MEETING OF THE CITY OF RIDGECREST INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE
1ST FLOOR CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM AREA B
Thursday September 17, 2015 at 5:00 pm

Committee Members: Chair Mike Mower, Vice Chair Matt Baudhuin
Vice Mayor James Sanders Planning Commissions Warren Cox
Staff: Dennis Speer, Loren Culp
Recording Secretary: Karen Harker

Agenda
Meeting – 5:00 p.m.

This meeting room is wheelchair accessible. Accommodations and access to City meetings for people with other handicaps may be requested of the City Clerk (499-5002) five working days in advance of the meeting.

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Approval of Minutes August 20, 2015

PUBLIC COMMENT OF ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

DISCUSSION AND OTHER ACTION ITEMS

- Discuss Traffic Impact at the New Murray Middle School
- Follow- up SCE
- See Design Plans for Downs Street Widening Project
- Drop in water usage for the City

COMMITTEE COMMENTS

SUPPORT STAFF COMMENTS

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

NEXT MEETING:
- **October 15, 2015**

ADJOURNMENT:

MEETING OF THE CITY OF RIDGECREST INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE
1ST FLOOR CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM AREA B
Thursday August 20, 2015 at 5:00 pm

Committee Members: Chair Mike Mower, Vice Chair Matt Baudhuin
Vice Mayor James Sanders Planning Commissions Warren Cox
Staff: Dennis Speer, Loren Culp
Recording Secretary: Karen Harker

Draft Minutes
Meeting – 5:00 p.m.

This meeting room is wheelchair accessible. Accommodations and access toCity meetings for people with other handicaps may be requested of the City Clerk (499-5002) five working days in advance of the meeting.

CALL TO ORDER: Meeting was called to order at 5:04

ROLL CALL: Roll Call was called by Tom Wiknich
Chair Mike Mower, Vice Chair Matt Baudhuin, Planning Commissioner, Warren Cox
Absent: Mayor Pro Tem James Sanders
Staff: Dennis Speer, Public Works Director; Loren Culp, City Engineer
Recording Secretary: Karen Harker

APPROVAL OF AGENDA *Motion To Approve the Agenda Was Made By Commission Mr. Cox, Seconded by Mr. Baudhuin. Motion Carried By Voice Vote of 3 Ayes (Baudhuin, Mower, Cox) 0 Nays, 1 Absent (Sanders), 0 Abstain*

APPROVAL OF MINUTES *Motion To Approve the Minutes of April 16, 2015 was Made By Baudhuin, seconded by Planning Commissioner Cox. Motion Carried By Voice Vote of 3 Ayes (Mower, Baudhuin, Cox) 0 Nays, 1 Absent (Sanders) 0 Abstain*

PUBLIC COMMENT OF ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Public Comment Open at 5:08 pm

Mr. Wiknich has seen advertising about motion sensitive lights that go one and off depending on what is happening in a neighborhood. Has the City seen anything about this program and is it something that is viable. This is a motion dimmer for neighborhood. Chairman Mower indicated that the only program that the City has seen is replacing LED's with no reduction in cost to the city. I would rather see LEDs being replaced in the streetlights and working towards getting a reduction in cost.

Public Comment Closed At 5:12 pm

DISCUSSION AND OTHER ACTION ITEMS

- **Left Turn Yield (At Possible Intersection)**

Dennis Speer gave a background about the flashing yellow left turn arrows. California was the only state that did not accept the National version of the flashing yellow arrows.

Findings flashing yellow arrows over circular greens by the drivers 1) cause drivers to move through the intersection 2) permissive for flashing yellow arrows 3) also if you are in an older population they are used to circular green. Studies have shown that a protected steady green arrow you are less likely to have accidents.

Dennis Speer explained in his handouts the different types of typical position and arrangements of shared signal faces for permissive for left turn lanes. There are four different types of arrangements permissive only, separate signal faces with flashing yellow arrow for permissive only mode, shared signal faces for protected only mode left turns and separate signal faces for protected only mode left turns. Dennis explained a fifth one that is a protected at the end of the cycle and this is a phasing process. He doesn't believe that Caltrans is even doing it.

Dennis gave the definition from the MUTCD for California and why you would go from the protected to a permissive. You also need to make sure that there is consistency within a city.

Mr. Speer's recommendation is not to change any lighting signals.

- **Update on the Sewer Plant**

Mr. Speer gave a brief background of the wastewater treatment facility of 2005 and BRAC and how it needed to be brought up to code and the 75% of capacity if the population was to rise. In 2010 solicited a Request for Proposal for a City Advisor and the Consultant still used numbers from the BRAC. They in turned moved forward and made a presentation to the former City Council with numbers that the City would see an increase in popular, and the new plant would be started in the year 2015. They looked at two sites: the one on base and the old site (out by the hay fields).

The Consultant was tasked in the beginning by the former City Council for a plant at the base and moving forward with designing a secondary treatment facility. Our consultant has been moving forward in that direction. The base has been moving forward with two issues 1) bonds have the issue that you own the land and language was created by the Navy that was put by our bond counsel and accepted then came along 2) The IRS rule is any Federal Agency utilizing more than 10% we would not be able to use a tax exempt bond. There are several issues that could be available when using 46 million dollars for tax exempt vs taxable bonds. The question becomes what do we do for funding? The current City Council and prior City Council had thoughts about a tertiary plant. Recently the Public Works Department asked the question do we need to re-scope for a design build contract. We don't have that urgency anymore because we don't have the BRAC situation and the issues have changed. The Department decided to bifurcate the study. Mr. Speer contacted the consultant and asked that they not only look at the old facility located out near the alfalfa fields but also the NAWS site. The Consultant has been

given direction from Mr. Speer to have ready a 30 percent complete design for both sites for both secondary and tertiary plants; the consultant will be able to give raw numbers; and they also have the 3rd modification that has been presented in the past. This would be a natural flow of the top third of the City going to NAWS. Anything else would go to the new facility and be funded with the bonds. These options will be coming back to City Council in October. The State revolving fund participates in 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 (state funds, city funds, bonds).

