

PORTOLA VALLEY TOWN COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING NO. 964, MARCH 28, 2018

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Mayor Richards called the Town Council's Regular meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Ms. Hanlon called the roll.

Present: Councilmembers Mary Ann Moise Derwin, Jeff Aalfs, Craig Hughes; Vice Mayor Ann Wengert; Mayor John Richards

Absent: None

Others: Jeremy Dennis, Town Manager
Cara Silver, Town Attorney
Sharon Hanlon, Town Clerk

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Resident Marilyn Walters requested a plaque be placed on the hut recognizing the Chilean woodcutters.

CONSENT AGENDA [7:04 p.m.]

- (1) Approval of Minutes – Town Council Regular Meeting of March 14, 2018.
- (2) Approval of Warrant List – March 28, 2018, in the amount of \$195,113.26. *[Removed from Consent Agenda.]*
- (3) Recommendation by Public Works Director – Adoption of a Resolution for the 2017/2018 Street Resurfacing Project – Surface Seals Project No. 2018-PW01
 - (a) Adoption of a Resolution of the Town Council of the Town of Portola Valley Approving Plans and Specifications and Calling for Bids for the 2017/2018 Street Resurfacing Project Surface Seals No. 2018-PW01 (Resolution No. ____) *[Removed from Consent Agenda.]*
- (4) Recommendation by Town Manager – Join the “Yes on 68” Effort
- (5) Recommendation by Town Manager – Opposition to Two Potential Propositions
- (6) Recommendation by Town Manager – Grand Jury Request, ALPR Policy Website Access *[Removed from Consent Agenda.]*
- (7) Recommendation by Interim Finance Director – Budget Amendment to Support Future San Mateo County Sheriff Gun Buyback Programs *[Removed from Consent Agenda.]*

Councilmember Hughes moved to approve Items 1, 4, and 5 the Consent Agenda. Seconded by Councilmember Derwin, the motion carried 5-0.

- (2) Approval of Warrant List – March 28, 2018, in the amount of \$195,113.26.

Councilmember Hughes asked regarding the surety deposit refund to the Douglasses. Town Manager Dennis said all of the required trees have been planted and they have had a 100 percent survival rate. He

said all of the other mitigations are in place and no additional maintenance work was recommended. He will provide the Councilmembers with the report.

- (3) Recommendation by Public Works Director – Adoption of a Resolution for the 2017/2018 Street Resurfacing Project – Surface Seals Project No. 2018-PW01
 - (a) Adoption of a Resolution of the Town Council of the Town of Portola Valley Approving Plans and Specifications and Calling for Bids for the 2017/2018 Street Resurfacing Project Surface Seals No. 2018-PW01 (Resolution No. 2755-2018)

Vice Mayor Wengert updated the Council that the 2017/2018 Street Resurfacing Project will go forward with all the neighborhood streets within the next fiscal year, and then potentially circle back around this year to conduct a few tests on the shoulders, anticipating there may be potential solutions or recommendations for the next fiscal year.

- (6) Recommendation by Town Manager – Grand Jury Request, ALPR Policy Website Access

Councilmember Derwin asked Town Manager Dennis to clarify this item. Town Manager Dennis said the letter received from the Grand Jury included items that staff felt could be addressed easily with an improved website. He said he is working with Vigilant regarding information that will be posted on the Town's website.

- (7) Recommendation by Interim Finance Director – Budget Amendment to Support Future San Mateo County Sheriff Gun Buyback Programs

Councilmember Hughes asked how this program would be advertised. Town Manager Dennis said on Monday the Town will start significant outreach to the schools, PV Forum, Next Door, flyers, etc.

Vice Mayor Wengert asked how long the County anticipated keeping the buyback program open. Town Manager Dennis said the County is planning a buyback event in May. He said Capt. Corpus said there is also an option to do one in Portola Valley, if desired. Vice Mayor Wengert suggested the Sheriff's plans be clarified and defined more clearly to be sure it is in alignment with how the Town sets it up.

