

CITY OF RIDGECREST

INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

City Council Conference Room
100 W. California Avenue.
Ridgecrest, CA 93555

Tuesday April 11, 2006 at 4:00 p.m.

Agenda

Infrastructure Committee Members: Chairman Steve Morgan; Members Duke Martin,
Jim Smith, Lois Beres

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES March 8, 2006
4. COMMENTS: (PUBLIC COMMENT)
5. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
 - a. Impact Fees
 - b. Request for Septic – N. Peg St.
 - c. County dump
 - d. Corporate Yard – City Boundary
6. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Adjournment

CITY OF RIDGECREST

INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

City Council Conference Room
100 W. California Avenue.
Ridgecrest, CA 93555

Wednesday March 8, 2006 at 5:00 p.m.

Agenda

Present: Chairman Steve Morgan; Members Duke Martin, Jim Smith, Lois Beres, CM Harvey Rose, DCM Jim McRea, APW Joe Pollock, PM Mathew Alexander, and public

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
The meeting was called to order at 5:06 p.m.
2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
The agenda was approved with item 5b moved above item 5a
3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES February 8, 2006**
Approved
4. **COMMENTS: (PUBLIC COMMENT)**
Dave Mathews – Questioned the adequacy of Sanders at Drummond pavement resurfaced.

Comment made that there was a near miss because bicyclists ride in road on College Heights. Traffic congested and part of problem is that the road is deteriorated and rough with rocks. Staff to look at sweeping the road and notify police department.

Question asked if the City is considering hiring city inspectors. Response is not at this time. The County has contracted out some of their plan checks for faster turn around.

Member Martin asked for an update on projects and status of matching funds. Staff will give committee a list of projects to the committee.

5. **DISCUSSION ITEMS:**
 - e. Sewer covers (Inyokern Rd.) - APW Pollock informed the committee it will cost \$2,500 per sewer cover to raise them. There are six.
 - f. Impact Fees – Planning Manager Matthew Alexander presented an overview of the proposed impact fees and report methodology with handouts distributed. The group first discussed traffic fees and then drainage fees.

James Bell - Asked about the revision of the report dated 3/1/06. It was explained the only changes made were to the industrial and commercial fees. Also, commented that City already charge on commercial; proposal kind of shaky. Need to address whether fees are logical.

Steve Zimmer - Expressed concern with the ability of City to pass ordinance and then change fees. Member Martin commented that fees are always going to go up. Fees can and will be changed by resolution.

Dale Howard – Questioned the process for cities selected. Staff responded that we wanted to look at cities that were comparable to Ridgecrest. Called 40 cities and most didn't respond. The list is intended for comparison, not justification.

PM Alexander indicated the commercial fees seemed unreasonable and the City was able to justify reducing them because they included ITE (drive by's). The table on pages 18 &19 reflect the changes. Comments made include:

- Member Smith - Fees should be lowered, can raise them later. Don't start out high, wait to see how it's going.
- APW Pollock - Fees are a big impact, favors large developers
- DCM McRea – Group believed high, not sure it's outrageous. Presented a synopsis of the cost of street projects.
- ED Parsons – Concern with the affect fees will have on small business. Methodology okay. Support reduction
- Mike Ferguson - Would like to see something presented. Knew adjustment was needed. Small businesses have difficulty paying fees. We're selling houses to people in town.
- James Bell – Consider looking at similar system to school fees (i.e., fees per square foot). Don't like new numbers for commercial. People come to town if jobs; jobs won't come if we make it tough. Some fees more than the building is worth.
- Jerry Taylor – Commercial development can go in County to avoid fees. Will create burden and sprawl. Stay competitive; square foot good, no flat fee.
- Steve Zimmer - An efficient way is to apply rate across the board. Look at fee simple.
- Jim Kight - Fees are a deal breaker. Amount is a concern. If City needs to generate funds look at sales tax.
- Carol Vaughn - Look at the smaller homes in Ridgecrest heights. With the cost of new homes, can't build affordable houses now. It's hard to get cost down for small homes, concern with overbuilding. Watch fees if you want affordable housing. Making some profit; why are the problems being passed on to new development? Everyone should pay for past neglect.
- Mike ? - Would like fees based on per square feet. Commercial still needs to be looked at. Traffic study shows Downs widen; it's already widen. College Heights needs to be four lanes now. Keep reasonable.
- James Mower - Fees to high and will push development out to County.
- Carol Wilson - Be prudent. Recommend reevaluating on per square foot. Not selling to out of town people.
- Dave Mathews - Have lived her 40 years. Thought I was paying taxes to City, but found out states steals the money.
- Dale Howard – If this truly a scientific study and if it is accurate then charge the fees. If people coming then we need to be ready. If needed don't bow your head, do it if it'll fix Ridgecrest. Make sure the study is right.

The committee was presented an overview on the drainage impact fees. Comments made include:

- James Bell - City should make a commitment for direction of travel; does city want sumps, regional retention basins? Fees aren't the same, City needs to pick a path. Looking at numbers there are some errors, may be better to consider per square foot.
 - Mike Ferguson - Developer aren't charged because of sump. City loses money towards solving regional problem. Will fees be collected up front for drainage? CM Rose responded the City intends to collect drainage fees before building.
 - DCM McRea - Bowman corridor is viable, practical and unfunded. Some developers will pay even if they put in a sump; it depends on their project. There is potential for in lieu opportunities.
 - James Mower - Fee at Tract Map for small builder quite a fee upfront. Is fee just for Tract Map, then existing lots doesn't pay for drainage (staff commented that's a loop hole to be corrected). Fees are high.
 - James Kight - Fee is high; 5% of project. Agree drainage should be mitigated.
 - Carol Vaughn - Reviewed phases of Tract Map, would like fees collected toward the end.
 - Steve Zimmer - Drainage fee structure amounts to 50% of proposal for improving existing system. Need to be built another way. Fees out of line, these two fees are about 85% of the proposed impact fees
 - Dale Howard - Keep fees as close to building stage as possible and practical.
 - Jerry Taylor - Keep fees closest as possible to when earth is disturbed. This is just another way to tax. There should be a discount for those who keep some of their water. Eminent domain is a fair use for this type of use rather than trying to make new development agreement.
- g. Median (China Lake Blvd. - Mall area) - APW Pollock City doesn't have money, it's a city problem. Chair Morgan spoke with Caltrans representative Alan; they will allow us to pour median. It'll cost \$500K but the City should suck it up. The committee agreed to put up delineators as a temporary measure.
- h. Public Services budget - This item was not discussed.

6. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Sewer handbills – This item was not discussed

Next meeting for Infrastructure Committee will be at 4:00 p.m. on April 11th.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.