With a drop in water conservation in the last several years the Wastewater Treatment Facility has seen a drop in the amount of flow going through the system.

There was discussion about taking the end use from a tertiary plant and having the IWVWD take it over and let them use the water for article 22 or potable water. They have more funds then the City does and might be able to cover the costs.

Loren Culp wanted to let the committee know that he attended the IWVWD water Co-OP meeting today and it was stated that the basin was in a critical status level and this state of status this could help with funding with a tertiary plant.

- **Grey Water Usage – Loren Culp**

Loren Culp spoke to the two ordinances that were given in the agenda packet. One was to a voluntary installation of a greywater system and the other is to a mandatory installation of a greywater system. He spoke about the ordinances themselves and how they were structures. Mr. Culp explained that the "whereas" is the background and findings of the ordinance and that the "therefores" gives the conclusions and will be more specific and site the municipal code.

The first ordinance speaks to the voluntary installation of a greywater system for existing residential, commercial and institutional. These systems can be bought right now at the local Home Depot. No permit is required currently by Chapter 16 in our municipal code UPC for "clothes washer system". Permits are required for a "simple", "complex" and "treated greywater systems". The "clothes washer system" and will need to go to a leach field.

The second ordinance from Section 12-9.3e is a mandatory installation of a greywater system for new construction of residential structures. The mandatory installation would call for the plumbing to be stubbed out for the future development of the "clothes washer system" and a stub out for a future "simple" and/or "complex system". This would be forcing the builder to installing the stub outs.

Both of these systems require a valve so that you can either use the greywater system or the sewer system. This greywater system must be subsurface and must have at least a 2 inch cover and would be more of a leach field. This would water more of a bed of flower or shrubs. You cannot use this on root vegetables or bubblers. If you are bring it to a bubbler it must be treated. This is an honor system.

The only recourse that the City would have is there is any greywater going into some else's yard would to use Code Enforcement Officer investigate the complaint and issue a citation.

The AD-Hoc committee wanted to know how much more it would add to the cost to the developer. Several Infrastructure Committee Members were not in flavor of this

stub out to the developer due to the cost and that the fees from the state and county were already increasing the fees to the builders. Mr. Allred thought that Kern County Environmental would have to come over to approve these system. This would add more expense to the developer and this would needed to be added into the fee.

Mr. Culp indicated that right now he was gathering information for the AD-Hoc Water Committee to report to them in September regarding the costs for the mandatory system. He let the Committee know the AD-Hoc Water Committee was looking at all the aspects to these ordinances and the effects they would have on the community, its citizens, and the developers.

There was also a concern about the fact if there were a large population of our community using the grey water system would there be enough water in the lines to flush them adequately to get the solids to the plant. It was decided that we were looking at two different variables. If you were doing a tertiary system you would want the grey water to get the end effluent to be able to sell but if we were to have a secondary then maybe it would be best to have and use a grey water system.

Mr. Culp would keep the Committee informed as to the outcome from the AD-Hoc Water Committee.

- **Update on Downs Street Project**

Mr. Culp stated that the plans and specifications were completed at one hundred percent (100%). We have the offer of dedications that need to go to City Council and there is one piece of property Gary Parsons is negotiating with the owner. Options: **1)** If we had all the money to underground the transmission and distribution poles it would take 3 years to move the poles and build the road. Karen Harker indicated that in the transcribed notes of April 16, 2016, it was the first time that she had ever heard that SCE would underground transmission poles. Dennis Speer confirmed this. For years they have heard they would not be able to underground transmission poles and only distribution lines. The funding would come from Rule 20A Funds which the City of Ridgecrest has 3 to 4 Million and that Mr. McQuiston had made arrangements to give us the rest to complete the project. The total project cost for moving the poles was estimated at 6 million. **2)** Do the project in phases. First do the two southbound lanes and the medians and then do the one north bound lane once the poles have been relocated. **3)** Mr. Culp wants to tell Southern California Edison (SCE) to move the pole along the West side of the Downs Street from Ridgecrest Boulevard to Upjohn Avenue. These poles are in the City's right of way and they should be moving them without us having to use the Rule 20A Funds. This would mean that we would not have an underground district but the poles would be moved to accommodate the roadway with curb, gutter and sidewalk.

Mr. Culp explained that when we get ready to do a construction project on a roadway, the Engineering Department sends out notices to all utility companies to move any utilities that might be in conflict with the project. When this notice goes out, this would put SCE on notice they would have to move the poles.

There was a motion made:

Motion: Mr. Cox made a motion that Southern California Edison (SCE) be notified by utility notices to move the transmission and distribution poles on South Downs Avenue from West Ridgecrest Boulevard to Upjohn Avenue on the west side into their own easement. Motion was seconded by Mr. Baudhuin. Motion Carried By Voice Vote of 3 Ayes (Mower, Baudhuin, Cox) 0 Nays, 1 Absent (Sanders) 0 Abstain

COMMITTEE COMMENTS

SUPPORT STAFF COMMENTS

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Follow- up SCE
See Design Plans for Downs Street Widening Project
Drop in water usage for the City

NEXT MEETING:

- **September 17, 2015**

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting was adjourned at 6:55.