

**Los Alamos
Planning Advisory Committee (LAPAC) Meeting
Los Alamos Senior Center
690 Bell Street, Los Alamos, CA
February 27, 2010
Approved Minutes**

1. **Meeting Called to Order:** By Chair, Chris Wrather at 10:02 a.m.

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call

LAPAC Members Present: Chair Wrather, deWit, Fordyce, Mortholé, Naughton, and Thyron

LAPAC Members Absent: Jimenez

Staff Present: Vicki Parker, Deputy Director, Long Range Planning
David Lackie, Supervising Planner, Long Range Planning
Bret McNulty, Planner, Long Range Planning

Bret McNulty introduced the purpose of the meeting to attendees as the second in a series of meetings for the LAPAC to finalize the Plan Update, an effort that culminates work that began in October 2006 and saw over 36 public meetings. McNulty introduced Kevin Barnard, General Manager of the Los Alamos Community Services District (LACSD), who was attending the meeting to answer questions regarding water and wastewater services, provided by the LACSD. McNulty thanked Mr. Barnard and the LACSD for their assistance solving problems identified during preparation of the Plan Update and introduced staff.

2. **Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda:**

Nancy Wrightenberger, member of the community, thanked the LAPAC for their work on the Plan over the last four years and expressed her hope that it would not have to be done again anytime soon.

No other comments were received.

3. **LAPAC Administrative Tasks**

- a. **Minutes** - The LAPAC considered the unapproved minutes from the January 28, 2010 meeting.

Naughton made a motion to approve the minutes, seconded by Mortholé, and the motion carried by a vote of 6-0.

- b. **Report from Staff - Planning Areas**

Vicki Parker briefed the LAPAC regarding the Board of Supervisors' extension of an urgency ordinance stopping the processing of marijuana dispensaries in the unincorporated County of Santa Barbara at their February 22 meeting.

Staff has received an application for a time extension of a previously approved use permit will be heard at a Zoning Administrator hearing on March 14 in Santa Maria. The application for a mixed-use development at 490 Bell Street, they are

proposing to add five residential units to a previously approved commercial building that is consistent with the Countywide 50% allowable residential units in the C-2 zone district.

Two communications were received by staff and will be reviewed during the circulation and parking discussion.

4. Los Alamos Community Plan Update (Plan Update)

David Lackie reviewed the Plan Update timeline and project milestones, and discussed key land use policies in the Plan, including the Plan's infill focus, the new CM-LA zone district, and the two other rezone sites (Thompson, Burtness). Mr. Lackie described the environmental review phase of the project and that the project is moving into the decision-making phase. Mr. Lackie reviewed the outcome of the January 28 LAPAC meeting which would be reviewed later in the meeting.

Mr. Lackie reviewed the water and wastewater policy summary sheets (distributed with the LAPAC meeting packets and available on the materials table to meeting attendees) containing the Goals, Policies, and Action Items in the Draft Los Alamos Community Plan Update, and suggested changes identified in the Draft EIR and during the public meetings of the LAPAC.

Mr. Barnard informed the LAPAC that the LACSD was operating at 52% of its wastewater treatment capacity. Mr. Lackie described the LACSD recommendation to remove Policy WAT-LA-1.1 calling for reclaimed water use and renumbering of the subsequent policies for consistency, and described the recommended policy changes and additions. Ms. Parker noted the County is in the process of updating its landscape irrigation ordinance to include updated conservation measures. Policy and action revisions include support for future LACSD grant applications and conservation measures. Committee member deWit expressed concern about requiring the use of cisterns. Mr. Lackie clarified that the policy did not require, but allowed planners to consider their inclusion.

In response to questions from the LAPAC, Mr. Barnard indicated the LACSD did not have the facilities to treat wastewater to reclaimed quality, but was fine with the LAPAC expressing their desire to have such treatment capacity as a community value in the Plan Update. The treatment facilities consist of two components, treatment, and disposal. In response to a question from Chair Wrather, Mr. Barnard clarified that the wastewater facility is scaled to serve buildout of the 1994 Community Plan and that there was some shortfall in water storage and a need for additional storage. Mr. Wrather asked Mr. Barnard to confirm although LACSD did not have sufficient water storage capacity additional wells help. Mr. Barnard responded that the district was at about 85% of its water capacity and redundancy created by having additional wells online gave the LACSD some flexibility to meet their water requirements. LACSD would need to plan for an additional storage tank to meet future buildout needs.