The Council directed Town Manager Dennis to hold this item until receiving additional clarification.

Craig Taylor, 11 Santa Maria. Mr. Taylor said his concern was asking students to join this program. He said he was supportive of curbing the guns, but this buyback program is a bad idea from an economic point of view and asked if there was any evidence that such programs were helpful. He said he understood and was supportive of the underlying philosophy of the idea but asked the Council to relook at the issue and said there were better ways to spend \$15,000.

Councilmember Derwin said she has heard this argument from several other community members as well as Councilmembers from Hillsborough and South San Francisco who are not doing gun buybacks.

Mayor Richards agreed and said it was a quick and enthusiastic response to a crisis and it made sense to consider the issue further. Councilmember Hughes said he understood the economic argument but said it overlooked the PR and community engagement aspects of a gun buyback program, which may not translate to a direct financial impact but was impactful in terms of public perception and was symbolic. He said the youth engagement piece of it was particularly powerful. Vice Mayor Wengert said it is incumbent upon the Council to have clarification of the details.

Councilmember Hughes moved to approve Items 2, 3, and 6 the Consent Agenda. Seconded by Vice Mayor Wengert, the motion carried 5-0, by roll call vote.

Item 7 was held over for further discussion.

REGULAR AGENDA

COMMITTEE REPORTS & REQUESTS

(8) Discussion – Town Center Master Plan – Architect Study Session

Town Manager Dennis introduced architect Larry Strain of Siegel & Strain. Mr. Strain said they received a list of 28 areas to be evaluated, with six designations: Facility Improvements, Facility Maintenance, Safety and EOC Planning, Community Gathering, and Nature/Outdoor Recreation and Library. He said specific items were discussed regarding multi-use space included building community, sustainability, historic, impact on recreation and fitness programs, etc. He said at this point it is not a community-wide process, but their recommendations will be going back to the Town Center Master Plan Committee.

Mayor Richards invited questions from the Council.

In response to Vice Mayor Wengert's question, Mr. Strain said he anticipated the process will take a couple of months, which could be affected by when they can meet with the Committee. He added that he will be taking a three-week trip in about a month and Susi Marzuola, a principal at Siegel & Strain, will be stepping in if necessary in his absence.

In response to Councilmember Hughes' question, Mr. Strain said the cost estimate was approximately \$19,000. He passed around the breakdown of estimated costs to the Councilmembers.

Councilmember Hughes said the Committee was asked to evaluate the projects and also think through a timeline. He asked if Mr. Strain's assessment will include staging and the order of the projects. Mr. Strain said they will do that in conjunction with the Committee, considering costs, logistics, sizes and impacts of projects, etc. He said they will work with the Committee to develop prioritization, but an actual timeline will depend on several considerations.

Vice Mayor Wengert suggested there be a column "Estimated Time to Completion" included in the analysis. She said that information, combined with the costs and impact, will help with the phasing/staging analysis. Mr. Strain agreed.

Mayor Richards invited questions from the public.

Craig Taylor, 11 Santa Maria, suggested assigning cost and impact ranges to some of the projects. Mr. Strain agreed and said the projects need to be more clearly defined in order to develop cost estimates.

STAFF REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PUBLIC HEARING

(9) Public Hearing – Recommendation by Town Attorney -- Introduction of Proposed Ordinance adding (133) Chapter 18.39 [Cannabis Land Uses] and amending Section 8.12.010 [Definition of Nuisance] of the Portola Valley Municipal Code and Adoption of Finding that Ordinance is Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (The Planning Commission recommended adoption.)

