Council Chambers 300 First Street Woodland, California

November 28, 1995

The Woodland City Council and the Woodland City Planning Commission met in adjourned session at 7:03 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, Borchard, Flory, Rominger

COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT: Slaven

PLANNING COMMISSION

MEMBERS PRESENT: Agostini, Moore, Friedlander, Sieberth, Hicks,

Fernandez, Schwartz

STAFF PRESENT: Ruggiero, Hanson, Nies, McDuffee, Horgan, Zeier, Wegener,

Siprelle, Winnop

PUBLIC COMMENT:

There were no public comments.

PUBLIC HEARING - GENERAL PLAN:

Mayor Sandy said the City Council and the City Planning Commission is meeting again jointly to continue 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. He said presentations were scheduled at the beginning with Erik Vink of American Farmland Trust and Jim Eagan of Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. He said Mr. Vink has not yet arrived, and Mr. Eagan was called away to another meeting. Mr. Fran Borcalli will take Mr. Eagan's place to give the Council and Commission an assessment of local water supplies.

Fran Borcalli said it is important to understand that water planning takes time and getting a project on line is even more difficult. From the Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District standpoint he described the water supply which is the Cache Creek watershed. He said the District has the water rights to Clear Lake and owns and operates Indian Valley Dam and Reservoir on the North Fork. These two reservoirs in conjunction with the tributary flow down stream constitute the water supply for the District. The District has an extensive distribution system throughout a large part of Yolo

County. He said that surface water distribution system is really significant in terms of reducing ground water pumpage for agriculture, and at the same there is a recharge component to it. He said the Cache Creek watershed is a deliberate system. In 1969 the water rights to Clear Lake were acquired by the District. He said had the District not acquired those rights the City's prices for water would be substantially different, and the City's water balance would be different. In 1975 the Indian Valley Dam and Reservoir was completed; it took two elections for that to be approved. In 1972 prior to its completion there was a drought situation, and in 1977 Indian Valley came on line. He said the Council previously heard a presentation about the 1992 Water Plan update, and there are activities underway that were approved by their respective agencies. The City of Woodland participated also. He said the City is working with the City of Davis and the University of California at Davis on a master plan. Mr. Borcalli said under State law if the cities go through the process and if they are granted a permit to perfect that permit, the cities have the license. Indian Valley Reservoir was completed in 1975, and there is still a permit on it. The District has very deliberately not attempted to get a license on it but probably will soon. He said the license fixes the quantity of water that can be put in storage and used for beneficial purposes. By operating under a permit the District has really maximized the storage. He then discussed ideas of moving surface water to ground water supplies.

Mayor Sandy summarized that the City and the Water Resources Association of Yolo County are engaged in long range water planning and have been for quite some time, and there are a lot of good things happening in terms of water planning in the County.

Erik Vink of American Farmland Trust (a nonprofit farmland conservation organization) said his organization operates throughout the country and its California field office is located in Davis. In the last ten years they have focused on what is going on in the Central Valley with the loss of agricultural land to urbanization. He said they are very concerned about population projections from the State Department of Finance, and official State population projections going out to the year 2040 which show the Valley's population tripling during that period of time. In Yolo County the population is estimated to go from 150,000 to 386,000 people by 2040. He said his organization is interested in painting a picture of what that population gain would look like. He said they are concerned about good productive agricultural land and ensuring that it remains in production and is not urbanized. Comparing different modes of future development and different ways of accommodating those people, his organization was interested in the cost of providing public services to service the new development. He said their studies, working with researchers at the University of California at Davis and economists, showed that 8 million additional people under the current patterns of development would take about an additional million acres of agricultural land. Mr. Vink gave Council a report based on a projection of where that growth would occur to the year 2040. His report compared two different scenarios: one million acres of farm land converted continuing our current patterns of development versus less than 500 acres utilizing a more compact efficient mode of development. The difference was an average of three residential units per acre under the status quo development which is averaging out residential development over the entire urban area and comparing that to a more compact efficient pattern coming in at an average of six units per acre. He said he is making similar presentations to city councils, county supervisors and community groups up and down the Valley in order to begin to generate discussion in other communities where they do not

have a general plan update so far along in the process as Woodland's is. Mr. Vink said his group was very alarmed by the fact that the study indicated that by the year 2040 there will be a virtual linear city along Highway 99 which is the heart of the most productive farm land in the valley. He said his organization is interested in keeping development off that very good agricultural land.

