

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING NO. 726, AUGUST 22, 2007

ROLL CALL

Mayor Driscoll called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Ms. Howard called the roll:

Present: Councilmembers Davis, Merk and Toben, and Mayor Driscoll
Absent: Councilmember Derwin
Others: Town Administrator Howard, Town Attorney Sloan, Asst. Town Administrator Willis, and Assistant Clerk Hanlon

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None

CONSENT AGENDA

By motion of Councilmember Toben, seconded by Mayor Driscoll, the items listed below were approved by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Davis, Merk and Toben, and Mayor Driscoll.
Noes: None

- (1) Minutes of Town Council Meeting of August 8, 2007, with Councilmembers Davis and Merk abstaining.
- (2) Warrant List of August 22, 2007, in the amount of \$194,212.04.

REGULAR AGENDA

- (3) Second Amendment to Agreement with Siegel & Strain

Ms. Howard reviewed the staff report of 8/15/07 on the second amendment to the agreement with Siegel and Strain to cover the additional work set forth in Exhibit A-4. With respect to the additional LEED credits, Larry Strain said these were things that would improve the project performance—not just earn LEED credits.

Councilmember Davis moved approval of Resolution No. 2358-2007 adopting the second amendment to the Agreement (AIA Document B-141/CMA 1992 Edition), as Amended, Between Siegel & Strain Architects and the Town of Portola Valley. Councilmember Toben seconded the motion.

Councilmember Merk said he would be voting against the motion because of his previous opposition to pursuing LEED certification and having money spent on items which he considered to be essentially frivolous and unnecessary.

Mayor Driscoll called for the question, and Resolution No. 2358-2007 passed by a vote of 3-1 (Merk).

- (4) Amendment to Title 13 [Public Utilities] of the Town's Code Regarding Cable Franchise Authority

Leigh Prince, Town Attorney's office, reviewed the staff report of 8/22/07 and recommendation to adopt an ordinance to bring the Town's code into compliance with current State law for cable and video service franchises.

Councilmember Davis moved first reading by title, waive further reading, and introduction of an Ordinance

Adding Section 13.12.430 [Applicability and Sunset] to Chapter 13.12 [Community Cable Television Franchise] of Title 13 [Public Utilities] and Adding Chapter 13.14 [Video Service Providers] to Title 13 [Public Utilities] of the Town's Municipal Code. Councilmember Toben seconded the motion.

Responding to Councilmember Merk, Ms. Prince confirmed that the Town could choose not to collect the fifty cents PEG support fee from subscribers. Ms. Sloan noted that that was currently in the agreement with Comcast.

Mayor Driscoll called for the question, and the motion carried 4-0.

(5) Addition of Chapter 12.12 [Use of Public Rights-of-way] to the Town's Municipal Code

Ms. Prince reviewed the staff report of 8/22/07 and recommendation to adopt an ordinance codifying the encroachment into public right-of-way permit process and setting forth specifics with respect to State video franchisees. Responding to Councilmember Merk, she said Section 12.12.020(a) was not designed to require someone to get a permit if they wanted to park in the street in front of their house. There was a difference between "storing" and "parking" vehicles, with parking being more temporary.

Councilmember Merk described two cases where extra driveways had been put in accessing the public roads. Ms. Sloan said encroachment permits should have been obtained. She added that this issue had been raised recently with the sewer project in Westridge. The Town had been issuing encroachment permits for years, but there was nothing in the code. The primary purpose of the ordinance was to set that out.

Responding to Mayor Driscoll, Ms. Sloan said all of the discussions that AT&T had had with the Town to date had been preliminary, and there was no formal application. AT&T had agreed to get a use permit. Even if the use permit was in effect before this ordinance became effective, they would still need to get an encroachment permit.

Councilmember Merk moved first reading by title, waive further reading, and introduction of an Ordinance Adding Chapter 12.12 [Use of Public Rights-of-way] to the Town's Code. Councilmember Davis seconded, and the motion carried 4-0.

(6) November 2007 Election

Ms. Sloan reviewed the staff report of 8/16/07 and options available to the Council for the November 2007 election to fill the two open seats on the Town Council for which there were only two nominees, Steve Toben and Ann Wengert. Responding to Councilmember Davis, Ms. Howard said it cost the Town about \$6,000 to place anything on the ballot. There were additional costs to the candidates to have their statements translated into Chinese and Spanish and published, which ran about \$300-\$400. Responding to Councilmember Merk, Ms. Sloan said there would be no ability for a write-in candidate if the election was cancelled. Ms. Howard noted that write-in candidates had until the middle of October to declare.