- (a) First Reading, Waive Further Reading, and Introduce an Ordinance of the Town Council of the Town of Portola Valley Adding Chapter 18.39 [Cannabis Land Uses] and Amending Section 8.12.010 [Definitions of Nuisance] of the Portola Valley Municipal Code and Adoption of Finding that Ordinance is Exempt from the California

Environmental Quality Act (The Planning Commission Recommended Adoption)
(Ordinance No. ____)

Town Attorney Silver presented the background of the laws concerning cannabis use, cultivation, and commercial activity. She presented staff's recommendation for a Town Ordinance, as detailed in the staff report.

Mayor Richards invited questions from the Council.

Councilmember Hughes asked for clarification regarding locations of sales. Town Attorney Silver said a plant in its natural state can be sold in the location where it's grown. If the plant is harvested and dried it would be considered a retail sale, which would not be allowed. Councilmember Hughes pointed out that, in Section 18.39.020 (S), the definition of a "retail sales" includes cannabis or cannabis products. He asked if the Planning Director would need to establish a regulation under the new section. Town Attorney Silver said the many ordinances they looked at do not make that particular distinction. She said State Law has determined the difference between cultivation and retail, so she did not anticipate this being a problem.

In response to Councilmember Hughes' question, Town Attorney Silver said the setbacks referenced in Section 18.39.140(C) are the building setbacks.

In response to Councilmember Hughes' question regarding Section 18.39.140(F), odor control and ventilation systems, Town Attorney Silver said that did not apply to outdoor cultivation.

Councilmember Hughes asked regarding Section 18.39.180(Q) regarding cannabis odor not being detectible offsite. He asked if the Planning Commission discussed having that requirement be applicable to any commercial activity in Town that emitted obnoxious odors. Town Attorney Silver said the Planning Commission did not address that particular issue. She said that would be a big enough change to the ordinance that it would require another reading.

Councilmember Aalfs asked for confirmation that commercial cultivation of 12 plants is allowed, but that any processing or testing of the product would have to be done out of Town. Town Attorney Silver said the grower can sell the plants on-site to a wholesale distributor. Councilmember Aalfs asked if testing was a requirement for the State's tag and trade requirement. Town Attorney Silver said she did not think testing was required as a precondition for wholesale selling. Councilmember Aalfs asked if someone could grow here and transport the plants to another location to process and sell from there. Town Attorney Silver said retail sale is prohibited in Portola Valley, but if a grower wanted to test or cultivate for retail from a different location that permits it, they can do that. She said the sale of a plant in Portola Valley can only be to a distributor, not to a neighbor, which would be a retail sale.

Councilmember Hughes said his understanding is that the intent was to keep it at the scale of neighbors helping each other out instead of requiring the product being exported from Town.

Vice Mayor Wengert said her understanding is that once the live plant is cut down, no processing would be permitted on-site in Portola Valley.

In response to Mayor Richards's question, Town Attorney Silver said the 12 commercial plants allowed is in addition to the 6 private plants.

Vice Mayor Wengert asked if the Committee was aware that the County had gone forward with their regulations that prohibited any commercial activity on anything but Ag-zoned and previously farmed lands. Town Attorney Silver said both the Subcommittee and the Planning Commission were aware of the County ordinance. Town Attorney Silver said the County ordinance is currently being litigated and it may change as a result.

Councilmember Derwin asked for clarification regarding the steps a resident would go through if he/she wanted to grow 12 plants. Town Attorney Silver said the seller would first get a State permit to cultivate and then obtain a permit from the Town of Portola Valley to cultivate cannabis in Town. In response to Councilmember Derwin's question, Town Attorney Silver said she did not know the exact cost of the State permit, but knew it was surprisingly affordable, and Portola Valley had not yet set a permit fee. Town Attorney Silver said the Portola Valley applicant would then have a hearing before the Planning Commission, providing detailed plans including irrigation, lighting, etc. She said if the permit is granted, a neighbor could file an appeal, or if the permit is denied, the applicant can appeal.

Councilmember Derwin pointed out that is a lot of work for only 12 plants, particularly considering those plants could only be sold in their plant form to a wholesaler.

