

TOWN COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING NO. 828 SEPTEMBER 28, 2011

Mayor Driscoll called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. in Hansen Hall at The Sequoias and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Ms. Howard called the roll.

Present: Councilmembers John Richards, Steve Toben and Ann Wengert; Vice Mayor Maryann Derwin; Mayor Ted Driscoll

Absent: None

Others: Angela Howard, Town Manager
Sharon Hanlon, Town Clerk
Leigh Prince, Town Attorney Representative
George Mader, Planning Consultant
Brandi de Garreaux, Sustainability & Resource Efficiency (SURE) Coordinator

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Mike Schilling said that it was a privilege to have the Town Council meeting at The Sequoias, reminding the audience that Councilmembers, Commissioners and appointed Committee members – a number of whom live at The Sequoias – are unpaid volunteers.

Carol Espinoza, Ladera resident of some 40 years, said that regarding the lower Alpine Road portion of the C-1 Trail issue on tonight's agenda, Portola Valley does not have the right to represent the interests of those who live further down Alpine Road in this matter.

(1) Presentation: Recognition of 30-year anniversary of John "Skip" Struthers, Maintenance Coordinator

Mayor Driscoll read a humorous, thoughtful proclamation in recognition of Skip Struthers's 30 years of service to the Town and its residents. Mr. Struthers said that it's been a pleasure working for the Town, its residents and staff.

CONSENT AGENDA [7:40 p.m.]

(2) Approval of Minutes: Regular Town Council Meeting of September 14, 2011

(3) Approval of Warrant List: September 28, 2011 in the amount of \$150,302.84

By motion of Councilmember Wengert, seconded by Vice Mayor Derwin, the Consent Agenda was approved with the following roll call vote:

Aye: Councilmembers Richards, Toben, Wengert, Vice Mayor Derwin, Mayor Driscoll

No: None

REGULAR AGENDA

(4) Recommendation by Sustainability & Resource Efficiency Coordinator: Acceptance of award and Master Services Agreement for electric vehicle charging stations at Town Center [7:15 p.m.]

(a) Enter into an agreement with Coulomb Technologies for acceptance of award and Master Services Agreement for electric vehicle charging stations at Town Center

As Ms. de Garmeaux indicated in her September 28, 2011 memorandum to the Mayor and the Town Council, Portola Valley has been awarded a grant for two dual-head electric vehicle charging stations through a program funded by the U.S. Department of Energy. A separate grant, funded by the California Energy Commission through Coulomb Technologies, is expected to cover the cost of Installation of the stations. As Ms. de Garmeaux explained, this presents a great opportunity for the Town to become part of the electric vehicle charging infrastructure, and for the Town Council to show its support for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions.

Ms. de Garmeaux indicated that she's discussed the stations with the public works director and finance director of Los Altos Hills, which installed three charging stations about a year ago under similar circumstances, and everything has gone smoothly. Los Altos Hills, which initially charged \$5 per hour for station use and has since reduced it to \$2 per hour, is considering moving to time-of-use charges when Coulomb Technologies updates its software within the next few months.

Vice Mayor Derwin said that Southern California Edison, at a recent presentation to the League of California Cities, indicated that it's working with 90 out of 180 cities, including electricians and residents, on a program to get through the complexities of installing private charging stations. She asked whether PG&E is doing the same in our area.

As far as interfacing with residents, Ms. de Garmeaux said she hadn't understood the process was so complex. She asked Councilmember Richards to relay his experience. Mr. Richards, who indicated that his wife has been commuting with an electric car for the past five months or so, has one of the Portola Valley charging stations. He found installation a fairly simple process, and said that PG&E gets peripherally involved, to the extent that they want to ensure that the electrical system has the capacity to do the job. He said that the Town's permitting procedures are simple as well. There have been no issues about the load on the grid, because they use the station only in the middle of the night.