Mayor Driscoll asked for public comment, and there was none.

Councilmember Toben said he was not enthusiastic about canceling the election. One of the defects in the Town system was the lack of knowledge that some residents had about who was serving on the Town Council. Even an uncontested election gave voters the opportunity to have candidates present a little bit about themselves. In his candidate statement, he described his approach to the job and accomplishments over the last four years. He also saw some value in knowing how much support each candidate received from the voters. He was, however, concerned about inflicting unnecessary cost on the Town.

Mayor Driscoll said he did not want to spend \$6,000. It was disappointing that there wasn't more interest, but it was a common disappointment in the Town's inability to fill all the committee vacancies at times. Some people were somewhat disinterested in how the Town functioned. That could be viewed as complimentary in that they were not upset with the Council and did not want it to change.

Councilmember Merk concurred with Councilmember Toben's comments but also felt \$6,000 was a lot of money. That \$6,000 could pay for three mailings, which might do more than the minimal amount of press that would be received. In this election, there would not be much interest in attending election/candidate events because there was no contest. He agreed with Mayor Driscoll. Councilmember Davis concurred. Additionally, he felt Councilmember Toben's statement could be sent to residents as a way of re-introducing himself.

By motion of Councilmember Merk, seconded by Councilmember Davis, Council adopted Resolution No. 2359-2007, 3-1 with Councilmember Toben abstaining. Canceling the November 2007 General Election and Appointing the Two Nominees to Fill the Two Vacancies on the Town Council.

COUNCIL, STAFF, COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(7) Construction Traffic Road Fee Analysis

Mr. Willis reviewed the staff report of 8/15/07 on the analysis of the construction traffic road fee program and recommendation to maintain the current program and allocation methodology. If the Council desired, staff would come back with a recommendation for an increase in fees. The question before the Council tonight was whether fees should be distributed to private roads.

Councilmember Toben noted that the Executive Summary of the MuniFinancial report (p. 1) indicated that only residential parcels in Town were subject to the road impact fee. The Woodside Priory and Sequoias projects were high impact, and he questioned why they were excluded. Ms. Sloan confirmed that the impact fees applied to both residential and non-residential projects. The data displayed in the Executive Summary reflected calculations for residential projects only.

Mayor Driscoll asked for comment.

John Boice, Woodside Highlands, said this had been a long effort. Referring to the minutes of the 11/9/05 Council meeting, he said he would make the same arguments tonight that he made then. The question was whether the impact fees should be applied uniformly across all of the roads in Portola Valley. As a practical matter, all of the roads in Portola Valley were public. They were used by the public, and anyone could use them. Secondly, impact fees were collected for the traffic that used the private roads. But this fee did not go to the private roads; it went to the public roads in Town. Last year, the Town collected \$32,374 from projects in Woodside Highlands. If the present method of calculating impact fees had been in place and applied, Woodside Highlands would have received \$25,841. It received zero. Ninety-nine percent of the traffic came from north and traveled on Portola Road less than .2 miles; \$32,000 to repair .2 miles was ridiculous. You taxed a person for impact fees on his road, and you didn't give it to him. There were not a lot of private roads in Portola Valley, and it didn't represent a lot of money. In Woodside Highlands, there had been a rash of building all at the top of the hill, which increased the mileage that trucks had to travel. Woodside Highlands had spent more than \$85,000 in the last three years repairing the roads; most of that had been spent repairing the edges of the road because the trucks were so large, they tore up the sides of the road. He distributed pictures of some of the road damage. He said if you charged impact fees for traffic that went up this road, that fee should go to that road. That was not to say that part of it shouldn't go to Portola Valley roads because those roads would be impacted no matter which private road you were talking about. The most impact in terms of mileage from border to border was 4.5 miles. In Woodside Highlands, there were about 1.8 miles of road. Woodside Highlands had been very diligent in keeping the roads

repaired. The residents had taxed themselves with a parcel tax of \$250, paid impact fees for the roads, and paid taxes to the Town just like every other citizen. And yet, they received zero. It was up to the Council to decide whether that was fair or not.