Mayor Richards invited comments from the public.

Planning Commissioner Craig Taylor said there is a requirement to review the ordinance annually for five years. He said he thinks it is a mistake to allow the Planning Director to make changes to the regulation, at least in the first couple of years. He said proposed changes should be in an open public hearing brought before the Planning Commission. In response to Councilmember Derwin's question, Planning Commissioner Taylor said that if a proposed change was brought before the Planning Commission, it would not necessarily be a lengthy process. He said if it was a lengthy process, that would indicate there was a problem, and a public hearing should be held to work through it.

Nicholas Targ, Chair of the Planning Commission and member of Cannabis Subcommittee. Mr. Targ said the recommended limit of 12 plants came out of discussion with the County Head of Narcotics and the Fire Marshal, both of whom raised concerns regarding their ability to police, inspect, and ensure compliance with a number of plants. He said this is a small jurisdiction in an area of evolving law. He said that for issues of grow and processing, the Head of Narcotics identified that as the point at which organized crime participation was more likely. Mr. Targ said they also looked at the State of Colorado, who has the greatest experience with legalized marijuana in the United States. He said Colorado initially allowed for a larger number of cannabis plants to be grown at residences; however, in the past year they have dialed that back to 12 plants based upon issues of crime, risk of fire, lighting, and odor. He said for Portola Valley's first foray into the issue, the Subcommittee found the experience and recommendations of local experts, and the experience of Colorado, who has the most experience, to be compelling. He said he wondered if it was appropriate to allow any growing within the Town. He said the General Plan states the Town will be mindful of the interference or intervention of the municipality upon the individuals. He said the Subcommittee considered it was appropriate to allow it, even in the face of other municipalities in the area not allowing it, just because of the values enshrined within the Town's constitution – the General Plan. He said if somebody wants to be a hobbyist or wants to have a very small boutique grow operation, the Town should be mindful of that opportunity and those values that are in the General Plan. He said the limit of 12 plants has a predicate to it and was adopted with mindfulness.

Councilmember Aalfs asked how much marijuana would come out of a residence growing 12 plants. Mr. Targ said he learned that one plant can generate from about 1 pound or less per life cycle to about 1-1/2 pounds. He said that is largely dependent upon the amount of light the plant receives. He said 12 plants could produce up to 18 pounds of marijuana. He said the additional six personal cultivation plants could produce another 9 pounds, for a total of perhaps 27 pounds of marijuana growing at one residence.

In response to Councilmember Aalfs' questions, Town Manager Dennis said the sizes of plants can vary greatly – with indoor plants between 2 and 6 feet tall and outdoor plants 10 feet or larger. He said one pound of cannabis can produce 450 joints at 1 gram per joint. He said there were a lot of different statistics regarding water use – 50 plants in 1/8 acre uses 24,000 gallons over eight months, so 480 gallons for one pound of product. He said another source suggested six gallons a day per plant. He said there are power issues because of the high wattage lighting used to grow. He said a plant life cycle is between 8 weeks and 6 months. He said, at the time staff gathered data, according to Marijuana

Business Daily, the price per pound for marijuana in California was \$1,300, ranging from \$500 to \$2,500. He said another source suggested the average price per pound was closer to \$1,400 nationwide.

Councilmember Hughes asked if it was intended that all commercial growing would be exported from Town and there be no informal sales in Town amongst neighbors. Mr. Targ said the issue was considered and they were advised by the County Head of Narcotics that the safest way to proceed was by way of export only. He said this raises concern if it is a goal to serve residents. He said the other factors, including public safety, fire safety, and potential crime, outweighed the advantage that local services could provide. He said a backyard dispensary or dealer would be even more difficult to regulate than a larger, more organized dispensary.