Councilmember Wengert said that perhaps because it's a nascent technology, she saw very little reference to maintenance in the service contract. She also asked whether there's any provision for upgrading the charging stations as technology advances. In terms of maintenance, Ms. de Garmeaux said that the charging stations are designed to run maintenance-free for 10 years, although she does not know whether any experience bears that out. Everything covered by the warranty would be covered by Coulomb Technologies; the Town would be responsible for any other maintenance expenses. As far as upgrades are concerned, she said, no provisions have been made beyond 2013.

Ms. Prince indicated that there isn't much incentive for Coulomb Technologies to agree to future upgrades and so forth, on a grant that runs through only 2013.

Councilmember Wengert noted that at the end of the contractual period, the contract should specify something – extension, renewal, removal of facilities, etc. Ms. Prince said that in this case, she believes the Town would just keep the hardware, pay for associated software and data reporting, and Coulomb Technologies would have no further obligation after 2013.

Councilmember Richards moved to approve entering into an agreement with Coulomb Technologies for acceptance of the award and Master Services Agreement for electric vehicle charging stations and their installation at Town Center. Seconded by Councilmember Toben, the motion carried 5-0.

- (5) Recommendation by Town Manager: Approval of Agreement for Town Manager Executive Search Consultant [7:25 p.m.]
 - (a) Enter into an Agreement with Ralph Andersen & Associates for Town Manager Executive Search Services

Ms. Howard recalled that in July 2011, the Town Council approved issuance of a Request for Proposal (RFP) for executive search services. Four proposals were submitted in response, and a subcommittee

(Mayor Driscoll, Councilmember Richards and Ms. Howard) interviewed three search firms – Bob Murray & Associates, William Avery & Associates and Ralph Andersen & Associates.

Ms. Howard said that she worked with Ralph Andersen & Associates President and CEO Heather Renschler on a timetable that should put her successor as Town Manager on board by April 2012.

In response to a question from Vice Mayor Derwin, Ms. Howard said that Ralph Andersen & Associates was chosen primarily on its excellent track record in working with small Northern California communities. She said that their answers regarding the difference in recruiting for a small town versus a large town also impressed her. Mayor Driscoll added that all three candidates were pretty good, but Ralph Andersen & Associates seemed slightly better.

In response to Vice Mayor Derwin's question about what cities the company has worked with, Ms. Howard said they've done searches for the manager position in Belvedere, Corte Madera, Hillsborough, Sausalito, Tiburon and Rocklin, as well as larger ones such as Davis and Beverly Hills. To her knowledge, she said, this firm has not worked with Menlo Park, Atherton or Woodside.

Councilmember Wengert asked how the firm approaches the assignment, i.e., with a lead recruiter? A team? Pointing out that the interviewing subcommittee wanted to ensure a single point of contact with whom the Council could have a good working relationship, Ms. Howard said that's exactly how Ralph Andersen & Associates operates.

In response to Councilmember Wengert's question about the phrase "the relation of master and servant," in the Town's agreement with Ralph Andersen & Associates, Ms. Prince said that's standard language in the Town's short form.

Vice Mayor Derwin moved to approve entering into an agreement with Ralph Andersen & Associates for Town Manager executive search services. Seconded by Councilmember Toben, the motion carried 5-0.

COUNCIL, STAFF, COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- (6) Discussion and Council Action: Proposed letter to San Mateo County regarding the lower Alpine Road C-1 Trail [7:30 p.m.]

Mayor Driscoll recused himself because his wife is a Stanford University employee.

Vice Mayor Derwin said that this matter involves only making a recommendation to the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors. Mr. Mader explained that a decision facing the San Mateo Supervisors is whether to accept in excess of \$10 million from Stanford University for the purpose of developing a trail/path along lower Alpine Road, from the Town limits of Portola Valley to Junipero Serra Boulevard. Mr. Mader added that as he understands it, either the County accepts these funds and proceeds, or rejects these funds, in which case the money goes to Santa Clara County.

A two-phase process has been discussed, according to Mr. Mader. The first phase might address the trail design, obtaining public input and looking at environmental impacts. Based on the outcome of the first phase, San Mateo County might move forward toward a detailed construction design.