Jean Isaacson, Santa Maria, concurred with Mr. Boice's comments about the lack of fairness. She did not think anyone in Town would think it was fair. The other people on private roads in Town needed to know about this too. Most people in Woodside Highlands did not know about it until very recently. If there was some enormous technicality that made it impossible for the Town to give the money back, then it should not be collected in the first place. The money that had been collected should go directly to the maintenance district and not be brought into the Town fund. With respect to the election, there was a deadline of October for a write-in, but the Council could legally cancel the election before the write-in candidate could enter.

Craig Taylor, Santa Maria, said what was being discussed was a public road that was privately maintained. The residents couldn't control the traffic. It was very much like other roads in Town that people traveled over at their pleasure. Secondly, the Council was the governing board of the road maintenance district. It was not the residents of Woodside Highlands; it was the Town Council. Third, there was an account to collect this money. This was not a technical, deeply complicated thing. Where the money could be put was known, and the maintenance district had the fiscal responsibility to spend that money. This was very much an issue of fairness.

Michele Marincovich, Tynan Way, said she agreed with the other residents of the Highlands. When she read about this, it seemed incredibly unfair. She would like to know why it hadn't already been addressed. The taxes were on those roads, but there was no money coming back for the maintenance of those roads. It was patently unfair.

Councilmember Davis said the rates collected for the public roads, which were owned by everyone—including the Woodside Highlands residents—were determined based upon the expenses to fix the public roads. They did not include private roads. The system that was put in place, which was common in the State, was for a taxation process so that the public roads were kept up. The fees only went partially to the expense for the upkeep of the roads. The concept of public money being used for private road maintenance was a legitimate suggestion, but it was not the way the calculus was done in determining the numbers. When this subject was brought up two years ago, one of the underlying proposals was to raise the rate incrementally in order to provide some funds for the private roads. What was in place was the result of a lot of work on the part of consultants and staff. The report offered multiple ways to address the problem. Responding to Ms. Marincovich, he said an analogy was the Town's trail system of thirty-some miles. Half of the trail system was in Westridge. Westridge residents paid totally for the upkeep. One-quarter of a million dollars was spent in the last couple of years on Portola Valley public trails. A resident of Westridge could claim that half the trails were in Westridge and therefore the Town owed Westridge \$150,000--or some number--for Westridge trails because the trails were public. That argument had not been made, and the Council hadn't considered it. The system in place was engaged by law and by intent to serve the public roads. The Council had the power to distribute public funds for private road maintenance, and this was a new consideration after all these years of incorporation.

Mayor Driscoll added that this fee had been implemented a few years ago as a way of trying to cover the cost of impacts of all the construction happening in Town. It was still being fine-tuned.

Responding to John Boice's question about the legal definition of a "private road," Ms. Sloan said the Town had been struggling with this issue for years. These were roads that were open to the public that were owned and maintained by the private property owners. The Town called them "private roads" even though the public had access. Ms. Marincovich said these roads were incorrectly called "private" because they were open to the public. They should be considered in the calculations in light of their real use rather than a technical definition.

Randy Single, Russell Ave, said anyone coming from anywhere in the Bay Area would travel on Sand Hill to get to Woodside Highlands and not the other roads in the Town. You should not be imposing a construction mitigation fee to address the impacts on the roads, because there were only about 200 yards of actual public roads that were affected. Or, you needed to find a mechanism to get some of that money to the maintenance district to take care of some of the problems created by people building up there. If it was a private road, the maintenance district should have the ability to assess a mitigation fee on the trucks that were driving up there. What the residents were asking was for a fair approach to allocate the costs of these projects.

In response to Councilmember Davis's analogy with the trails, Craig Taylor said the money was not being collected for impact on a particular trail because of some use. This was an impact on the roads. These roads were seriously impacted. The edges were falling apart and repairs were continuously needed with no real recourse in terms of being able to collect money for that damage. It was the impact nature of this that was at issue.

Responding to John Boice, Mayor Driscoll confirmed that one of the options was to impose different fees for private roads. But, the hope was to keep this relatively simple from a calculation point of view.