Mayor Richards asked Mr. Targ if there were many residents clamoring for commercial use. Mr. Targ said residents raised interest in having delivery occur from out of town. He said a handful of people were interested in micro-enterprises. He said there was overwhelming concern about dispensaries and sale of marijuana within the Town, given the nature of the Town, the nature and state of the law, and concern that Portola Valley could become a marijuana destination spot.

In response to Councilmember Hughes's question, Town Attorney Silver clarified that under State law if a person is growing cannabis for personal use, they cannot sell it, but they are allowed to gift no more than 8 grams in concentrated form and no more than 28.5 grams in unconcentrated form, and only persons over 21 years old.

George Andreini. Mr. Andreini said he's lived in Portola Valley for a long time. He questioned why the Town needed to have a commercial approach to dope. He said he feels it is a problem to allow growing it in personal homes, exposing the growers' children or grandchildren or neighbors, but understands it is going along with State law. He said potentially exposing children to an additional avenue by allowing commercial growing is a mistake. He said Portola Valley is getting to be a elitist location to begin with and does not think exposing narcotics to children should be added. He said he does not understand how intelligent people can spend an hour and a half, after going through two committees and two reviews, etc., considering commercial growing of marijuana in Portola Valley. He said the Westridge HOA does not allow commercial operations in their neighborhoods and that should also apply to all residential areas. Mr. Andreini questioned how gifting personal use marijuana could possibly be regulated.

Councilmember Aalfs asked if commercial activities such as processing were allowed in San Mateo County. Town Attorney Silver said it is not allowed in San Mateo County.

Mayor Richards asked Town Manager Dennis if there had been any inquiries regarding cannabis permits. Town Manager Dennis said there have been no serious inquiries; however, staff does get an occasional call from someone, usually from out of State, inquiring about retail opportunities in Town.

With no further public comment, Mayor Richards brought the item back to the Council for discussion.

Vice Mayor Wengert said it is not often the Council deals with something at a local level, when it is still illegal at the Federal level. She said the Planning Commission is adept and creative and said she was supportive of how they organized the study in a way that made the most sense for this type of ordinance. She said she had two primary questions – what problems are being addressed and have the residents' needs, concerns, or requests been the driver. She said with this issue, a problem is not being addressed. She said while Portola Valley has the values of individual rights of property owners, there are also very strong values regarding things such as open space, lack of crime, lack of noise, and lack of odors. She said those additional values, in the aggregate, trump the other potential issues that might be pointed to for rationale for going forward. She said her next level of questions include a test for reasonableness. She said the very severe restrictions on the definition of commercial and the fact that the County has banned commercial growth on anything residential weighed heavily in her opinions. She said it would be very difficult, costly, and complex for somebody to move forward growing 12 to 18 plants and that fails the

reasonableness test. She said that weighing the two sets of issues, she was not supportive of the commercial portion of the ordinance.

In response to Councilmember Hughes's question, Vice Mayor Wengert confirmed that her intention would be to leave the personal use portion and remove all of the commercial aspect.

Councilmember Aalfs said there is a moral issue with that because the Town voted 68 percent in favor of personal use and the marijuana has to come from somewhere. He said to allow personal use and no commercial use feels like NIMBY. He said he is not saying he wants to see commercial cultivation in Town, but if the Town allows personal but no commercial it is basically pushing all of the burden of it to some other far away communities, which creates a moral problem for him. Vice Mayor Wengert said even if Portola Valley allowed commercial growing, it would be exported out of Town. Councilmember Aalfs said that is the inconsistency. He said no one would want to have a commercial permit to grow 12 plants they could only sell wholesale to a distributor. He said they would likely want to create their own product. He said taking a local issue and creating a burden somewhere else is not good governance in general.

Vice Mayor Wengert said at this point people cannot process or sell cannabis products in Portola Valley, so allowing commercial growing would take on a set of risks with no return, even to residents who might be interested in creating their own product. Councilmember Aalfs said as it is written now, anybody who uses cannabis personally will take delivery from somewhere else.