A few facts that Mr. Mader cited:

- Because the General Use Permit (GUP) for Stanford University shows a C-1 Trail on Stanford land from Junipero Serra Boulevard to Arastradero Road, it's already part of the approved plan. In administering that provision of a plan approved by Santa Clara County, Santa Clara County determined that it would meet its approval requirements if the trail were developed in San Mateo County.

- The Committee for Green Foothills filed a court action stating that the trail – in San Mateo County – had not been reviewed pursuant to CEQA, whereas apparently the trail on the Santa Clara County side of the county-line boundary had been. As Mr. Mader said he understands from exchanges with The Committee for Green Foothills' Lennie Roberts, Legislative Advocate, San Mateo County, that action ultimately went to the California Supreme Court, which opined that the Committee's filing missed the deadline by a matter of two days.
- The Portola Valley General Plan and the San Mateo County Bikeways Plan both show a bike path along lower Alpine Road from Junipero Serra Boulevard to Arastradero Road.
- Stanford offered approximately \$2 million to Portola Valley to build its section of the C-1 Trail, which runs from Ladera to Arastradero Road. That portion is near completion, at about half the anticipated cost.
- The portion of the existing path along lower Alpine Road from Ladera to Junipero Serra Boulevard has a number of distressed areas – cracked pavement, narrow pavement in some places, questionable safety in some areas (e.g., around Stanford Weekend Acres and even prior to that, where bicyclists ride on the other side of the guardrail).
- Serious erosion is undermining the Los Trancos Creek bank and, in some places, the paved path, and might threaten the road in the future.
- Points of access from Stanford Weekend Acres to lower Alpine Road pose a dangerous situation for many who live near those access points. The heavy traffic at considerable speeds combined with at least one bad curve present hazards, despite some mitigation thanks to a waiting lane and left-turn lane at one point.

As Mr. Mader explained, Stanford Weekend Acres residents take a position that the path proposed would bring in greater numbers of walkers and bicyclists, going in both directions and making it more difficult for them to exit their driveways across the path to get to lower Alpine Road.

Some people feel that the path should not be improved, Mr. Mader continued, and that San Mateo County should reject the Stanford offer in the hope that Santa Clara County decides to develop other trails to serve the area.

To help clarify how Santa Clara County would use the money if San Mateo County rejects it, Mr. Mader read from Santa Clara County's agreement with Stanford University regarding Trail Easements, Construction, Management and Maintenance and Grants of Easements. Under "Payment to Santa Clara County," he read:

If, for any reason, San Mateo does not enter into an agreement as provided in Section 4.d above or otherwise fails to complete construction pursuant to such an agreement on or before the date of completion as provided in Section 4.d above, Stanford shall instead pay \$8.4 million (as increased annually pursuant to the indexing mechanism in Section 4.e) or any portion of that amount that either was not paid to San Mateo by Stanford or was reimbursed by San Mateo to Stanford, to the County of Santa Clara no later than 60 days after the date of completion. Similarly, if, for any reason, Portola Valley does not enter into an agreement as provided in Section 4.d above or otherwise fails to complete construction pursuant to such an agreement on or before the date of completion as provided in Section 4.d above, Stanford shall instead pay \$22.8 million (as increased annually pursuant to the indexing mechanism in Section 4.e) or any portion of that amount that either was not paid to Portola Valley by Stanford or was reimbursed to Stanford by Portola Valley, to the County of Santa Clara no later than 60 days after the date of completion. The County shall use such funds only to mitigate

impact OS-3 described on page 4.2-21 of the Environmental Impact report for the GUP (to wit: the adverse effect on recreational opportunities for existing or new campus residents and facility users that will be caused by the housing and academic development approved by the GUP, which will reduce the availability of recreational facilities while increasing the demand for such facilities); provided the funds shall not be used for facilities on Stanford's lands without Stanford's consent.