Public Comment Period

Chair Wrather opened the public hearing on water and wastewater policy. Richard Todd asked the LAPAC reconsider removing reclaimed water use. Mr. Todd expressed that the policy is advisory using the term "where feasible" and it would be shortsighted to deny a potential future nexus, not just a new wastewater pond, but to create new reclaimed water facilities. He would like to see policy that looks outside of water district for sources. Mr. Todd further expressed concern that matching grants be limited to guard against the existing community having to pay for new infrastructure.

Laurie Tamura expressed concern that responses to EIR comments had not been released and expressed that Policy WAT-LA-1.2 should be an action not a policy. Ms. Tamura expressed standard conditions and BMP already exist and should not be added to the plan. Ms. Tamura expressed that the county should have an impact fee in place when it adopts the plan requiring each new development to pay for improvements and that the words "shall be encouraged" should be rewritten or removed from the Plan, as an action should either be required or not. Ms. Tamura expressed that waterless urinals should be removed and replaced with the words "highest and best technology and a concern that requiring a finding of RWQCB compliance as being redundant.

Mr. Lackie and Ms. Parker responded to Ms. Tamura's concerns and answered questions from the LAPAC in regards to the purpose of development standards; the values expressed in the plan, and discussed potential changes. Committee member Mortholé noted that Los Alamos might want more restrictive standards than the County.

Chair Wrather, noted the Plan Update is not just regulatory, but is an expression of the community values and communicates to the County the types of activities appropriate to Los Alamos. Committee member Thyron expressed concern that the community could adopt a policy and the County would later remove it. Mr. Lackie offered clarification regarding the purpose of the standards incorporated into the local plan.

Mr. Barnard answered questions from the public regarding LACSD's water quality and treatment practices and the status of the district's water mains. Mr. Barnard invited the public to visit the LACSD office and meet with him to discuss any concerns they have. The LACSD Board of Directors meets the 4th Wednesday of each month and the public is welcome. Committee member Naughton noted that the LACSD regularly tests and reports to its customers on the quality of its well water.

Mr. Lackie explained to Ms. Tamura and the LAPAC that the County's EIR process typically included the response to comments on the Draft EIR released as part of the FEIR, which will be submitted to the Planning Commission in advance of their hearing. Mr. Lackie and Mr. Barnard explained that new development pays fees for new infrastructure required to serve it. LACSD revenues are used to pay for maintenance. Ms. Tamura asked that WAT 1.1.4 be revised to reflect existing district fee program and expressed that underground cisterns cannot be used as the water table is too high, and therefore policy should cite either wine barrels, or tanks, not cisterns. Mr. Barnard indicated that the district has an underground tank and weight of the water keeps it underground. Richard Todd expressed that it depended on the elevation and a preference for water cisterns underground compared to tanks, which are highly visible from around town.

Ms. Parker and Mr. Lackie clarified the new policies would take effect after approval of the Board of Supervisors of the Plan Update and when fees apply. Staff answered questions from the LAPAC regarding policies and actions and Mr. Barnard answered questions about financing LACSD's debt.

ACTION: A conceptual motion was made by Mortholé and seconded by Naughton to recommend to decision-makers approval of the Water and Wastewater policies with revisions recommended by staff with staff bringing back the following changes for LAPAC review at a future meeting: revise DevStd WAT-LA-1.2 to keep the text, "Water conservation measures should include high efficiency fixtures and appliances" and remove reference to specific appliances; retain Draft Plan Update Policy WAT-LA-1.1 encouraging use of reclaimed water; and changing new Policy WAT-1.2 to become Action WAT-1.2. Vote carried 6-0.

The LAPAC adjourned for lunch at 12:05 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 1:15 p.m.

Next, staff and LAPAC reviewed Fire and Resource and Recovery goals and policies and recommended revisions. Staff reviewed suggested change to explore feasibility of locating a sheriff substation at the new fire operations center.

Public Comment.

An unnamed member of the public inquired of staff how to get credit for retrofitting their homes with water conserving fixtures. Staff outlined ways in which such programs might work in the future and pointed to manufacturer rebates in the interim.

ACTION: A conceptual motion was made by Thyron and seconded by Naughton to recommend decision-makers approve the Fire and Resource Recovery goals and policies as detailed in the policy review sheets in the transmittal packet.

Vote carried 6-0

Next, staff reviewed the Transportation, Circulation, and Parking goals and policies and discussed changes recommended by staff and the EIR. Issues discussed included a need for additional safety features at the Bell Street and 101 underpass as identified by Committee member Michael Fordyce in an email to Caltrans. Cars travelling near the underpass under correct and swerve into oncoming traffic and pedestrian pathways. Potential solutions, such as reflective pillars to separate pedestrians and bicyclists from traffic, lighting, gateway features, alternative routes including trails, and bike lanes were discussed. Chair Wrather raised the possibility of the LAPAC writing a letter to the decision-makers regarding the goals the community has for the Bell Street corridor and Highways 101 and 135. Staff recommended including in the letter short-term interim measures to address the issues as well as long-term goals of the community.

