plan as currently written would be 730. **Estate Style Lots**, the low-density lots, are defined in the General Plan as lots that range from one unit per acre up to four units per acre. The Specific Plan has greatly increased the number of lots that were originally planned for Plan A and Plan B. Currently there are 477 units shown in the R-3 category, which would allow everything from one dwelling unit per acre to three. There are 668 units in the R-4 category, which is four dwelling units per acre. The issue of alternative modes

of circulation, **bicycle/pedestrian/transit circulation**, is a key component of the Plan which embraces several mechanisms for addressing this, including controlled block lengths which maintain a pedestrian-scaled community, use of grid street patterns and traffic calming to disperse and slow traffic, on-street and off-street bicycle system that connects all of the parks and all of the schools in the Plan and in the Master Plan remainder area, and provides links to the downtown. Additionally each subdivision is encouraged to have greenbelt connections to other subdivisions, trails, parkways, and greenbelts. There are planned grade separated crossings in four locations within the Plan area: 1) across Gibson Road at the high school; 2) across County Road 102 at the regional park; 3) across Parkway Drive at County Road 101; and across State Route 113 at County Road 24A. There are land uses and densities specifically organized to support bus service, and there is greenbelt framing around the Plan including a 50 foot landscaped area on the south side of Gibson Road, the west side of County road 102, and the east side of State Route 113. With regard to **park and recreation** issues both the General Plan and the Parks Master Plan require parks to be provided at a ratio of 10 acres per 1,000 population. There are also minimum requirements for park size. Ms. Tschudin said those do not always mesh when you look at a specific plan, so a system was set up that the Planning Commission and staff believe meets those requirements by providing three 8-acre neighborhood parks, one 8-acre central park, 34-acre sports park located outside the plan area in the southeast corner of State Route 113 and Parkway Drive. She noted that there is a small two-acre neighborhood commercial node within each neighborhood park, to create a focal point for each neighborhood. Additionally next to the central park there will be five acres of neighborhood commercial land and the proposed new fire station, this will create the town center. **Neighborhood design** is an important part of the Specific Plan and the most fundamental element. The Plan includes a number of things to ensure a livable community. Attractive tree-lined streets with tree canopy requirements, separated sidewalks, vertical curbs, and landscaping are included. Traffic calming measures and a roundabout are used at the main intersection of Parkway Drive and Pioneer Avenue. There are façade controls that are designed to avoid repetition of the way houses look within individual tracks that are under the control of one builder and to avoid changes that are very abrupt as you go from one builder to another. There are also different requirements for different elevations for architectural diversity, mixing of single story and two-story units, mixing of lot widths and the local builder requirements to encourage small merchant (custom) builders. She said some of the home design features include front porches, bay windows, street-facing houses, prohibitions on garage-forward design, requirements for separate entry walks, and prohibitions on color restrictions. There are park design requirements that preclude back-on residential lots. There is discussion of the town center with the central park, including a plaza and perhaps a community rose garden. There will be mixed-use neighborhood commercial uses with community serving retail uses, second floor residential uses, restaurants with outdoor seating and public facilities that would include a community center and the fire station. School design is discussed as well as energy-efficiency and even the mix of multi-family and single family units with the goal being to create an opportunity for "life cycle" housing. There are requirements for landmark features within each neighborhood, such as a clock tower, spire, bell

tower, etc. There are requirements for horizontal landmark features at public facilities, such as public art, a plaza or a fountain. There are requirements that Spring Lake Specific Plan design guidelines be developed. There will be the use of trails to connect the entire community and allow for non-vehicular, off-road access to every park and school and the ability to utilize private streets constructed to a narrower standard than the City specifies.

