



JOINT ANTELOPE VALLEY AUTHORITY

**Board Meeting
March 13, 2003**

Meeting Began at: 10:04 a.m.
Meeting Ended at: 11:17 a.m.

Members Present: Allan Abbott, Christine Jackson, Paul Zillig

Others Present: Roger Figard, Amy Cornelius, Randy Stramel, Joel Pedersen, Margaret Remmenga, Kent Seacrest, Mike Morosin, Wayne Teten, Bruce Sweney, Wynn Hjernstad, Duncan Ross, Rich McDermott, Ron Ring, Glen Cekal, Jim Christo, Ed Patterson, Harlon Layton, Erin Royal, Barbara Layaman, Steve and Paula Bowder

Order No. 01-03 - Call Meeting to Order

Christine Jackson called the JAVA Board meeting to order at 10:04 a.m.

Order No. 02-03 - Minutes of Previous Meeting

Abbott moved to approve the minutes of the February 13, 2003 Board meeting.

Zillig seconded.

AYE: Zillig, Jackson, Abbott

NAY

Order No. 03-03 - Amendment to the DAS Improvement Agreement

(attachment)

Wayne Teten explained the changes to the DAS agreement. There are three changes:

1. Trail north of Military Road to be moved back to the east side of 14th Street with sidewalk right-of-way on the west side and will not have an impact on parking.
2. There will be a left-in (only) median break on 14th Street due to the location of the Transportation Service building at the University to accommodate buses etc.
3. The aesthetics of the bridges will not use limestone as previously stated.

Abbott clarified that both the neighborhoods and the State Fair Board are coordinating with respect to the trail. Teten indicated that the Northbottoms Neighborhood has been met with, however the State Fair Board has yet to approve this but Teten does not anticipate any problems. It is on the agenda for the State Fair Board on March 14, 2003.

Pedersen handed out copies of the DAS agreement and went over the changes.

Zillig moved for approval of the amendment. Abbott seconded.

AYE: Zillig, Jackson, Abbott

NAY

Order No. 04-03 - Approval of the House Preservation and Infill Program

Kent Seacrest from the Antelope Valley Design Team presented the board with a draft document that discussed the House Preservation and Infill Program. The goal was to work with the citizens within the project area to come forward with a plan. The JAVA partners promised to work with the groups in every way possible.

Moving and rehabilitating residential structures is not economically viable because a

house must meet existing code in order to qualify for occupancy. It was estimated that it would cost approximately \$60,000 just to rehabilitate the house in addition to the moving costs. There is a gap financially between these costs and the market value of the house.

The plan does not suggest relocation of specific houses or of specific lots available. The main purpose of the plan is to illustrate criteria guidelines and estimated costs. There are 45 structures that are identified in the Environmental Impact Statement. A windshield survey was done on these structures however the homes were not entered into. This allowed an estimated cost to be achieved as well as criteria for which houses would qualify for relocation and the criteria for which kinds of lots houses would need to be relocated into. Money has been identified for budgeting to move an estimated 8 dwellings units; 4 historical homes listed in the EIS and 4 unidentified homes. It is estimated that it will take approximately \$165,000 per dwelling to rehabilitate and relocate the 4 non-historical units.

Abbott asked for clarification if this was money that was really budgeted or is it an estimate of costs so that budgets can be prepared? Seacrest responded that it is not official or formally approved, but just an estimate in the tentative budget.

Jackson asked about what the review process was for this program. Seacrest indicated that this program was mailed out last week to the JAVA Board, the Citizen's Committee, to affected presidents of the neighborhood associations and to the affected property owners in the project area. The process is open to dialog with all these groups.

Stramel stated that presentation to the Citizen's Committee on March 11, 2003 on the program went well. He appreciated the difficulty of the process, but thought there were no issues with it. The expense was a concern, but the reasons are fair, real and legitimate.

Morosin thought there are flaws in the program. First, he thought how the residents who will be displaced will be dealt with needs to be addressed in the plan. Second, JAVA owns land in the area, this needs to be looked at, giving those who live in the area and are interested first choice in those lots. Last, he suggested that the partners approach the residents to see if these residents wish to move their house.

Steve Bowder, resident in the project area had some concerns regarding the property at 1907 L Street, which is the legal description for 3 houses. The plan indicates just one house is to be moved and his question was in regards to the other two homes. He also wanted to know where the money is coming from. He would like to see identified, the lots that are available for relocation. Bowder asked about how to become a member of the Citizen's Committee?