Larry Mintier, the City's General Plan consultant, discussed the implications of the alternative growth scenarios. He said at the last meeting the Council and Commission directed staff and the consultants to report back with speculation as to the implications of selecting a population target lower than the 64,700 which is already built into the draft General Plan. Specifically Council and Commission were looking at two lower levels for 60,000 by the year 2015 which would result in a 1.7 percent annual compound growth rate and 58,000 by the year 2015 which works out to 1.5 percent annual compound growth rate. He said Council and Commission were concerned about how selecting either of those alternatives would effect the EIR analysis, the General Plan documents, perhaps the need for recirculation, and the fiscal and financial analysis for the Plan. First, he said the draft General Plan designates land to accommodate a population of approximately 64,700, and that is based upon SACOG projections. He said that is an approximate holding capacity and is only theoretic. There are several things that could affect the likelihood the City would reach that number by the year 2015. First that population figure assumes that virtually all of the land vacant and underutilized designated in the General Plan for urban development would be developed by 2015. The population projection also assumes that 35 percent of the housing stock will be developed as medium density. Whether market conditions could support that 35/65 split is anybody's guess. He said the point is that 64,700 was used as the target, and the figure is a benchmark and is theoretical. There are a lot of market factors which could affect the ability of the City to reach that figure. He said there are three ways to achieve a lower annual average growth rate or conversely a lower population target or level in the year 2015. First land which is designated for urban development could be taken out of the General Plan. To achieve 64,700 the City needs roughly 1,400 acres beyond the existing City limits. If that figure is dropped to 60,000 population or 1.7 percent growth rate, the land requirements drop from 1,400 to about 1,000. If the population target is dropped to 58,000, or the 1.5 percent growth rate, the land requirements drop to about 850 acres, or another 150 acres beyond the 60,000. Mr. Mintier said removing land from the General Plan is going to reduce the infrastructure requirements, but it is not going to be one for The infrastructure requirements will not go down in direct proportion to the reduction in the population. Also, it is going to make a difference when that land is removed from the General Plan. In most cases removing land will have a positive effect or simply reduce the aggregate level of impacts, but the City in a few cases may find out that the City has unanticipated impacts, such as increasing traffic in the existing City. Under land use scenario Alternate 1 with a straight band across the south, if the Council/Commission were to reduce the land it would be impossible to get a roadway in that narrow band. That would probably force traffic to the north into the existing City Overall reducing the land will reduce the impacts, but there will be shifts in impacts, making some of them worse. He said probably the City would not have to

recirculate the EIR, but reducing the land could potentially raise the per unit cost of housing for a development because the City could not cut back on the infrastructure. A second method is to leave all that land in and simply reduce the average density which uses land less efficiently. He said if there is less development and less total housing units in a given area the impacts in the aggregate are going to drop. There will be fewer people, fewer cars and fewer impacts, but the City will probably not be able cut back the infrastructure in anything directly proportional to the amount of development that has been eliminated from the Plan. He said the City would be stuck with the same basic infrastructure requirements and fewer units of development to pay for that infrastructure package. He said probably this alternative would conflict with a lot of policies in the Plan that promote compact urban development and efficient patterns of development with a more pedestrian friendly and transit friendly environment. He said it is more difficult to service a dispersed population, but he said Mintier and Associates is not certain it would require recirculation of the EIR. He said they feel it is more wasteful of the given resources, and the Council would have to seriously consider the significance of spreading the given infrastructure package price tag over fewer units. The third alternative for reducing the target population for the year 2015 is to leave the same amount of land in but reduce the rate of growth, so the time frame is stretched out. The question is which mechanism to use to do that, and he said the market may deliver up the lower growth rate. He said for example if the City were looking at a 1.5 percent annual growth rate, the City would hit 58,000 population in the year 2015 but it would take seven more years to build it out to 64,700. At 60,000 by the year 2015 there would be a 1.7 percent annual growth rate, and under that scenario the build out would occur in 2019 or 24 years. He said there is a complicating factor with this method because there is the question of whether the City extends the time frame just for residential or extends the time frame for nonresidential, including retail. To a large extent, but not completely, the nonresidential is dependent on the residential in the area of retail sales. If population growth rates are reduced, the City will lose retail sales, but it is not as clear a link to industrial employment. If the Council favored stretching the time frame for residential, it would make sense to stretch the time frame for nonresidential. This method probably would not require recirculation, but it could have the implication of making the financing more expensive. The cost of borrowing will be more expensive. The other alternative is to stretch the residential time frame but not stretch the nonresidential. Mr. Mintier said the draft General Plan is based on a 2 percent annual population growth rate and a 4 percent annual employment growth rate. If the Council decides to go down to 1.7 or 1.5 percent growth and keep the employment growth rate up at 4 percent, the City will reach its target by the year 2015 but the residential is stretched beyond that. The City will be adding in additional employment growth to reach parody with the residential. To chose that option, the City would have to recirculate. He said this is the one area where there are going to be increased impacts because of increased employment.