Councilmember Hughes said there is broad agreement in Town that personal use is reasonable. He said his question is around the fact that the Town has a lot of unusual properties where someone might not have the opportunity to grow even one plant on their property and they might want to partner with a neighbor who has some land. He said a simple commercial agreement, under an LLC to protect them from liability, is the kind of commercial activity that makes sense in Portola Valley. He said growing plants to export from Town is much more commercial than what he had in mind. He said his thinking was along the lines of agreements between neighbors, like a co-op, which could technically be considered commercial because there is money changing hands and corporation is being formed. He said there is a problem that needs a solution that allows some level of something technically commercial, as long as it's simple enough and of a small scale. He said perhaps the personal cultivation can be allowed, review it in a year, and if people start clamoring to set up co-ops with neighbors, it can be revisited. He said he does not want to prohibit that possibility.

Councilmember Derwin said she personally does not see marijuana as a demonized substance. She said her personal family life was eviscerated by alcoholic family members, so she has a difficult bias to consider. She said she has appreciated all of the discussion, particularly Mr. Targ's explanation about how they arrived at this recommendation and the 12-plant limit. She said only five people would be allowed to grow commercially in the first year, and she questioned if anyone would even go through that process to be only allowed to sell a plant to a wholesaler. She said she knows people who would want to grow marijuana for horticulture reasons, including garden club members, but not 12 plants and probably not for use. She was supportive of the ordinance.

Mayor Richards said he was supportive of approving six plants for personal use, with restrictions such as some other jurisdictions that restrict use of gas products in growing. Councilmember Hughes said the proposed ordinance for Portola Valley requires that all energy consumption would have to be fully renewable. Mayor Richards said he understood Councilmember Aalfs' point, and he could envision a desire to have a boutique with special plants, but he does not see that solving burden sharing and does not see a need for allowing commercial growing.

Councilmember Aalfs said it was more of a principle thing and he did not think Portola Valley would become a self-sufficient local provider of cannabis products. He said he was uncomfortable about the Town wanting the privilege of being able to smoke, but for all the difficult part to happen somewhere else. He was supportive of the ordinance as written because the Town will be coming back to this issue yearly

for review. He doubted there would be requests for the commercial permit because of the restrictive nature of it.

Vice Mayor Wengert said no one was questioning the support for personal use, which was the spirit of Proposition 64. She said it was also recognized how unlikely it is that people would follow the very complicated process to get a commercial permit. She was not supportive of allowing any commercial cannabis activity in Town at this time. She said if there is a request for a small-scale operation, the Town can always revisit the ordinance.

Councilmember Hughes asked Town Attorney Silver if the commercial section of the ordinance could be deleted or if it would need to be changed to specifically prohibit it. Town Attorney Silver said it would need to be specifically prohibited. Councilmember Hughes said he would support approving the ordinance as is, acknowledging that it is imperfect and because it is unlikely that there will be many, if any, applicants for commercial permits. He said he does not want to discourage people from discussing possible changes to the ordinance by a complete prohibition now.

Vice Mayor Wengert said the Council's responsibility is first and foremost to the residents and community. She said there are enough concerns relative to some of the potential negative outcomes on this issue that she is uncomfortable supporting it at this point in time. She said it's enough of a change for the Town to allow the personal growth. She said Colorado is running into issues that they believe outweigh the personal liberties side of the discussion. She said her intention is not to limit personal liberties as much as it is to weigh in the balance which are the bigger risk factors for the community. She said, at this point in time, she thinks the risk factors outweigh the benefits or moving forward with a very complicated new ordinance that will be very difficult to enforce.

Mayor Richards said it should also be considered that Portola Valley did not pass the moratorium and the idea was to move forward and approve the private use of six plants. He said there has not been a demand for anything beyond six plants. He was supportive of approving only private use.

In response to Councilmember Aalfs' question, Town Attorney Silver said a rewritten ordinance would need to go back to the Planning Commission.