Mr. Mader referenced communications in August 2011 between Stanford Provost John Etchemendy and Santa Clara County. Mr. Etchemendy raised several questions germane to this issue, and Mr. Mader discussed two of them. One: "Has a Regional Trails Grants Program or recreational funding in connection with the Stanford Trails Agreement ever been discussed by the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors? If so, has it been approved?" That's because there's speculation of how those funds might be used should they accrue to Santa Clara County. The response: "At this point, the Board of Supervisors has not formally discussed a Regional Trails Grants Program for trail funding at either regular board meetings or at the committee level, thus, no such program has been approved."

The second question, Mr. Mader continued, was: "Before Stanford's offer to San Mateo County expires, will the county consider how any funds that might come to the County pursuant to Section 4.i, would be used, and what process would be employed to distribute those funds?" Is it possible that Santa Clara County would determine that any such funds would be used exclusively in Santa Clara County?" The answer: "I would not expect the Board of Supervisors to consider how such funds might be used until, and only after the conditions of Section 4.i. have been met." So once the funds have been rejected, Mr. Mader concluded, Santa Clara County would determine how those funds might be used.

Mr. Mader said that he's attended three events San Mateo County has hosted in regard to the trail issue – two public meetings at Ladera Oaks Swim & Tennis Club and a field trip. San Mateo County plans to hold another meeting on October 4, 2011 to discuss the input received to date, Mr. Mader added. He said that San Mateo County Assistant County Manager Dave Holland told him that based on that meeting, a recommendation will be made to the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors whether to accept or reject the funds. The Board of Supervisors has tentatively scheduled a hearing on the matter for its October 18, 2011 meeting.

Referring to Ms. Espinosa's earlier comments about Ladera, Mr. Mader said that the Ladera Community Association (LCA) also met and prepared a letter to San Mateo County endorsing improvement of the path in question. Of about 20 people at the LCA meeting, he said, two or three spoke in opposition to the improvements and the rest favored them.

Mr. Mader said that an endorsement letter from Portola Valley also had been drafted for the Town Council to consider, based on the fact that the path improvements are in the General Plan and would complete the path along Alpine Road. The planning area in the General Plan goes to the intersection of Junipero Serra Boulevard and Alpine Road. Ladera and all the land down to Stanford Weekend Acres are encompassed by Portola Valley's sphere of influence, he explained. Thus, if any of that land is ever annexed, it can be annexed only to Portola Valley. Stanford Weekend Acres itself, also an unincorporated area, lies within Menlo Park's sphere of influence.

Mr. Mader said that the Town has received a number of communications on the topic as well, from proponents and opponents of the path proposal alike.

Councilmember Wengert, seeking clarity on the outcome if San Mateo County doesn't vote to accept the Stanford funds by the deadline, asked whether the funds would revert to Santa Clara County for unspecified use. Mr. Mader said that the funds would be used for recreational facilities that have been displaced by development on the Stanford campus. He pointed out that the agreement also stipulates that the money couldn't be spent on development on campus without the University's prior approval.

Vice Mayor Derwin noted that among the correspondence the Town has received is a letter recommending support of a Regional Trails Grants Program. She asked whether such a program is an option on the table at this time. Mr. Mader said that Santa Clara County would provide for facilities that service those people on Stanford campus who are losing recreational opportunities, but how Santa Clara County interprets that is unknown. Mr. Mader said that in his opinion, the replacement facilities would have to be somewhere near the campus, rather than in southern Santa Clara County.

Vice Mayor Derwin asked whether supporting a Regional Trails Grants Program would require rejecting the notion of the funds coming to San Mateo County and then just hoping that Santa Clara County Supervisors decide to create a Regional Trails Grants Program. Mr. Mader said that he believes that to be the case, because the Regional Trails Grants Program is not an option available to San Mateo County.

