

Council Chambers
300 First Street
Woodland, California

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.

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.

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 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.

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.

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.

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 allow the various agencies to comment on it. A major obstacle of the landowners was the fear that if there was a Swainson Hawk on the property, the property would not be salable. Mr. Taormino said the most important lesson from the whole process was to start early to put a conservation easement on land.

Rich Jenness, Woodland resident, and engineer, 608 Court Street, Woodland, made some technical comments about the General Plan and specifically about surface and ground water. He said the General Plan addresses the need to investigate the possibility of surface water supplies for domestic and/or agricultural use in the area. His concerns

related to the belief that a surface water supply could be economically introduced to the Woodland area. The City is now entirely on a ground water system, and in his estimation should remain so. Investigation of surface water use should be for the benefit of agricultural water users for the following reasons: (1) it is better quality water for crops in that boron and other salts are in lesser concentrations and less injurious to crops; (2) it is usually less expensive water than ground water pumping because it need not be treated for agricultural purposes; and (3) it will reduce the dependency on ground water supplies for the City or for any urban use. He said the City should remain on ground water supply for the safeguards inherent in that type of system and because it is the system in use today. If the City were to consider using surface water in lieu of ground water, the cost would be far greater for water to customers. He said for Alternative 2 of the General Plan which consists of approximately 1,500 acres the cost of water treatment plant, pumping, conveyance facilities, water storage, water distribution system will be approximately \$20,000,000. The same area using a ground water system will cost about \$5,000,000. Additionally operation and maintenance costs are far more expensive for a treatment plant and related facilities than a ground water system. If one were to consider changing the water system to a surface water system, consider the cost and interruptions to the existing underground facilities and consider the problems getting the voters to vote on financing such a system. He said he is not making a case against surface water development. He said in fact this County needs additional surface water. He stressed the need to work with agricultural water interests in developing additional surface supplies for ag purposes allowing municipal and domestic needs to be served by the present ground water system.

Vice Mayor Rominger said she agrees with Mr. Jenness' cost analysis. She thought the City could possibly do some exchanges and/or some diversion at a different point. She asked Mr. Jenness if that was a viable alternative.

Mr. Jenness said that is a viable alternative, and that is why he suggested the City at least assist the ag water interests in that endeavor. Getting the surrounding area of the community off ground water supply for ag water pumping enhances the ability of the City to grow using the ground water system. Then farmers are better able to use the untreated surface water supplies.

Vice Mayor Rominger said the City Council and City Public Works Department has received a letter from Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District to look at studying extension of the Magnolia Canal and working jointly to use some of that water to distribute it along the northern and western sides of the City to help with percolation and help distribute the water.

Felix Ybarra, 113 North College Street, Woodland, said he was a resident on a street which is very close to property within Alternative 1 and was aware of what was proposed two to three years ago for the area. As a small builder in the community he said it makes sense to continue the infrastructure to maintain the core look. He said one alternative maintains the core look and the other goes off into the sunset to the east. He

said the infrastructure is already there making Alternative 1 much less costly and conceivably open to phasing. The timing would also be beneficial in terms of making Alternative 1 happen.

Paul Deering, Vice President of Yolo Land Conservation Trust, said he was available to answer questions about conservation easements. He said they are talking about a permanent form of zoning, something that political bodies have a hard time accomplishing. He said easements can be used to lock in the City's conservation decisions. He said Yolo Land Conservation Trust holds the two easements mentioned by Mr. Taormino on the Willow Slough By-Pass north of Davis. He said Trust also holds an easement in Clarksburg for 60 acres which is a reinforcement to their Urban Limit Line and allowed development of six home sites. He said both of these easement locations were generated from development mitigation requirements for different purposes.

Blanca Garcia, 385 Bright Day Court, Woodland, said she supports Alternative 1. She said she served on the City Parks and Recreation Commission for two and one-half years and saw a lot of need for facilities for youth, such as soccer and baseball fields. She said it makes no sense to place these facilities farther away from current residents. She said she is in the real estate business and is concerned about the need for and safety of bike paths. She said the City needs to look at growth rate over a longer period than one year at a time, and the City needs upscaled, executive housing.

