

**CITY OF RIDGEFIELD, WASHINGTON  
CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

**DATE** September 10, 2009

**ATTENDANCE** [6:30:12 PM](#)

**PRESENT:** Mayor Ron Onslow; Council member Matt Swindell, Lee Wells and Darren Wertz.

**ABSENT:** Council member David Taylor.

**STAFF:** Finance Division Director Gaylynn Brien; City Manager Justin Clary; Director of Finance & Administration/City Clerk Kay Kammer; City Attorney Chris Sundstrom; Public Works Director Steve Wall.

**MOTION:** Council member Matt Swindell moved to excuse Council member David Taylor

**SECOND:** Council member Darren Wertz.

[6:31:18 PM](#)

**Vote:** 3-0

**Yes:** Mayor Ron Onslow; Council member Matt Swindell, and Darren Wertz

**No:** None

**Abstained:** None

**Absent:** Council member David Taylor and Lee Wells

Motion unanimously passed.

**CALL TO ORDER**

**PLEDGE OF ALLIEGANCE**

Mr. Wells arrived

**LATE CHANGES TO THE AGENDA**

1. Add under Business Item No. 2: Discussion - Appointment of a Citizen to the Stakeholders Advisory Committee for the Shoreline Master Program
2. Add under Business Item No. 3: Discussion – Development Code

**MAYOR/COUNCIL REPORTS**

Council:

Mr. Swindell Attended council briefing session. Council assignment is the Ridgefield School Board meetings and reported that the School Board has opted to move forward with Option C which is the \$39,000,000 bond

Mr. Wertz Attended council briefing

Mayor:

Mayor Onslow Attended council briefing, the North County Leadership Group meeting, a meeting of the Fire District regarding their survey on the purchase of a Fire Boat, a meeting with Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)

regarding funding of the Interchange Project and also met with Mr. Wall about the Gee Creek Trail and have been invited by the Port to visit the Waterfront Study Program

Council:

Mr. Wells                      Attended council briefing, the Port meeting, and the WSDOT meeting

- a. Appointment of Two Councilmembers to Participate in Facilitated Discussion of the North County Leadership Group Future

Mayor Onslow announced that he has been attending on a regular basis the meetings and Council member Swindell has attended approximately 50% of the meetings. Mayor Onslow suggested that the council appoint them as the representatives

MOTION: Council member Lee Wells moved to appointment Mayor Onslow and Council member Swindell to the North County Leadership facilitated discussion of its future

SECOND: Council member Darren Wertz.

[6:49:54 PM](#)

<u>Vote</u> :	4-0
Yes:	Mayor Ron Onslow; Council member Matt Swindell, Lee Wells and Darren Wertz
No:	None
Abstained:	None
Absent:	Council member David Taylor

Motion unanimously passed.

#### **CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS**

Tevis Laspa, non-resident  
Japanese Knotweed is all over Gee Creek watershed  
Worked with others recently to inject the plants for eradication  
Thanked the City, Steve Wall and Tad Arends for their efforts  
Good public-private partnership

Discussion with Steve Wall:  
Knotweed goes from the Pioneer Street Bridge to the refuge  
Floods continue to bring in the seeds of the plants  
Eradication is a multi-year process

Tevis Laspa, non-resident  
Bellwood Heights stormwater retention facility is causing some problems  
City needs to clean sediment chamber  
Debris screen is higher than the walls of the sediment chamber and bio swales  
Erosion is occurring  
Need to require piping and rock basins  
Without addressing these issues it will only get worse  
Need to review stormwater standards

Discussion:

Part of the problem is that staff is not able to get equipment to the area

May need a 24 inch pipe

A 0.4 Full-time employee is assigned to stormwater

#### **CONSENT AGENDA**

1. Approval of claims/payroll in the amount of \$242,647.33  
Claims: No. 12468 through 12516 in the amount of \$62,383.99 and automatic payments in the amount of \$504.00  
Payroll: No. 12460 through 12467 in the amount of \$33,750.81, direct deposit in the amount of \$93,154.00, and automatic payments in the amount of \$52,854.53
2. Approval of August 13, 2009

MOTION: Council member Matt Swindell moved to excuse Council member Wertz from the August 13, 2009 meeting

SECOND: Council member Lee Wells.