Public Comment

Tony Cano, a local businessperson commented on the difficulty of sustaining a local business group to address these issues. He asked questions and provided examples regarding the challenges of funding needed changes in the downtown. Staff and the LAPAC discussed financing mechanisms and the challenges in Los Alamos. Examples of projects separating pedestrians from roadways were discussed.

Staff and LAPAC discussed the location of future walkways along the parallel and cross-streets in the downtown. The difference between hardscape sidewalks and gutters and water permeable walkways, and the costs of including these improvements were discussed. Sidewalks and elevated walkways were discussed as appropriate for Bell Street and permeable surfaces (decomposed granite, permeable pavers) were discussed as being appropriate for parallel and diagonal streets such as Waite Street. Angled parking with tire stops were discussed as appropriate for County maintained roads. Staff discussed the new abandonment policy requiring that a public benefit must be a part of any public right-of-way abandonment. Chair Wrather noted that he would like to keep angled parking as an option along Bell Street citing inconsistencies in Caltrans' Main Street Program which encourages angle parking, and the Caltrans' Manual, which does not.

Staff and the LAPAC discussed a comment letter from Lisa Carmen regarding safety issues at the intersection of the Highway 101 exit road intersection with Highway 135 west of Los Alamos. The lack of visibility of the stop sign and difficulty seeing traffic moving on 135 due to the grade of the roads was discussed as being safety concerns. To help the LAPAC prepare its letter, staff will discuss with Public Works the process of addressing the intersections and report back to the LAPAC at the next meeting.

ACTION: A conceptual motion was made by Naughton and seconded by Mortholé to recommend decision-makers approve the Transportation, Circulation, and Parking goals and policies with clarifications identified. Motion carried by a vote of 6-0.

Discussion ensued regarding the schedule for the remainder of the meeting and it was determined that the discussion of Air Quality goals, policies, and actions be tabled and brought back at a later meeting with the Biology and Flooding goals, policies, and actions.

The LAPAC took a break from 2:45 p.m. and reconvened at 2:55 p.m.

Next, staff reviewed the types of lots in the proposed CM-LA zone district and the development potential table in the LAPAC transmittal memorandum. The materials were included to inform review of the proposed change of the threshold for requiring the preparation of a Development Plan (DP) with the rezoning of properties in the Bell Street corridor to the proposed new Community Mixed-Use Los Alamos (CM-LA) zone district. Currently, buildings exceeding 5,000 square feet are required to prepare a DP and undergo discretionary review. The DP threshold for properties within the new CM-LA zone district would be 15,000 square feet.

The LAPAC, staff, and members of the public discussed the implications of the DP threshold change using information provided in the transmittal and PowerPoint presentation. Issues discussed, included how lot sizes were determined, coordination of project review with planning, public noticing of projects and Central Board of Architectural Review (CBAR) meetings, potential future project configurations, and development fees.

The LAPAC took up discussion of allowable uses in the CM-LA zone district. The conversation focused on level of controls to be used for wine tasting rooms and bars. The pros and cons exemplified in the community of Los Olivos to the south were discussed. Issues discussed included regulatory control, public safety, security, noise, parking, revenues, property values, the demographics of tasting room visitors, and limits on the number of permits.

The discussion moved to the idea of a vision statement written by the LAPAC for inclusion in the Plan Update forwarded to decision-makers. Discussion included the idea of a balanced community and the idea that some community members would like to see more wine tasting. Enforcement of conditional use permit conditions of approval were also discussed as a concern. The discussion moved to enforcement of alcohol permit conditions and policing. Staff is working on the issue with the Board of Supervisors and may be in a position to provide additional information at the next meeting.

ACTION: A conceptual motion was made by Thyriion and seconded by deWit to recommend decision-makers approve the new 15,000 square foot DP threshold for projects in the CM-LA zone district. Motion carried by a vote of 6-0.

5. **Future Meeting Date:** The LAPAC will reconvene the meeting until March 11, 2010, or other appropriate date to take up the remaining issues including the mission statement. An example is included in the LAPAC meeting materials from the Mission Canyon Community Plan.

ACTION: A motion was made by Naughton and seconded by Thyriion to table discussion until the next meeting and adjourn the meeting. Motion carried by a vote of 6-0.

Meeting adjourned at 3:46 p.m.



Chris Wrather, Chair