In terms of the eroding creek bank that Mr. Mader mentioned, Vice Mayor Derwin asked whether it will require repairs at some point regardless of San Mateo County's decision on the lower Alpine Road trail issue. Mr. Mader said that it should be repaired, because the erosion threatens existing public improvements and the magnitude of the threat will increase until it is addressed. He said that it's his understanding that San Mateo County could use the Stanford funds to deal with the erosion problems.

Ms. Howard confirmed Vice Mayor Derwin's understanding that the Town has taken a very public position on reducing greenhouse gases (GHG) by endorsing AB32 (the Global Warming Solutions Act), using sustainability as the framework in which to judge all development, and working with the Safe Routes to Schools Program to encourage children to ride bicycles and walk to school. In addition, Ms. Howard said, the Town is working on a new committee to encourage people to bike to work and use bikes as an alternative mode of transportation.

In that context, Vice Mayor Derwin asked whether it would support Portola Valley's core mission to reduce GHG by supporting a bicycle-pedestrian walkway that would enable residents to safely ride bicycles into Menlo Park, Palo Alto and even the CalTrain station. Ms. Howard said yes, it would.

Vice Mayor Derwin said that she takes exception to a statement made in a letter from Jon Silver suggesting that San Mateo County has money in its house and its sales tax measure 3% for bike and pedestrian projects. As a member of the C/CAG Board, she said, she knows that those findings are highly contested. There is not a lot of money, and it's not easy to get.

Councilmember Wengert asked whether San Mateo County is in an all-or-nothing position. Mr. Mader said that it appears that way – that San Mateo County either accepts or rejects the funds – but he added that according to Mr. Holland, they could undertake a two-part process. The first would focus on design, including public meetings and an environmental study. If at that point, the County decided not to proceed, the balance of the funds would revert to Santa Clara County.

Mr. Mader noted that the regular traffic backups at the intersection of Alpine Road and Junipero Serra Boulevard will only get worse with the completion of the Stanford University Medical Center (SUMC) Project – despite findings in the project's Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The lower Alpine Road trail may play a role relative to that congestion, he said, because some people may rather ride bicycles than contend with even heavier traffic.

Jon Silver, Portola Road, requested a list of communications that the Town has received relative to the lower Alpine Road trail issue. Ms. Howard said that statements in favor of San Mateo County accepting the funds came from the Ladera Community Association, Noel Hirst, Susan Gold (Trails and Paths Committee chair), and Lynne Davis (Trails and Paths Committee member). Among those submitting statements of opposition were Adele Jessup, Roland Taylor, Diana Gerba, Joel Schreck, Mr. Silver and Mary Paine.

Alluding to Vice Mayor Derwin's comment on his letter, Mr. Silver said he didn't think he'd suggested San Mateo County was wasting tons of money from sales tax proceeds, but the County has acknowledged the safety problems on the trail. Because it will face liability unless something is done about those problems, he said that the County would find the funds to do the sensible repairs.

Mr. Silver also said that he believes it's a mistake to simply accept an ultimatum; when the best choices aren't apparent. He argued that we must try to make those choices available. He said that Stanford didn't like the agreement it entered into with Santa Clara County. While he said that Mr. Mader's recount of the situation was not inaccurate, some points of emphasis and certain facts were missing. It took five years of difficult back-and-forth negotiations between Santa Clara County staff and Stanford University before the parties agreed to a "mediocre route" for the S-1 Trail near Matadero Creek. Just hours before the meeting, Mr. Silver stated, Stanford delivered an ultimatum to Santa Clara County, demanding that if Santa Clara County wanted Stanford's property on that trail, the C-1 Trail would have to be moved over to San Mateo County.

According to Mr. Silver, Portola Valley should suggest that the two counties set up a Regional Trails Grants Program. He reasoned that just because it doesn't exist now doesn't mean that it cannot, particularly if San Mateo County approaches Santa Clara County saying they could take the offer with a two-year extension, and with some flexibility in terms of how San Mateo County spends the money, i.e., in a jointly administered Regional Trails Grants Program.