Ralph Townsend, Tynan Way, said he agreed with the previous speakers that this was essentially unfair. He also thought the analogy with the trails system was faulty. Westridge didn't have to maintain a right-of-way. The maintenance district cut the brush along the roads twice a year without any assistance from the city. It was the pavement that was the issue. As the photographs indicated, those trucks were gigantic and took a huge toll. If those trucks weren't there, that roadway as maintained by the maintenance district would last indefinitely. There was a way to apply public money to a "private" road without litigious involvement. Councilmember Davis reiterated that the consultant's report demonstrated a number of ways that might be done with various levels of complexity. Mr. Boice said the way the consultant recommended assessing fees for private roads wouldn't be worth the accounting required to do so.

Craig Taylor said the mitigation fees should look at where the construction activity impacted the road. When you did an EIR, you looked at how traffic patterns were affected, etc. While he wasn't recommending a traffic study every time, for the residents at the northern most edge of the Town, 90% of the traffic went up Sand Hill. There were no impacts to Town roads.

Rowland Tabor, Santa Maria, said there was a semantic problem. The so-called "private" roads were not private roads. They were part of Portola Valley and part of the incorporation of Portola Valley. They should have a different name to get away from the issue of public funds going to private roads.

Mayor Driscoll suspended the comment period.

Councilmember Merk said when he initially looked at options 1, 2 and 3 in the staff report, they all seemed reasonable. But reading the details, he thought things were way too complicated and in some cases patently unfair. A couple of the residents commented that 99% of the traffic to the Highlands came from north. He did not agree. Anyone hauling away waste was probably going to the Zanker Road landfill and would be going out the south end of Town; they would probably take Arastradero Road to cut off 5 miles. If you traveled Alpine, you saw those vehicles. He also had an issue with the idea of measuring from one end of Town or the other end of Town. For the Highlands, the predominance would be Portola Road, but the whole Town had to be considered. Another formula should be found for the initial computation. For example, divide the distance from the entrance to Town on Alpine Road to the entrance to Town on Portola Road in half. That would be the base number that you started from so that everyone was paying equally. Additionally, the idea of dividing up the streets according to the quality of the street was way too complicated.

Councilmember Merk said there were two members of the Council who lived on private roads. He asked Ms. Sloan to explain why these two Councilmembers were not in a conflict of interest. Responding, Ms. Sloan said Councilmembers Merk and Toben were allowed to participate because more than 10% of the residents in Town lived on private roads. State law allowed them to participate in this discussion and vote because this issue affected the public generally. Responding to Councilmember Davis, Ms. Sloan said this was an impact fee and not a tax. The authority for the impact fee came from a section in the Government Code that allowed you to figure out the approximate impacts that things cost and approximately where the money would be put. The consultant had been hired because they did a lot of these impact fees throughout the State. They were not just for roads. There were library impact fees where they looked at the number of residents and the fees needed by the libraries. Even if someone never went to the library, it was still legitimate to charge fees on a new house assuming that those people would use the library. Whatever solution the Council came up with, the staff felt a consultant would still be needed to put it in a framework that was legitimate.

Councilmember Merk said he felt there was an issue of fairness here. It primarily affected the Highlands and Wayside Road. Where he lived on Brookside Drive, there was no homeowners' association or maintenance district. Nothing was done on the road except when someone did something on his or her own volition. He did not expect Brookside Drive to get any money. It was only .33 of a mile and wouldn't amount to anything any way. From having a construction site next door and others on the street, there was damage to the road. For one of the projects, the ASCC required the contractor to take pictures of the road before and after and undertake repairs as necessary. But, it was very difficult to say which truck cracked the pavement. Responding to Mayor Driscoll, he confirmed that currently there would be no one to give the money to on Brookside Drive. However, if this went through, he would try to organize something.

Councilmember Merk said the consultant's report broke down projects into a number of categories and assigned an average axle load to each one (Table 5). The consultant assigned 76 axle loads for a minor residential remodeling project under 400 sf. But for this size project, almost all of the materials came in a pickup truck with an axle weight of 4,000-5,000 pounds—not 18,000 pounds. He thought the data was flawed and was concerned about those kinds of numbers.

Councilmember Davis said he wanted to end up with a relatively simple algorithm, which didn't have all this fine structure and detail. It could be a simple footprint structure where the size of the building determined the load, and you paid that much money to that district. That algorithm could be applied to a couple of the larger private roads. The Town's algorithm should not be changed. That way, additional funds could be collected for maintenance of the two larger private roads. He did not like the alternatives presented, which measured yards from imaginary exits, made assumptions as to the way traffic moved, and had great specificity on the nature of the road as opposed to looking at the whole road network. A simpler more gross technique should be used with the numbers driven by some actual math. Responding to Ms. Sloan, he confirmed that he envisioned a basic fee and an additional fee for maintenance of the private roads, which was not included in the nexus of the public roads. That nexus would be based on the average cost of maintaining those roads every year.