Councilmember Derwin said she goes back to the passing of Proposition 64 and Mr. Targ's explanation of why commercial growing was considered and why they felt 12 plants was appropriate for Portola Valley. She was supportive of the ordinance.

Councilmember Aalfs asked Mr. Targ if the narcotics person and the Fire Marshal were comfortable with the 12-plant commercial grow or if they would rather see none. Mr. Targ said they were initially looking at the micro-business opportunity which was 25 plants and they were not comfortable with that. He said they did not raise an objection or concern about 12 plants, but they also did not affirm that 12 was the right number. Town Attorney Silver said the Fire Marshal was primarily concerned with indoor operations.

Councilmember Derwin asked Town Attorney Silver if the ordinance could be looked at in a year and, if there were issues with odor, water usage, lighting, etc., the Town could then say no to commercial growing. Town Attorney Silver said they could, but an issued permit would not be able to be changed mid-permit. Councilmember Hughes said the Planning Commission's intention is to review the ordinance annually for five years. Councilmember Aalfs said he assumed the Council would also be looking at the ordinance regularly.

Councilmember Hughes moved to introduce for First Reading the Proposed Ordinance along with the modifications noted by the Town Attorney with an additional amendment to Chapter 18.39.190 requiring that the Planning Commission have the authority to adopt regulations and not the Planning Director. Seconded by Councilmember Aalfs; the motion carried 3-2. Councilmembers Hughes, Derwin and Aalfs voted in favor, Vice Mayor Wengert and Mayor Richards opposed.

Councilmember Hughes commended the Planning Commission and the Subcommittee for the thoughtful and very fast work they did on this issue.

At the end of the Liaison reports, Councilmember Hughes pointed out that a vote was not held regarding CEQA.

Councilmember Hughes moved to find the Ordinance Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act. Seconded by Councilmember Aalfs; the motion carried 3-2. Councilmembers Hughes, Derwin and Aalfs voted in favor, Vice Mayor Wengert and Mayor Richards opposed.

(10) COUNCIL LIAISON COMMITTEE AND REGIONAL AGENCIES REPORTS [8:49 p.m.]

Councilmember Hughes – Attended, with Vice Mayor Wengert and Town Manager Dennis, the Sheriff's Contract Committee meeting with Sheriff's Department, where there was a presentation of the services provided by the Sheriff's Department and the relative costs compared with Towns that have their own police departments. The Sheriff's Department showed how the contract with Portola Valley does not nearly meet the costs of the services provided to the Town. They will be drawing up a version of the contract, merging the supplemental and basic contract. He said they are discussing a 3 percent annual increase. Councilmember Hughes said he asked if that was a concern about the sustainability of that considering the cost of living in the Bay Area rising much faster than 3 percent a year and they did not seem to think it was a concern.

Councilmember Derwin – Attended a Resource Management Climate Protection Committee meeting where there was a presentation on California's plans for deployment of hydrogen vehicles. She said the Committee will begin working on updating the San Mateo County Energy Strategy. They also received the March 21 BAWSCA water report. She said there is currently action in the legislature to implement the new water use objectives and BAWSCA will help agencies comply with the proposed legislation. There will be an indoor/outdoor water use study in the area. She said BAWSCA will hold a smart water meter workshop. They discussed the Governor's Climate Summit to be held in September. They are gathering information from cities and towns that should be submitted by March 30. She attended the March Council of Cities dinner meeting hosted by the City of Daly City where the speaker was Assemblyman Phil Ting. She attended the March 26 ASCC meeting where they discussed amendments to the ADU ordinance to meet State regulations and an amendment to the yards ordinance. She said they also discussed updating the Town's historic ordinance. She attended a C/CAG Administration meeting with Town Manager Dennis. She attended a Grand Boulevard meeting today. She attended a Home for All workshop on March 23 with Vice Mayor Wengert on "How to Talk About Housing So People Will Listen, Think, and Act." Councilmember Derwin said the presenters were social scientist PhDs from Frameworks in Washington, D.C. She attended a workshop the following day, also with Vice Mayor Wengert, in Belmont at the Department of Housing for the pilot cities.