Mr. Silver also observed that after serving on the Portola Valley Planning Commission for nearly 13 years and having attended the last Ladera meeting, he found the process dysfunctional. He said he was shocked to see Mr. Holland disseminate inaccurate information – "crucial mistaken information" – in indicating that if the money went to Santa Clara County, Santa Clara could do anything they wanted with it. Mr. Silver also said that the meeting was structured in such a way as to lead people down a path to a decision that he likened to animals in a slaughterhouse.

According to Mr. Silver, Mr. Mader failed to mention that San Mateo County Board of Supervisors twice turned down Stanford's offer unanimously. He also claimed that this project would not support Safe Routes to Schools; in contrast, it would be an unsafe and environmentally destructive trail. The weakest link to Menlo Park would be at the intersection of Sand Hill, Alpine and Santa Cruz Roads, he noted, asking how parents would ever want to send their children on bikes through that intersection. He also claimed that commuters would continue to use the road rather than turn to the trail. He said other good trails could be built, but not under the terms of this offer as it stands today. He also noted that while Portola Valley's General Plan shows a trail in this area, it's not a 12-foot trail with 2-foot shoulders, which he said would be a "monstrosity."

Mr. Silver said that the staff report echoed the misinformation given out by Mr. Holland in regard to Santa Clara County's freedom to use the money any way it wants if San Mateo County doesn't accept it. He said that fact makes him very uncomfortable about the road the Town is already too far down. He said that Portola Valley has a history of making forward-looking decisions, but there's nothing more backward-looking than this "awful" proposed trail. He said that a trail next to a busy road with 25,000 vehicle trips on it every day is not a recreational trail; it makes the EIR process a joke.

Mr. Silver said that since the California Supreme Court never ruled on the merits of the issue, he wonders whether a new opportunity for a lawsuit will present itself if San Mateo County accepts the funds and proceeds. He said he'd rather see Portola Valley be the catalyst that brings San Mateo County, Santa Clara County and Stanford together to get a Regional Trails Grants Program going.

Steve Schmidt, Central Avenue, Menlo Park, said that he's a former Menlo Park mayor who had a difficult time during expansion of the Stanford West area. The project Stanford wanted and Palo Alto approved created a lot of congestion in the Sand Hill/Santa Cruz/Junipero Serra/Alpine Road area, he recalled, and Menlo Park found itself in the awkward position of having to make a decision about widening its roadways to reduce the congestion.

He said that Stanford was very persistent, and finally got Menlo Park to agree to widen the road at Stanford's expense. Mr. Schmidt said that Menlo Park had no choice other than to agree or become the pariahs of the Peninsula. In hindsight, he said, with more room, it's safer now to ride a bicycle through those complex intersections, but the congestion remains serious.

That being said, Mr. Schmidt stated that the C-1 Trail project on lower Alpine Road is reminiscent of Stanford's persistence in his own experience. However, he said that the offer of \$10 million plus doesn't bring much benefit to Portola Valley, and especially not to San Mateo County. As Mr. Silver alluded, Mr. Schmidt added, a multi-use trail next to a busy road is a dangerous design that should not be considered or constructed. Contrary to what Mr. Mader claimed in terms of improved public safety, he said, this would create greater danger. Furthermore, it would be redundant insofar as San Mateo County is already very committed to building bike lanes on Alpine Road and a safer bike route through the I-280/Alpine Road interchange. He said that nowadays traffic professionals all consider mixed-use trails sources of increased hazards rather than solutions to safety problems. He said that it's great that Stanford brought Portola Valley a multi-use trail; there's some rationale to that because the road shoulders on Alpine Road aren't bike lanes. In summary, Mr. Schmidt said, he doesn't think Portola Valley should send the proposed letter because it's an extremely bad idea to support the sidewalk or mixed-use trail.

Marilyn Walter, Coyote Hill, said that because the University owns all of the land across from Stanford Weekend Acres, from the Sand Hill/Alpine Road intersection, it should produce what's needed to carve into its side of the road down to I-280 and thus avoid the tremendous problem of reaching I-280 from Sand Hill Road.