[7:09:32 PM](#)

Vote: 4-0  
Yes: Mayor Ron Onslow; Council member Matt Swindell, and Lee Wells  
No: None  
Abstained: Council member Darren Wertz  
Absent: Council member David Taylor

Motion unanimously passed.

MOTION: Council member Lee Wells moved to approve the August 13, 2009 minutes as amended

SECOND: Council member Matt Swindell.

[7:10:35 PM](#)

Vote: 3-0  
Yes: Mayor Ron Onslow; Council member Matt Swindell and Lee Wells  
No: None  
Abstained: Council member Darren Wertz  
Absent: Council member David Taylor

Motion unanimously passed.

MOTION: Council member Matt Swindell moved to approve the claims and payroll

SECOND: Council member Lee Wells.

[7:10:04 PM](#)

Vote: 4-0  
Yes: Mayor Ron Onslow; Council member Matt Swindell, Lee Wells and Darren Wertz  
No: None  
Abstained: None

Absent: Council member David Taylor

Motion unanimously passed.

## **BUSINESS**

### 1. Discussion – System Development Charge and Impact Fees

Study session conducted on the following points:

- Discussion whether to allow the payment of fees to be deferred by agreement or city wide
- Discussion of 2009 increases
- Discussion of point of vesting of fees to be calculated

#### Payment deferral

Discussion:

Deferring payment should be city wide

Will give incentives to the builders to move forward

LaCenter has the option to defer payment by entering into an agreement

Washougal is looking at options also

Mike Bomar, Building Industry Association

Thanked council for reviewing the issue

LaCenter also has a 12 month deadline for payment of fees

Helps with the loan-to-value for the builders

Sensitive to staffing resources

Joanne Boys, Community Development Director, City of Washougal

Leaning towards final inspection not final occupancy for when fees would be required to be paid

Issues with people occupying homes without a final occupancy

May want to consider adopting a resolution regarding policy rather than an ordinance

Discussion:

Difference between the final inspection and a certificate of occupancy

Ryan Zygart, Tamarack Homes

Certificate of occupancy comes after Labor & Industries, the City and all other agencies have signed off on building construction

Must present certificate of occupancy for funding

Deferral of fees is attractive for spec builders regarding loan-to-value, cash availability and saving the interest on fees already paid

Able to work with lenders better

Commend the City for looking at this issue and working with the building community

Recommend that fees be paid at transfer of title not necessarily the certificate of occupancy

Trying to defer payment until home is sold

Discussion:

Like the idea of a deadline line of 12 months for fees to be paid

Need to have multiple triggers for payment of fees

Temporary occupancy will not allow lenders to release funds

Council feels that a deferral program should move forward  
Look at this as a partnership and job creation  
Trying to help the community grow

Mark Jefferies, Pioneer Canyon  
Impact does not occur until occupancy, so fees should not be required until impact is made  
Right thing to do  
Needs ability to charge VISA for permits

Vern Veysey, non-resident  
Support impact fees and system development charges not required until occupancy occurs  
Against reduction of impact fees

### Vesting

Discussion:

Vest at time of preliminary plat approval  
Developer will have assurance of what the fees will be and will have the ability to factor them in for cost of land acquisition  
Clark County vests at preliminary approval  
Changes in Capital Facilities Plan can change fees  
Does not accurately account for impact at time that impact is made to the system  
City would not be out any funds as the fees would be higher for newer developments if older developments had been vested at a lower fee  
Credits would then need to be reflective of CFP at time of preliminary plat  
Significant amount of time can pass and requirements may change

Vern Veysey, non-resident  
Need to review extensions of preliminary plats

Mike Bomar, BIA  
Fees have stayed low  
Incentivize affordable home ownership  
Adjust fees incrementally and do not put the burden on newer developments

Discussion:

Need to research more vesting issues  
When vesting at preliminary plat, may be digging a hole and pushing the increases to future development  
Impact fees are calculated to pay for the 20 year list of projects  
Need to look at preliminary plat timeline, extensions and phases  
May be better to vest at final plat  
Shift risk from developer to the City  
Development community is the economic driver for any city

Ryan Zygart, Tamarack Homes  
Preliminary plat vesting would be best  
Makes a better business decision easier

Mark Jefferies, Pioneer Canyon  
Gives big business certainty

### 2009 Increases

Adopted increases in 2008 but they were delayed to become effective September 1, 2009  
All fees included difference is approximately \$6,000

#### Discussion:

Roughly \$1,000 difference on Transportation Impact Fee  
Transportation trip costs went from \$203 to \$293 per average daily trip  
Percent of nothing is nothing and if it keeps builders from building then we get nothing  
If fees are delayed may spur development  
Delayed implementation has not spurred development in 2009  
Postponing increases will transfer burden on future developers  
Past councils did not want to raise fees and we are now faced with a deficit and aging infrastructure that need to be replaced  
Projects are pushed out and not completed when necessary  
Possibility of Sewer Coalition  
Review Comprehensive Plan and Capital Facilities Plans  
Fees are charged to pay for projects over a 20 year plan  
Compare with the County and the new fees adopted

Mike Bomar, BIA

Overall fees are higher in Ridgefield  
Impact fees are being reviewed if they are an appropriate source of revenue  
Increase in fees are acerbating the problem and driving building to a screeching halt  
Material and labor costs are going down

Vern Veysey, non-resident

Different areas will differ in costs depending on what they are doing  
Look at true costs of what you are doing  
Building a community for a population of 25,000 and need to decide what do you want it to look like  
Have courage to stay the course and build the community you want  
Create jobs for residents of Ridgefield not for other areas  
We are no longer mill towns where the company ties the jobs with housing and retail  
Want a livable and sustainable community

#### Discussion:

May be cutting off our nose to spite our face  
Would be better to incentivize building in the short term  
When growth starts moving again, can raise fees  
Must raise fees to pay for infrastructure  
Need to create a retro vesting ordinance  
May vest from the next development forward  
Need to expand our sewer  
No other members of the coalition have these high fees

Mark Jefferies, Pioneer Canyon

No one is thriving now  
Will have to raise rates to pay debt service if no growth is realized  
Inappropriate time to raise fees

Discussion:

Look at cost for reviewing fees and changing plans  
Plans look at multi-year projections  
Plans look at various factors including urban growth area, growth, costs and inflation rates  
Denominators change on both costs and growth rates  
Would like to see fees stay at the 2008 rates  
Not comfortable with any projections presented  
Need to help things along and be fiscally responsible

2. Discussion – Appointment of a Citizen to the Stakeholders Advisory Committee for the Shoreline Master Program

To ensure public process, there will be an advisory committee formed  
One citizen from each jurisdiction to be appointed to represent the City's interest

Discussion:

Jim Maul, lives outside city limits  
Kent Landerholm, lives outside city limits

Looking for council input for people to approach to sit on committee  
Council members to call City Manager with recommendations within the next week

3. Discussion – Development Code

City has been pursuing total rewrite of development code  
Planning Commission approved proposed performance based code to be forwarded for council review  
Need to have input from a stakeholders group  
Application for a grant for funding to form a stakeholders group

Discussion:

Excited for grant for stakeholders group  
Four professional planners worked through code  
Code should not have taken almost four years to process  
Request council to move forward with adoption of code within 60 days  
Part of the process to adopting a development code needs a vetting process  
Developers and builders need to be able to have input  
Code has been available for 9 months and public input was already received  
Risk may occur with applications coming in before vetting process is complete  
Current lots are vested under current code  
Code is from Puget Sound area, builders and developers of this area need to have input on feasibility  
Need to have hearings prior to adoption

**CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS**

None

**ADJOURN**

**[9:20:11 PM](#)**

---

**Kay Kammer**  
**Director of Finance & Administration**  
**City Clerk**

---

**Ron Onslow**  
**Mayor**