Commissioner Moore asked how the City stretches out the time frame.

Mr. Mintier said there is no mechanistic growth control program. The General Plan was drafted with the assumption that the requirement for specific plans would be the

primary tool, at least for residential development, by which that got sequenced and development occurred in a smooth fashion over time. He said the City would be relying on the specific plan requirement to even out the growth rate. When the time frame is stretched by four years or seven years, he said it becomes more problematical and becomes a bigger issue. He said when the market keeps the City growing at 1.5 or 1.7 percent there is natural demand, and there is no problem, but the question is when there is five percent one year and then eight percent another year. He said he would not suggest any kind of annual growth control mechanism where you rate projects.

David Freudenberger of David Taussig and Associates, the City's economic consultant for the General Plan, discussed the financial impacts associated with the change in population. He said if the Council/Commission were to reduce the population and the number of residential units and tried to relate the infrastructure to that ultimate number, the amount of infrastructure would be less and the physical and geographical location would be different. He said that would probably be some reduced infrastructure cost, but indirectly there are two basic components of infrastructure cost. There is fixed cost and variable cost, and there is a fixed cost associated with something like expanding the sewer treatment plant. There are variable costs associated with the number of roads and the mileage associated with the roads required to serve a certain area. If Council reduces the population, the annual burdens associated with the infrastructure will probably come down somewhat. On a per unit basis the cost of infrastructure will probably be higher. He then reviewed with the Council a memo prepared by Susan Goodwin of Taussig and Associates. In terms of the fiscal analysis he said if the population is reduced there may be corresponding reduced employment. He said there is a direct link with retail/commercial. Industrial and business employment will need to have a population base to draw their employees which would be a link but not a direct link. For 60,000 population assuming no reduction in commercial would be Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 would assume there would be a corresponding reduction in retail commercial. The same would apply to 58,000 population. Under build out population of 60,000 assuming the retail demands continue to be at the level we have assumed all along there would be a fiscal impact at build out of about \$460,000. By reducing the population and keeping the retail the same and the employment development the same, the City will go from a \$320,000 deficit to a \$460,000 surplus which is about a \$780,000 switch. If it assumed that the retail uses decrease at a rate which corresponds to the decrease in the population, the fiscal impact at build out is about \$120,000 positive which is about a \$440,000 switch. With build out population of 58,000 there would be an \$800,000 surplus at build out assuming no retail reduction and about a \$320,000 surplus assuming corresponding retail reduction. The retail reduction under a 60,000 population scenario is about 26 acres which is about 19 percent of what is being proposed now with the draft General Plan. Under the 58,000 population it is about 38 acres or 28 percent. He said this shows that given the market conditions, the land use mix and service standards in the City of Woodland, there is a net fiscal deficit associated without adding every person to the City. When you add people to the City you generate the demand for retail and generate the employment base. There obviously is a link between residential and nonresidential.

Mayor Sandy opened the public hearing.

Dona Mast, President of the Yolo County Farm Bureau, said in 1994 agricultural crops produced \$297,905,469 which does not include that the third party of these producers shop in Woodland. She said this has a significant impact on Woodland and the balance of trade. She said the Farm Bureau supports a 1.5 percent annual growth rate instead of 2 percent. Regarding water, she said the water that percolates by irrigation of farm land is a lot different than water that comes from the lawn watering because a lot more water goes down to the sewer system.