Ms. Tschudin then discussed the **environmental review process**. She said the project has been through a formal environmental review process. A Notice of Preparation was released February 18, 1999 for a 30-day comment period. There was the typical EIR process, and the EIR was circulated. There was opportunity for comments and the responses to those comments. In the process of the **environmental assessment** they identified both impacts expected to occur as a result of the plan and also mitigation measures that would either fully or substantively mitigate those impacts. Some of the key measures were identified in the staff report. She said there was a series of different deed disclosures that would be required to alert future buyers of such things as nuisances from agricultural use, future development and use of the regional park, noise that may occur from the small existing private airstrip (on an interim basis), noise from uses at the Regional Park, nuisances potentially associated with the sports park, and a disclosure statement that the community contains a variety of multi-family and affordable housing opportunities. Another mitigation is the acre-for-acre (1:1) land set aside. She said in the past the Council has discussed this loss of agricultural land and loss of habitat. The EIR identifies a one for one acre requirement for each of those but also states that one acre can satisfy both if it meets the biological requirements as well as the agricultural requirements to do that. There is a requirement for plan specific infrastructure facilities which are needed to finish the plan, and there are a variety of site specific studies that will be required for some of the properties where there was no biological assessment or a noise assessment. Those studies would come in with the tentative maps. There is a requirement for fiscal impact analysis, which is already on board, for a financing plan, and for a capital improvement plan. There is also a requirement that transit impact fees be looked at and that there be an affordable housing plan which will be the precise tool to implement the affordable housing ordinance. She then noted some mitigation measures for which staff recommends some slight adjustments. Some of the impacts of the Specific Plan which will remain significant and unavoidable include the loss of farmland, conflict with Williamson Act contract land, cumulative loss of farmland, impacts to groundwater, loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat, cumulative impacts to wild life and habitat, project air quality emissions, cumulative air quality emissions, increased ambient noise, cumulative traffic noise, project nuisance impacts from black gnats, and cumulative nuisance impacts from black gnats. Ms. Tschudin outlined the precise action of the Planning Commission on June 8, 2000 after 11 hearings on the Specific Plan. She also pointed out some of the modifications to the recommended action. She said after the Specific Plan is approved there are a number of subsequent actions required for implementation of the Plan, including annexation, an affordable housing plan, Spring Lake Specific Plan

guidelines, financing mechanisms, and special site studies which would accompany individual maps.

Council took a recess from 8:58 p.m. until 9:10 p.m.

Contract Planner Heidi Tschudin presented four letters which were received in regard to the Specific Plan from the following: Abbott and Kindermann representing Cal-West Seeds, Legal Services of Northern California, the Community Housing Opportunities Corporation (CHOC), and the Woodland Chamber of Commerce.

Mayor Borchard opened the public hearing.

Tom Lumbrazo of Turn of the Century, LLC, discussed issues with respect to implementation of the Plan. Other persons who spoke were Bruce Pope, Larry Greene, Leslie Marcus, Bruce Bailey, Russell Miller, Chuck Cunningham, Dave Taormino, Cate Merritt Murphy, and Don Sharp.

There being no further comments, Mayor Borchard closed the public hearing.

Council Members thanked the Planning Commission and staff for carrying the Specific Plan through the process. They said they hoped the Council can now keep the Plan moving toward approval and implementation.

**On motion of Council Member Flory, seconded by Council Member Dote and carried by unanimous vote, the City Council extended the Council meeting from 10:30 p.m. until 10:40 p.m.**

Mayor Borchard thanked the speakers for their comments and he said this hearing will be continued to June 27, 2000.

The City Manager said Council Members have stated tonight that they greatly appreciate the positive steps that all of the landowners are making this evening. He said the City has legal indemnification issues and fiscal and financial issues. He said it is important that before we move to the next steps following Council's discussion with regard to land use, circulation, densities, etc., it is incumbent upon all of the property owners within the 1,097 acres that there is a meeting of the minds. He said there need to be appropriate legal indemnifications to the City of Woodland and all need to be willing to deal with the fiscal and financial analysis that will be dependent upon the land use, circulation and other elements of this Specific Plan. He said there is a very critical next step. He asked the City Attorney to draft a letter that would represent those concepts, and the Council should review that tomorrow and incorporate that into the Council discussions.

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES  
JUNE 26, 2000  
PAGE 12

On motion of Council Member Dote, seconded by Council member Monroe and carried by unanimous vote, the City Council continued the public hearing until June 27, 2000, 7:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT:

At 10:35 p.m. there being no further comments Mayor Borchard adjourned the adjourned regular City Council meeting.

---

Jean Kristensen, City Clerk of the City of Woodland