Bill Glazier thanked the City staff, Council and Commission for all of the work on the development of the General Plan. He said he supports Alternative 1 for continuity.

Suzanne Falzone, 1723 Cottonwood Street, Woodland, asked the Council/Commission to consider the quantity of tax revenue with increased development as well as the quality of life for future residents. She asked them to consider very carefully a cost effective use of shared land and shared facilities in one of the alternatives. She said the City has the opportunity to maximize the use of shared facilities with other agencies whether they include soccer fields, ball fields, libraries, technology infrastructure, or child care. She said they have the capability to be clustered together in a very shared and effective way and made available to the residents of this future community.

Ed Borchard said he supports Alternative 2. With Alternative 1 there is a traffic problem; the City will have to assume all of the new traffic which will be diverted back up West Street, Cottonwood Street and College Street. He said Alternative 2 is the lesser of two evils in terms of taking out prime farm ground. He said he would like an ag study being done of the remaining area.

Eric Paulsen said he prefers Alternative 3 which is not being proposed; he said he wished there were stronger consideration being given for the land east of County Road 102. He said there are some inherent problems there and wishes it could be studied further to know whether or not these problems could be solved for the future. He said he felt there is potential for doing business with PG & E for water rights reasons.

Bev McWhirk, 624 Wildwood Way, Woodland, said she agreed with the comments of Suzanne Falzone with respect to share facilities. She said she supports Alternative 2 because it requires a large tract of land to make those things happen. She said the City needs to have the right sized block of land. Additionally, she said consideration needs to be given to Alternative 2 because County Road 25A is the southern boundary, and ultimately 20 years from now consideration should be given to a beltway around Woodland. When working on the Downtown Specific Plan there was much discussion of how to get the traffic off Main Street and make the Downtown pedestrian friendly. She said she would like to preserve the small town quality of Woodland, and one issue to plan for is traffic.

Andy Efstratis discussed the density issue. He said whether the growth goes south or southeast there should be consideration of the 65/35 or 85/15 ratio of multifamily residential and single family residential housing. The City needs to consider that. When the City zones property for multifamily, the City creates an infrastructure situation where the City has to plan for it and build it and create a surcharge on single family residential. If the City plans for a very large multifamily area, the City is adding onto the cost of homes. He said rents for single family residential are actually moving down.

Don Reed, former President of Larchmont Homes, said he has been in the housing industry for over 20 years, primarily single family housing. He said the Plan the City is addressing is important because it sets the expectations from the community and also is required by law to achieve certain housing types. A concern addressed is that when the Plan is being developed which calls for a high percentage of multifamily versus single family the City has to deal with the infrastructure that becomes a charge not only for housing but a charge for other kinds of development that will occur for the Plan area.

Dr. Jim North said Woodland has a small town feeling and is family oriented. He said he has read the General Plan documents, and they are very good. He said he took an informal poll of residents which resulted in support for a no growth policy. He said he supported Alternative 2. He said coming from Iowa and experiencing flooding he did not feel it would be wise to build in the Conaway Ranch area.

Mike Beeman said he is affected by both Alternatives. If the Council does adopt Alternative 1, it becomes natural that Road 25 may become a southern boundary. If that occurs he wanted to go on record that it should go on land that is presently annexed and not be bestowed on land owners to the south. He said Dorothy Scott, another land owner, is also opposed to this becoming a major thoroughfare. Secondly, he said he farms on land throughout the Conaway area, and if the City takes Conaway's surface water and uses the wells that they drill, this affects his property. The wells are going to remain higher around Woodland.

Chuck Townsend, Woodland resident, said he supports Alternative 1. He said when the Planning Commission first discussed the alternatives, they decided to do away with phasing, but he said when he looks at Alternative 2 he sees Alternative 4. He said

when the Planning Commission brought forth the idea of Alternative 1, the attempt was to broaden the aspects of the land and to provide a competition for projects so that projects could be brought to the Planning Commission and the City Council to benefit the community. He said he supports Alternative 1 because it addresses the problem of traffic on Gibson Road.