Ed Patterson showed a map that is a proof of concept of one way that the relocation of homes could occur.

Glen Ceval spoke of concerns regarding the project and house relocation. He wants to ensure that all factors are being considered and taken into account when it comes to the relocation of homes.

Jackson asked Seacrest to respond to some of the citizen's concerns. Seacrest talked about the interim costs and stated that under the State Relocation laws, we must provide for decent, safe and sanitary replacement housing. There are funds that have been budgeted for this. With regards to the plan not showing potential lots available for relocation, this is a correct observation. There are several reasons for this. First, a dialog with the community needs to take place. Second, is the flood plain question. Some of the property that is available is in the flood plain and we cannot place a house back into the flood plain. Third, there is the timing issue. Once the flood plain is reduced and the creek

is addressed, then the lots available for relocation can be looked at. For the properties at 1907 L street, the EIS has only identified the corner house on this lot, not all three homes. The other three historical homes identified in the EIS are the Triplets on north 22nd Street. Seacrest recommends that the plan needs to be changed to reflect this. Finally, on page 13 of the draft plan, the Economic Viability Ratio is flipped and needs to be corrected. What was meant is the cost to move, acquire the existing home, build the foundation, buy the new lot and rehabilitation is higher than the final finished market value of the home.

Abbott asked for clarification on the 1907 L Street lot. It is the intention that JAVA will purchase only the one house not all three homes and the lot which they currently sit on. Further mitigation can take place if the parties wish.

Zillig inquired about the time line of the plan given that there are still questions that need to be answered? Seacrest indicated that there are two processes: first, the Board is encouraged to move forward with the plan and approve it as a commitment that we are serious. Second, the RTKL Study will be finished this summer which will help identify lots and dialog with the neighbors can start to take place.

Abbott wanted clarification about the wording of “program” and asked what exactly is the Board being asked to approve? Pedersen responded that “program” was decided on, mostly due to when applicants inquired, we could indicate that these are the guidelines and the commitment that was in the EIS. This is a City program and Urban Development is administering it. The program is subject to availability of funding. Pedersen indicated that JAVA’s role is to approve the program, recognizing the commitment for the Housing Preservation and Infill and have Urban Development administer the program, subject to lawful appropriation.

Bowder wanted the Board to know that the properties at 1907 L Street are rental properties and there may be issues with regards to the lease agreements that have been signed.

Abbott asked that as soon as possible, the rules/guidelines for moving be distributed.

Abbott moved to approve the criteria that was presented for the House Preservation and Infill Program with the understanding that it shows JAVA’s commitment to this program and that it will follow the budget process. Jackson added that Urban Development will administer the program. Zillig seconded.

AYE: Zillig, Jackson, Abbott

NAY

Order No. 05-03 - Update on RTKL Study

Hjermstad presented an update on the RTKL Study. The study’s goal was to look at community revitalization the for Antelope Valley Project. RTKL has been here three times working with those involved in the project to look at redevelopment issues. RTKL has prepared three concepts for redevelopment. They were asked to give us “out-of-the-box - wow”, which they did. As a result, the process has been delayed slightly. The hope is to be back to the three mayor’s committees in early April.

Abbott wanted clarification that RTKL’s proposals were only the revitalization portion and did not have an impact on the channel. Hjermstad concurred and indicated that these are only concepts, the channel is set and cannot be moved.

Order No. 06-03 - Staff Reports

Teten updated the Board on several items. A draft of the Citizen’s Committee Mission Statement was sent out to the Board several days ago Luanne Finke has given up her

position on the Citizen's Committee. We will be following public notice process to seek her replacement.

NE park is on schedule. The contractor is ahead of schedule on the west side of Devaney.

Order No. 07-03 - Citizen's Committee Reports

Stramel wanted to reinforce Hjermsstad's comments regarding the RTKL Study, that these are only concepts. He wanted to thank everyone with regards to the decision of the N 14th Street bike trail situation. Everyone's cooperation and coordination was very appreciated.

Order No. 08-03 - Non-agenda Items

Morosin brought up maintenance needs for the properties that Antelope Valley owns currently. He would like to identify someone to keep the lots clean from trash, weeds and snow.