Dudley Holman spoke about the EIR and the water issue. He said he finds the comments in the General Plan documents to be lacking. He noted that on page 5-1 of Chapter 5 of the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan it is pointed out that the City's sole water supply is currently ground water. He said he knows that but there are a lot of people in the community who do not know that. The City has no back up supply or alternate supply, and we understand there are moves being made to augment that in some fashion through cooperation with other operations in the County. He said we hope that will be successful. On that same page it states that "For purposes of this Draft Environmental Impact Report, the City's future water system is assumed to rely on ground water supply." He said there is a little weakness in counting on the underground water supplies taking care of us in the future. The following sentence states "Although the City continues to participate in regional efforts to investigate the use of surface water supplies, the ability to acquire surface water rights is uncertain, and development of a surface water supply system would be a long-term effort that would take many years and additional environmental review." He said he agreed that we do not know how many years that would take. He asked if that was comforting as far as suggested mitigation and is that enough. He said obviously our supply is very questionable and our efforts to get more although underway are undetermined. He said he would like to see the EIR, if possible to suggest some additional possibilities, other mitigations that we might be looking for to take care of our community's future.

Mayor Sandy asked Community Development Director Janet Ruggiero to make a note of Mr. Holman's suggestion.

Reed Youmans passed out information sheets regarding land use alternatives: one which addressed the strengths of Alternate 1, one which addressed the weakness of Alternate 1, and one which addressed to the weaknesses of Alternate 2. He said his company has a small parcel of land that exists in Alternate 1 and he spoke to the strengths of Alternative 1. He said the existing residents of Woodland will benefit from the new schools, new ball fields, large community park and large neighborhood shopping center. Zamora and Gibson Schools are continually crowded, and there would be a new elementary school in this area to relieve that pressure. The soccer fields and Little League fields could be easily reached by children in this area by bicycle. All of Woodland will enjoy a community park that is centrally located and easily accessed. A neighborhood

shopping center on West Street will relieve congestion on Gibson Road for those people who live south of Gibson Road. An east-west arterial connecting Road 98 to East Gibson Road will be at Matmor Road and will provide a good alternative to Gibson Road. This arterial will be directly in front of the new Woodland Christian School, and that will begin to create guite a bit of traffic as that is developed. He said it has been widely accepted that Woodland needs more executive style housing, and it seems most appropriate to put that arterial by upscale housing. He said the General Plan continues to focus on the central business district, and this will be needed by development along the existing northsouth arterials. Neighborhoods on the southern edge of town will maximize the existing community services, for example the fire station on West Street. The primary weakness of Alternate 1 is that it is on prime ag land. He said also new housing in Planning Area 1 and in the new General Plan is largely east of State Route 113. He said this will separate the City with the new houses east of the highway, east of the Mall, east of the fairgrounds and east of the East Street Corridor. All of the new parks, schools and shopping centers will be inconvenient to the existing residents. By placing the new parks, schools and ball fields east of town, Main Street and Gibson Road will be the only alternatives. He said it is hard to believe that someone on Gibson Road would drive south a mile to Road 25A, across Road 25A and back a mile to the high school or to the Community College. The new Woodland Christian School will also be located on East Street and State Route 113, and this will create a significant amount of traffic in the morning and in the afternoons for kids going to school. There will also be significant conflicts created in new Woodland east of State Route 113 and old Woodland. He said it is generally agreed Woodland needs new executive style housing, and it does not seem guite appropriate to put this behind the Mall, behind the County jail or along the freeway. Finally, he said development of State Route 113 will make the Mall more central and it will be taking more business away from downtown businesses. When these things are considered with the General Plan outline and goals there is significant benefit to Alternate 1. He also noted four significant impacts listed by the General Plan EIR.

Tag Demment, member of the baseball subcommittee for parks and recreation and member of the committee involved in developing the baseball master plan, said although he and other baseball supporters may not agree on what development should take place, if development takes place, they want the Council to place baseball fields in a high priority. He said the City has never actually constructed a baseball field. The City took over Clark Field in 1937 and any new ball fields added to the community since have been done by the School District. He said those fields have been renovated by volunteer groups, but the City has decreased its commitment to maintenance to those fields. He said while the future and the past are somewhat separate development issues, they are inextricably linked. For the future he said his group is putting together a baseball master plan which they hope will be incorporated into the General Plan for the community. said they would like to see the General Plan (1) provide for a front loading of recreation facilities in general and baseball facilities in particular and (2) serve as a basis for development of present facilities. He said the value of our homes is not set so much by the taxes but by the community we build. He urged the Council to give very strong consideration to the incorporation of recreation facilities and baseball facilities and to use the baseball master plan as a mechanism and a prototype for incorporating planning for other recreational sports into the General Plan.