Tom Stoffregen, Chair of the Parks and Recreation Commission, said the Commission at its meeting last night discussed the small allocations for park land which are not sufficient for the needs of our citizens. The growth is limited in a box in this manner. Development is forced to become the vision for quality of life and quality of parks. He said the Commission hoped that land would be available in acreage in predevelopment phases so that all of the City funds are not spent on post development land requiring the City to spend \$100,000+ per acre. He said the Commission is not supporting a particular alternative but supports the acquisition of additional park land and school land.

Pat Monley, 650 Elm Street, Woodland, said he is a small builder in the County. He said he has built about 30 homes in the County and one has been built in Woodland. He said it is much easier to sell homes in Davis; Davis has outstanding schools, diversity in housing, and excellent recreational facilities. He said he prefers living in Woodland because of the heritage, and he said he supports Alternative 1 because it shows continuity.

Kathy Trott said she was speaking on behalf of her husband Ken Trott as well, and they support Alternative 2. She read a letter on their position. She said they supported preserving prime ag land and continuing enhancement of the Downtown. They supported policies favoring infill development over outward growth and higher residential and commercial densities.

Julie Farnham said she supports Alternative 2 and quality of life in Woodland.

Dudley Holman said he is glad that his comments regarding water have started dialogue regarding the issue. He said it is a false assumption that our ground water will always be here and that it will always be sufficient. He encouraged the investigation of alternatives.

Mayor Sandy said the City has received letters from some bona fide water experts who point out that Woodland's water is in fine shape, and that Woodland's best hope is to look to Cache Creek and not to the east for its water supply. Some of those experts have asked to appear before the Council in the coming month to set the record straight.

Rodney Hersom II, resident on College Street, spoke about his "stump theory." He said just as stumps have new growth around even though the center is dead, the City needs to keep the heart of the City from dying. He also encouraged residents to shop in Woodland rather than going elsewhere.

Deborah Kunesh thanked the Council and Commission for its time devoted to the General Plan. She said there are four key principles to the General Plan: (1) orderly development to achieve an orderly pattern of community development consistent with economic social and environmental needs; (2) economic health for a diverse economic base with a range of employment opportunities for all residents; (3) adequate housing with a variety of sizes and types; and (4) continuance of intergovernmental coordination. She encouraged the Council and Commission to continue with its time line for the General Plan.

There were no further public comments offered.

Council Member Slaven addressed the issue of the fiscal analysis regarding Table IV capital costs. He said there is a problem of getting adequate sports fields in our community. He said the estimated land cost per acre is \$100,000. Estimated development costs are \$115,000 per acre. The new neighborhood parks and sports fields are estimated at 243.2 acres which equates to land costs alone of \$24,000,000. He said the City needs to develop an adequate fund for acquiring the land.

Council Member Flory said we need to develop some way of getting the land at a less costly tab, but with new development we always have to remember that whatever we do with parks and amenities the homeowners are going to pick up the tab and some of the commercial. The landowners inevitably pass on the price of the home to the homeowner. He said he favored the idea of offering some of the Community Park land now with someone who is interested in developing for some land the City can get even closer to the City that is less expensive. The City can utilize that land immediately because with the problems at the Community Park it will take millions of dollars to develop there. The City could start stockpiling some land now and come up with a method of developers paying in advance so the City can buy land somewhere else in the City now instead of five or six years from now when the land is more expensive.

Vice Mayor Rominger said the City currently has property which has been designated for ball fields, etc., and the City has not developed them. She said the point is the City can put this in the Plan and make plans to develop the facilities, but she asked if we are actually going to do it. She said the Council has been talking about the Regional Park for six years, and the Council has not done anything with it even though the City has had offers from various groups to help out in the development of the facilities. Storz Pond is there, and the response she received from Parks, Recreation and Community Services Director Tim Barry regarding the timing of the development is the concern about the drainage and the maintenance of the facility. She said the drainage problem could be solved by just filling it up with some soil, but the construction and maintenance would have to be addressed.