Responding to Councilmember Merk, Ms. Sloan explained the current system. Referring to Exhibit C, she said if you were building a new residence over 400 sf, you paid \$1.90 per sf. It was based on the amount of construction rather than on any distance. The consultant looked at the miles of public roads and the amount of money it took to maintain them. He came up with approximately how much damage was done for a new construction. It was not based on where you lived. Ms. Howard said once the fee was derived, a spreadsheet that had every street was used to do a rough calculation from when you entered the Town limit up to the project. Allocations were made by percentage to each road that was traveled. Ms. Sloan said it was not legally necessary for that to be done. The \$1.90 per sf was for all new residences. When those road impact fees were collected, they were earmarked for the public roads. The staff chose how it wanted the funds allocated to the roads. The Council could decide to take all the money from the road impact fees

and spend it only on Portola Road one year and Alpine Road the next year.

Councilmember Davis confirmed for Ms. Sloan that he felt there should be an additional fee for construction on private roads. Other than raising the rate, he did not want the current system for the public roads changed. The additional fee should only apply to the longer private roads used by the public. Ms. Sloan said Wayside and Woodside Highlands roads were both over 1.4 miles long (Table 6). There could be a fee that went to those roads under the theory that the longer they were, the more the public used them. The third longest private road was Blue Oaks. Because that was a recent subdivision, the road was up to Town standards.

Responding to Mr. Boice, Councilmember Davis said an additional fee should be used for the private roads. The private roads should be looked at incrementally. The Town should be collecting funds for those residents if they wished to have funds collected. The money collected for the private roads would be returned to the private road maintenance districts.

Councilmember Toben said it appeared that the Council wanted to move beyond the staff's position of maintaining the status quo. He shared the view that the status quo needed some fine-tuning. The Council was being asked to choose between a set of imperfect options and move forward with the expectation that fine tuning might again be needed down the road. This was one of the more complicated issues on a technical level that he had encountered by the Council. He was inclined to prefer option A-1, which he felt used a fairly simple formula for addressing the equitable distribution of the funds collected under the current system. For the public private road parcels, there would be a second allocation calculation which turned on issues of specific distances. He agreed with Councilmember Merk's suggestion to take the midpoint of the two arterials or something like that. He was not in favor of an additional fee on top of the base fee that everyone paid. Of the various flawed options, he preferred simplicity and greater equity and would choose the A-1 option. It preserved the basic fee calculation but allowed for an allocation that was more appropriate for the realities of the private roads.

Responding to Mayor Driscoll, Councilmember Davis said when the algorithm was put together for the public roads, it didn't include the private roads. The maintenance fees for the additional road network that these fees addressed needed to be raised. He also wanted to raise the fees generically for the Town roads for reasons that had nothing to do with the allocation scheme.

Councilmember Merk said the staff report indicated 14% of the roads were private and 86% were public. To be simple, the fees could be collected and then divided by those percentages; the 14% could be divided according to the mileage. Raising the fee by that much and some cost of living adjustment would be a reasonable option. The whole Town would be looked at the same. If 14% of the people lived on private roads, over time 14% of the projects would be on private roads. They would get 14% of the money allocated according to their length. The issue he had with the distance aspect was that it was so complex to figure out.

Councilmember Davis said the private road structure was very different. Ms. Sloan said the nexus study was based on the number of miles of public roads and what it took to keep a public road up to public road standards. That was how the fee was calculated. She felt the private roads needed to be looked at to come up with some additional amount of money based on what it would take to maintain those. The issue was that the standards were different.

Mayor Driscoll said he felt it would be more expensive to maintain the private roads than the public roads. Going with the straight 14% and 86% assumed that all roads were equal. If the private roads required more money, that would be an incentive to improve those roads over time. He added that he was persuaded that there was a fairness issue here. He was unhappy with inheriting this public road/private maintained dichotomy. He did not like segregating the Town into categories, and hoped that those types of boundaries

could be smoothed out as opposed to reinforced. He also felt the complexities of this issue were similar to the riparian corridor issue. Until you owned a piece of the creek, you couldn't understand all of the issues associated with it. He suggested putting together a small ad hoc committee that included some private road residents and public road residents to look at the issue and bring back a proposal in a couple of months. He preferred to involve people who were affected by the problem and have them come up with an equitable solution that was not too complicated. He also would like those residents on private roads that did not have a homeowners' association, etc., to create one.