Vice Mayor Rominger asked how far the City is behind.

In terms of lighted baseball fields Mr. Demment said the City is at about 25 percent of our standard. He said there are two types of baseball fields: Little League fields and other baseball fields which are full size fields. He said the most impacted group in our community is the group which uses full size fields. Full size fields and lighted fields are at a premium; the City has one lighted facility.

Vice Mayor Rominger said Mr. Demment is suggesting that currently it would be desirable for the City to have four such fields.

Mr. Demment said the baseball master plan includes a series of alternatives which are being presented to the community to allow input on the various alternatives for solving problems to be explored and the financial accounting of those alternatives to be analyzed. Then we can come back and make decisions on types of funding sources and what types of alternative would be the best. He said the assumption is that the City is so low on facilities the schools and City would jointly use fields.

The Community Development Director said she and Parks, Recreation and Community Services Director Tim Barry met and talked about this issue, and they already had an implementation program prepared for the master plan. She said they talked about adding a policy about implementing the baseball master plan once the General Plan is adopted. The other issue, she said, is the front loading of recreational facilities, and that relates a lot to our legal ability to do that and looking at that in reference to the specific plans. She said that is something that can be looked at, but that is a major change in policy from what we have now.

Dave Taormino said he supports Alternative 1. He said Alternative 2 is a lot more than it appears. He said as you review the EIR, policy documents and other documents, you do not see the granting of an exclusive monopoly or exclusive franchise for the next 30 to 35 years for essentially residential development for the City of Woodland. He said Alternative 2 provides an exclusive franchise to a single development partnership. Part of the ability for their promises and representations has been the fact that they do control all of this land and will be able to deliver. He said with Alternative 2 they are essentially the only ones being allowed to develop in this community. He said if Bank America came to the City and said they wanted to be the only bank in the City of Woodland for the next 20 to 25 years and will do good things and will be efficient, that would be met with a tremendous amount of skepticism. He said the EIR is silent about this; the EIR looks at environmentally related issues. He said when economics become so significant and so substantial they can become environmentally related. He asked if the City of Woodland would be skeptical if Dave Taormino was the only developer for Alternative 2. He said this would be a complete departure from choices, competition and variety which the City

has talked about for the past eight years. With an exclusive franchise the City will not get that choice. In terms of dollars with Alternative 2 there is essentially a \$400,000,000 project. Once that monopoly begins it will continue and other groups will not be able to come in. He said the monopoly has to be debated. He said when you look at Alternative 1 and the balance and opportunities for the ball fields, traffic mitigation, it meets the Farm Bureau half way with their concerns and could meet their concerns all of the way with a good conservation easement program funded by development fees. Most importantly, he said Alternative 1 provides competition.

Al Beaird, resident of Woodland and Member of the Parks and Recreation Commission, addressed the financial analysis. He said they were told the maintenance figures used were based on the current maintenance budget, and the Parks and Recreation staff has indicated their current maintenance level with current parks is substandard to our population and the number of acreage. Maintenance of the current parks is substandard based on the current budget and budget cutbacks experienced over He said the Commission would like to make note of that in future consideration of the General Plan update. He referred the Council and Commission to Table 4 of the financial analysis. He said the old standard used in the current General Plan was one acre per thousand for neighborhood parks, two acres per thousand for ball fields and community parks and three acres per thousand for the regional park. This was the suggested standard the Commission used of six acres. He said the Commission spent considerable time revising the standards (to catch up to our needs) to one acre per thousand for neighborhood parks, two acres per acre for community parks, three acres per thousand for the regional park, and an additional four acres per thousand for sports fields and facilities. This makes a total of ten acres per thousand. He said it has been suggested that the consultants use the six acre per thousand figure which is the old standard. He said the Commission proposes that the ten acre per thousand be used, back out the regional park since it is already in existence, and use a seven acre per thousand standard in the General Plan update. He said they firmly believe this would be more representative of what the City's needs are and what they will be down the road. He said the Commission also suggests that Table 4 with the Regional Park listed with 73 acres and estimated development costs of \$115,000 per acre with no capital cost of purchasing land be revised. He said this projects to about \$8.4 million in total estimated cost, but there is a big portion of the park which is not capable of being developed. He said that future should be adjusted downward. Regarding front end loading for future development, the General Plan document should be more proactive in developing parks and recreational facilities needs as the population grows. He said the City should be involved in acquiring land early in the development process so that the City is not paying \$100,000 an acre or the highest cost. This would mean exploring predevelopment agreements with developers and upfront fees. He said the City should also look at other ways of utilizing existing land or trading existing land for land elsewhere.