Councilmember Aalfs -- Attended the March 20 Trails & Paths Committee meeting where they discussed the Spring Down plan. He said they discussed opening Old Spanish Trail to bikes as a safe route to school, which the Bicycle, Pedestrian & Traffic Safety Committee supported and the Trails & Paths Committee opposed. He said Coal Mine Ridge probably couldn't be opened to bikes anyway. Councilmember Hughes said the Bicycle, Pedestrian & Traffic Safety Committee were generally supportive of people cycling in Town, but acknowledged it was not within their purview to make that decision about the Old Spanish Trail. Councilmember Aalfs attended the 2018 Yosemite Policymakers Conference presented by the Local Government Commission where they discussed building decarbonization and eliminating natural gas usage. He said Sonoma County and Sonoma Clean Power are working to try to incentivize new replacement buildings after the fires to be all electric. He said he learned how harmful natural gas cooktops are because they emit carbon monoxide, formaldehyde, nitrous oxides, etc., and should only be operated while using a vent hood. He said another keynote speaker was Carl Guardino of the Silicon Valley Leadership group. He said local officials commented on some of the problems caused by Silicon Valley technologies such as AirBNB taking up housing stock,

Next Door being a venue for flaming local government, problems caused by Uber, etc. They discussed affordable housing in general and specifically SB-827 which would allow large scale construction in the vicinity of transit stops. Councilmember Aalfs said they heard from two Sonoma County Commissioners, one Santa Barbara County Supervisor, and the Mayor of Santa Rosa, who discussed the aftermath of their natural disasters. Councilmember Aalfs suggested Portola Valley join the Local Government Commission. He attended a lunch with the Funders Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities, who are sponsoring a study and report by the Local Government Commission on water management and land use.

Vice Mayor Wengert – Attended the meeting to review the Sheriff's Contract with Councilmember Hughes. She attended the Home for All event with Councilmember Derwin. Vice Mayor Wengert attended a luncheon today with Supervisor Simitian and colleagues from Woodside to discuss Stanford lands.

Mayor Richards – Attended the March 27 Conservation Committee meeting where they discussed Spring Down and developing plans to deal with ongoing maintenance. He attended the Annual Meals on Wheels event where they discuss funding.

(11) Town Manager Report – Town Manager Dennis reported that the recruitment for Finance Director will begin on Monday, April 2. He said the recruitment for Planning and Building Director is scheduled to begin the week of April 9. He reported that the contest to name the Vernal Pond starts next week that will culminate in a display at Earth Day. He said staff is beginning work on the 2020 census. He said the '18-'19 FY Budget process is underway, which will include an annual performance review of staff software. Town Manager Dennis reported that two staff members attended an Active Shooter Class held by the San Mateo County Sheriff's Department. He reported that staff participated in an EOC training with Mayor Richards in attendance. He acknowledged Assistant to the Town Manager Brandi de Garneau for putting together an excellent program. Councilmember Hughes said he understands that the concepts in the current plan deemphasize the role of the Council and asked if it was in the plan the Council to do a refresher training for the Councilmembers. Town Manager Dennis said that could be arranged.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

(12) Town Council Digest – March 16, 2018

None.

(13) Town Council Digest – March 23, 2018

None.

ADJOURNMENT TO CLOSED SESSION [9:25 p.m.]

(14) Conference With Legal Counsel – Initiation of Litigation

Government Code §54956.9(c): One Case

REPORT OUT OF CLOSED SESSION

None to report.

ADJOURNMENT [10:00 p.m.]

Mayor Richards adjourned the meeting.

Mayor

Town Clerk