After discussion, Councilmembers Davis and Merk agreed to serve on the subcommittee. Mayor Driscoll suggested John Boice and Gary Nielsen participate. He said this should be a negotiating/crafting body rather than a voting/lobbying body. Ms. Sloan noted that the consultant outlined the legal requirements in his report (p. 12-13) for imposing a mitigation fee. The committee should use those findings as guidelines.

Councilmember Toben said the issue of retroactivity would need to be faced. He wanted the solution to contemplate returning funds collected in the past years to the private road communities. Mayor Driscoll said there were some complexities associated with retroactivity and suggested the Council discuss it when the committee came back with a proposal. He confirmed for Councilmember Toben that the recommendation to increase the fees was within the scope of the ad hoc committee's charge.

(8) Extension of Green Waste Recovery Franchise Agreement

Mr. Willis reviewed the staff report of 8/15/07 and recommendation to ask GreenWaste to submit a proposal for an agreement extension for five years. Responding to Councilmember Merk, he confirmed that the Town had collected all of the information listed in the staff report. Responding to Councilmember Davis, he said the company was small, innovative, very customer service oriented and did a great job. Since he had been with the Town, complaints were few and the company was very responsive.

Council concurred with the recommendation to invite Green Waste to submit an agreement extension for five years.

(9) Status of Town Center Project

Ms. Howard reviewed an article from the *San Jose Mercury* that discussed the Town Center project and building green projects. She distributed photos of the construction site. At the last ADT meeting, she said building interiors were discussed.

Mayor Driscoll said he wanted to make sure the rest of the Council was aware of what was being proposed for the interiors. Using the plans, he discussed how tree branches and trunks would be used in the library for columns, shelf supports, etc. Responding to Councilmember Merk, Ms. Howard said the branches and trunks came from the site. Councilmember Merk felt using these materials would require someone with quite a bit of skill. They had to be sawed entirely longitudinally and wedged such that they wouldn't crack as they dried. Fitting the pieces in place would also be time consuming, and he was concerned about the additional cost. Mayor Driscoll said he would follow up on the cost with the ADT. After discussion, Councilmember agreed there should be an interior style presentation. Councilmember Toben said he didn't want a prolonged back and forth process like there was with the backstop. He suggested the presentation be a public meeting with increased notice.

Ms. Howard noted that Councilmembers were receiving the weekly update on the project by e-mail or in the digest. The bids for the softball/baseball field were due 8/28/07, and there was some interest. Staff was working with an arborist to ensure the redwoods weren't impacted by the fence going in underneath them. Mayor Driscoll said C.R Hodgson and Mr. Young were working very hard to meet the deadline on the playground. He noted that the play structures were out in the open, and it was very hot in the afternoon. A

temporary tent structure might be needed or planting bigger trees for shade could be accelerated. Councilmembers discussed proposed planting and timing.

Mayor Driscoll discussed testing done on the new type of concrete being used to ensure structural strength. Use of this concrete also resulted in 80% less carbon being produced. Additionally, the FSC-certified wood for the windows lengthened the lead time to 16 weeks. There was a possibility that some of the windows would not use FSC wood in order to keep on schedule.

(10) Reports from Commission and Committee Liaisons: None

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

(11) Town Council 8/10/07 Weekly Digest

(a) New Assistant Town Administrator

Referring to the memo on the new Asst. Town Administrator, Ms. Howard noted that this was Mr. Willis's last Council meeting. Mayor Driscoll wished Mr. Willis good luck in his retirement.

(12) Town Council 8/17/07 Weekly Digest

(a) SSMC Carbon Emission Inventories

Referring to the e-mail of 8/16/07 from SSMC, Mayor Driscoll asked staff to see if Councilmember Derwin could attend the workshop on calculating carbon emission.

CLOSED SESSION

(13) Conference with Real Property Negotiator
Government Code § 54956.8
Property: Trevis Parcel #077-212-140
Negotiators: Town Attorney and Town Administrator
Under Negotiation: Price and Terms

REPORT OUT OF CLOSED SESSION: None to Report

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Mayor

Town Clerk