The Community Development Director said the issue of funding for long term facilities as defined in the General Plan when you get into issues of land costs and development costs these are issues that are raised with the development fee study and

are based on the issues of development fee payment which is done at the time of new development. If you are talking about prepayment of fees for future development, you are going to need to have the City Attorney look at how the City can do that. She said the City of Sacramento just did something with the commercial and industrial developers to pay for infrastructure, and they formed a district and issued bonds to go in and prepay for the improvements to avoid payment of development fees only at time of construction and pay over a longer period of time. She said the Council would have to look at alternative funding methods to do that because the current funding method is setup based on development fees being paid at the time of building permit issuance. That money is collected, and then we negotiate for the acquisition of the land. She said we pay that price, and that land is paid for by all of the new development in that area. If the City were to look at land banking, the City would have to find a source of funding for that and then use development fees to pay those costs to keep development fees lower because the land costs would be lower. She said we still need to address maintenance. The City of Davis has a landscaping and lighting district throughout their City, and she said Davis pays for their park maintenance through the district. In the new areas of the City of Woodland fees are required to pay for park maintenance.

Council Member Slaven said a stronger statement needs to be included in the Plan regarding park facilities.

Vice Mayor Rominger said she has some extensive comments regarding the General Plan Policy document, and she will type the comments and give them to the Council and Planning Commission.

Mayor Sandy said Judy Cahill of McDonough, Holland & Allen was present at the meeting. He said the City retained her because of Conaway Conservancy; the City had to hire a separate legal counsel to represent the City.

The Community Development Director addressed the multifamily issue. She said the Council asked staff to research what other cities have done for multifamily requirements. She said Sacramento Area Council of Governments surveyed three cities with respect to multifamily requirements and low and very low income units: Vacaville, Roseville, and Yuba City. She said none of these cities have a multifamily requirement, but Davis, Winters and Woodland do. Davis is 40 percent; Winters is 25 percent; and Woodland is at 35 percent. In terms of very low and low income allocations the City of Woodland has the very lowest percentage for very low and low income. When the City received its allocation, the City protested and it was determined that 40 percent of the new units to be built should be in the very low to low income category. She also gave the Council information about the last ten years of low income residential construction. She noted that \$18,500 annual income is considered very low income for a family of four people; low income is \$19,000 to \$30,000; moderate income is \$30,000 to \$40,000; and above moderate is \$40,000. She said there has been discussion about amending the Housing Element, and staff did not propose that. She said any amendment to the Housing Element requires the City to go back to HCD to review the element, and it takes approximately 45 days for the review. She said staff cannot guarantee HCD will certify

the Housing Element if the City removes the multifamily housing requirement. State law requires that HCD once the City submits an amendment to the Housing Element needs 45 days to review the element, and HCD has 90 days if a new Housing Element is sent in for readoption.

Mayor Sandy said if the Commission and Council decided they wanted to change the housing percentages, they could possibly put a finding in the General Plan which stipulates that. For example, he said they could set a goal in the Plan.

The Community Development Director said her initial reaction to that suggestion is whether the City would have internal consistency between the Housing Element of the Policy which talks about 65/35 and a General Plan Policy which is somewhere in the land use element which says something else.

Assistant City Attorney Ann Siprelle said one concern she has is to make that type of change in this General Plan update the Council would first have to consider that in the environmental document, and it would be a change to the Housing Element. There is a legal requirement that the General Plan be consistent internally. The appropriate changes would have to be made in the Circulation Element and the Land Use Element and consider all in one EIR. She said this could be done but it would take a significantly longer time.

The Community Development Director said as the City embarks upon the next specific plan the City can look again at the housing diversity issue as a part of that plan. She said the Council/Commission may find as in the Southeast Area that the allocation was 72/28 percent because of the way the land was planned. She said amendments could be made to the Housing Element at that time.

Planning Commissioner Tony Fernandez suggested that the Planning Commission could hold a mini housing summit or workshop and take a snapshot picture of what is happening in the Southeast Area. Developers could be invited to participate to get a better feel of what is happening, and then the Planning Commission could come back to the Council with a recommendation. He said he prefers keeping this General Plan process on track and not deviating from where we are going. He said the Commission/Council could settle the issue after it finishes the General Plan.