John Murphy said he is a homeowner and expressed his support for the overall principles which the General Plan update summarizes. He said one thing he likes best about Woodland is the way we conserve farm land without a no growth policy, and way

people can maintain contact with City government without having to go through many intermediate steps. He said he likes the fact that the two alternatives do not provide for strip development which would allow Woodland to grow further to the east and further down I-5.

John Hunter said he represents Little League and youth sports but was present at the meeting on behalf of baseball in general. He said he is not that familiar with the General Plan update, but he said there is a need to increase our standards. He said Woodland is a baseball community and many youth have received baseball scholarships. He said there are professional scouts and recruiters coming to Woodland looking at our baseball players. He said there are people fighting for fields now, and we can produce a better group of ball players with better opportunity. He said he hopes the Council will agree to adding language to the General Plan to upgrade some of the standards.

Rick Elkins said he is against monopolies also; however, he said he wanted to say that Michael Beeman would be the first one to tell the City that his firm does not represent Mr. Beeman in the Alternate 2 area. Stanley Davis Homes also has property in the Alternate 2 area which his firm does not represent. He said Baker and Prudler own the property south of the Mall which his firm does not represent, and he wanted to clear up that misunderstanding.

Mayor Sandy closed the public hearing on the draft EIR.

The Council/Commission took a recess from 8:40 p.m. until 8:58 p.m.

Mayor Sandy reminded the public that written comments may still be submitted on the draft EIR for the General Plan update until tomorrow, November 29, 1995, 5:00 p.m. He asked for Council and Commission comments on the draft EIR.

Vice Mayor Rominger said she and City Water Conservation Specialist Harrison Phipps agreed that water conservation needs to be emphasized in the EIR for the General Plan as a way of generating an additional water supply. She suggested that we put into our implementation plan discussion about requiring property owners who do major remodels to existing homes to put in low flow shower heads and toilets and that a certain threshold be established to require them to retrofit to become meter ready. Also, she said Commissioner Fernandez voiced concern about ag land and surface water and making sure there is an equal exchange of water that is being used when ag land is developed. She said she was concerned that there should be an equal exchange from the previous ag land use to the new urban use. She said some of the land that surrounds Woodland which could be developed may currently be using surface water. If surface water is used and not ground water, she said houses built on the property will result in a net increase in the usage of ground water rather than an exchange of water use.

Mayor Sandy said page 5-7 of the draft EIR under "Water Supply and Delivery" outlines a number of ways of promoting efficient water use and reducing water demand.

He asked if Vice Mayor Rominger wanted to add to those.

Director of Public Works Gary Wegener said page 5-9 of the draft EIR states that those policies which Mayor Sandy referred to should be modified to <u>require</u> water conserving landscaping and other conservation and over time retrofitting all existing development with water conserving devices.

The Community Development Director said the suggestion is to change the draft Policy Plan to include these mitigation measures in the Policy Plan, and this added language would take place of what is in the draft EIR.

Planning Commissioner Schwartz said in regard to Table 10-1 of the draft EIR regarding "Comparative Impacts of Alternatives" there has been a lot focus of attention on the pros and cons of Alternatives 1 and 2. He said in a couple of instances the Table is not as comprehensively reflective of some of the differences between the alternatives as the underlying background text would suggest. Page 10-8, he said, discusses the alternatives of agricultural land, and the text under "Preferred Alternatives" is almost identical for Alternative 1 and 2. The draft EIR itself on page 3-11 says clearly that Alternative 1 overall encompasses higher quality soils for agriculture. He felt that distinction or clarification should be made there. Also, he said, on page 10-12 under the discussion of the impact on water supply and delivery the language for both alternatives is the same, but on page 1-17 it clearly states that there is more of a potentially significant impact for Alternative 2. His concern was that some people would just look at the chart and try to make their evaluation based on that.