Mayor Sandy said he agrees with Commissioner Fernandez, and the Council would need a recommendation from the Planning Commission. Council Member Slaven said he agreed.

Mayor Sandy said the Community Development Director prepared some tables giving history on growth rates. In the 1970's there was a healthy growth rate of 3.7 percent, and in the 80's there was a growth rate of 2.8 percent. So far for the 90's the rate has been 1.9 percent. He asked if the Council/Commission was interested in a mechanism for dealing with an increased growth rate. He said he felt strongly that there

should be.

Commissioners Hicks and Moore also agreed there should be a mechanism.

Council Member Flory said they need to discuss the ultimate goals and agreed if there are some controls that could be placed the community will benefit.

Commissioner Fernandez said he was leery of setting growth caps and felt the market forces play a role.

Vice Mayor Rominger said she has been advocating all along that 2 percent is too high for a growth rate and 64,000 is too many people. She said she does not see a need to grow any faster than the Statewide average which is 1.7 percent. She said 1.5 percent is more in line with something she could support. She said it makes a difference how much acreage is required.

Commissioner Sieberth said he could also support a 1.5 percent growth rate. Commissioner Agostini said she too would support a more conservative growth rate. Commissioner Hicks said quality growth and being flexible are more important than getting hung up on the numbers. Commissioner Schwartz said he felt we need to build in some form of a cap to protect ourselves; he said we could easily get caught up in a major shift in population and have it turn around, go the other way and be left holding the bag.

Mayor Sandy said the degree to which the City limits or manages the population has a dramatic impact on the City's ability to finance some of the improvements discussed earlier. His concern is that the City should not constrain population and constrain land use to such an extent that developers are severely restricted because there is insufficient land and insufficient numbers to do anything else. He said we should set a reasonable population and at some point economics has to play a role.

Commissioner Friedlander said he supports a population less than 60,000, somewhere around 58,000, but he said the Council/ Commission has to put some energy into how it would implement the General Plan policy.

Assistant City Attorney said if the Council agreed to slow down the growth, you would think the adverse impacts would also slow down, the revenue the City gets from development fees, etc. If the Council decides to do this, the consultants would need to go back and look at what the impacts would be in each area and see if the EIR was still sufficient. If the EIR needs to be changed significantly, it will have to be recirculated.

The Community Development Director said staff would ask the consultant to determine if a new fiscal analysis would have to be prepared. She said much depends on what the Council tells staff. She said if the Council wants the growth rate to go from 2 percent to 1 percent, that may be viewed as significant.

Mayor Sandy said the Council/Commission can ask the question and wait for the answer.

The Community Development Director said a lot depends on what the Council/Commission is looking at. She said the Council/ Commission has discussed looking a reduction of land area, reduction in growth, and issues of putting into place growth management tools but keeping the same population. Some just want to lower the rate, and some want to lower the rate but keep the same amount of land area in the Plan because they want the flexibility. She said the third thing she heard is not touching the figure but looking at how we can put in place some method to manage the growth so that it becomes an ultimate cap that we do not bypass. She said those are all things that would affect the EIR very differently.

Mayor Sandy said staff could ask the fiscal consultant and the EIR consultant what lowering the population might be. He said maybe they could look at 58,000 and 60,000 and bring the answer back at the next meeting.

Mayor Sandy said the final issue is that a number of letters were received regarding water.

The Community Development Director said staff will put together a packet of the letters. She said some are not significant from a policy standpoint, but she will ask for direction from Council/Commission at the November 28 joint meeting.

Mayor Sandy said requests to speak to the Council were received from Erik Vink of the American Farmland Trust which recently a completed a fairly widespread study of consumption of farmland in California and from Jim Eagan, Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, regarding water issues. He said those presentations could be made on November 28.

The Community Development Director said we have not had the water consultant, storm drainage consultant or sewage consultant, and she said they could be present at the November 28 meeting. Mayor Sandy suggested also that the fiscal consultant be present at the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

At 9:48 p.m. the meeting was adjourned.