Mayor Sandy said our water consultants are present at the meeting, Gary Meyerhofer and Karen Johnson. He said page 5-4 of the draft EIR states that "These estimated agricultural demands are presented in Table 5-3. In addition, urban water demands for these same lands were projected for comparison with the existing irrigation water applications. Subtracting the future urban water demands from existing agricultural demands results in a projected surplus of water." He said in Table 5-4 adds the existing City urban demands for water to the existing agricultural demands and then the projected build out demands are subtracted. That results in a deficit, and he said he does not follow that comparison.

Karen Johnson of the water consulting firm of Montgomery-Watson said this Table looks at the entire study area and not just the areas that are currently under ground water irrigation applications. She said if you looked at just ag lands that are using ground water versus a certain average development, there is an almost even exchange. Based on Alternatives 1 and 2 land use plans there is lower water use factor for urban than for the agricultural land so there is a surplus. She said if this is applied to the entire study area and all of the lands that are proposed to be developed under the two alternatives, there are lands included that are not currently under agricultural production.

Mayor Sandy said the EIR addresses subsidence. He said it is his understanding

that subsidence around the City is a historical phenomena and has occurred over many years. He said he felt it is important to mention that in the EIR. He said he felt there was not sufficient addressing of the flooding issue which could be addressed in another section of the EIR. He said there should be a good explanation of how the water table works in regard to ag pumping. He asked if the EIR addresses water transfers.

Planning Commissioner Fernandez said he previously asked that the issue be included in the Policy Document.

Karen Johnson said page 5-7 of the draft EIR under "Water Supply and Delivery", Section 4.C.1 states that the City shall continue to investigate the possibility of surface water supplies for domestic and/or agricultural use within the Woodland Area. She said that could include exchanges, conjunctive use programs, water rights applications, etc.

The Community Development Director said she has received several letters on the Policy Document, and she gave Council and Commission Members copies of the letters with staff comments. She said the Planning Commission will receive any additional comments at its December 7 meeting. At that time the Commission will also consider other policy decisions previously discussed at the Commission/Council level.

Vice Mayor Rominger said staff has typed her comments and questions, and she will review them with staff before presenting them to the Council and Commission.

Commission and Council Members discussed population projections. They agreed that recirculating the EIR was not an option.

The Community Development Director requested a brief recess. **The Commission and Council took a recess from 9:47 p.m. until 9:57 p.m.**

The Community Development Director said what staff and the consultants were asking the Council and Commission to do was unfair because the impacts of taking in the land area varies with the Alternative, and Council and Commission have not decided on which Land Use Alternative. She said there are two ways to deal with the issue. First the Commission and Council can decide on a rate of growth. Then the Commission and Council would make a selection on the Alternatives in terms of reduction of land area. Staff can then look at what the implications are on the Alternative selected because they vary between the Alternatives. She said the second way is still to decide on the rate of growth but simply lengthen the time line. If the time line is lengthened, the EIR would not have to be recirculated. The land area would not be reduced. The time line would be expanded to a 25-year plan, and at such time as the specific plans are developed the land areas would be looked at together with the rate of growth. At that time other implications would be reviewed including financing, what lands are under Williamson Act contracts, and using the specific plan as the vehicle.

After a request from Commissioner Fernandez regarding rate of growth, the Community Development Director said a 64,700 population projection results in a 2 percent rate of growth; a 60,000 population results a 1.7 percent rate of growth; and a 58,000 population results a 1.5 percent rate of growth.

After further discussion the Council and Commission reached a consensus that the population projection shall be 64,700, that the time line be stretched an additional five years to 25 years, that the land area remain the same.

Council Member Borchard said because of the linkage between growth rates and population and development in the south he cannot and did not participate in that decision of consensus.

Mayor Sandy reminded the audience that the Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on the General Plan including the Alternatives on December 7, 1995, at 7:30 p.m. The City Council will hold a public hearing on the General Plan on December 19, 1995, at 7:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT:

At 10:15 p.m. th	ne meeting	was adjourned.
------------------	------------	----------------

City Clerk of the City of Woodland	