Janet Davis, Alpine Road, Menlo Park, said that she sees children at La Entrada School (in the Las Lomas Elementary School District) come and go every day. She said there's a total of about 1,400 students. Of that total, 90 children come from Portola Valley, all but six of whom take the bus. She also said that Stanford doesn't recognize the dangers along Alpine Road; once she said she counted 43 semi-trailers coming to Stanford, along with bicyclists, other commuters and pedestrians. She said there are too many people doing too many things for it to be safe. Ms. Davis also said that because the gas line along Junipero Serra Boulevard – which joins the huge pipeline that follows Alpine Road in front of her driveway – is on the top-10 list of dangerous gas lines, a lot of the work that's needed on the road will be taken care of in the process of upgrading those gas lines anyway. She said that under CEQA, negative impacts are considered significant when paths cross driveways, and she's very much in opposition to the lower Alpine Road trail. Her property is deep enough that it wouldn't personally affect her all that much, she said, but still she said that it's unsafe.

Ted Huang, Mimosa Lane, said that he's been a Ladera resident for two years and is also a member of the Silicon Valley Bike Coalition, which recently wrote a letter in support of the renovation of the lower Alpine Road trail. He said there's been a lot of talk about studies showing that a bicycle-pedestrian path separated from the road is safer than bikes sharing the roadway with motor vehicles. In his research, in conjunction with the Coalition, he said he learned that in December 2010, the Harvard School of Public Health published a study that examined a similar situation, and determined that fewer accidents occur on "separate bicycle tracks" than on shared roadways. He said that a number of websites discuss research that shows shared-use roadway studies haven't been undertaken diligently. He said that he favors a separate bicycle-pedestrian track.

Ray Villareal, Meadowood Drive, said that he isn't an expert but is troubled when opinions are presented as facts. He said that he supports the Town's letter to San Mateo County as it was written. He has used the trail as it exists, and would love to be able to ride his bike with his daughter to a Stanford football game but would be nervous about using the trail for that purpose as it stands now. He said that although there are probably a thousand ways to make the trail better, at this time we're presented with circumstances we can either take advantage of or not.

As a practical person, Mr. Villareal said, he'd encourage taking advantage of the circumstances, resulting in the ability to use a trail that connects Portola Valley to Stanford. He would like to ensure that the money is spent in San Mateo County, and hopes the County will view this as an opportunity to do something positive. He mentioned an earlier comment about the County being committed to bike trails, but said after living here 14 years, he hasn't seen much evidence of that. He said that the C-1 Trail project could be a catalyst to do it, and thus he'd support it.

P.J. Utz, West Floresta Way, Ladera, said that he's a Stanford faculty member. He said that everything Mr. Mader said is correct; he's been fact-checking on this issue over the past four months. He also said that the portion of the C-1 Trail being built now in Portola Valley is gorgeous, and it makes him sick to think that it will end in some sort of roundabout. In terms of children and commuting, he said that his children would ride their bikes to school on the trail if it weren't so dangerous. There is no way children can ride bikes safely on Alpine Road, he argued. Serious bicyclists might not use a dedicated, separate trail, he said, but children certainly would need it.

Mr. Utz said he took offense at an earlier comment about children being bribed with pizza and soda to demonstrate in favor of the trail. He said that these children, including his daughter and about 50 others, self-organized and formed a group they called "Flat Tires." In terms of a Regional Trail Grants Program, he said that in some ways it's a good idea, but this money won't be used to build trails along Arastradero Road or connecting with Skyline Boulevard way up in the foothills. The Stanford Weekend Acres Neighborhood Association, he said, has made it very clear to him that they have ideas about how they'd like to see the money used, and it would not be for those two trails.

Shandon Lloyd, La Mesa Drive, Ladera, urged the Council to send the letter in support of the trail to San Mateo County. She said people use that trail, and it's in bad enough condition that sometimes she and her children have to get off the trail into traffic and to walk around parked trucks. She said she'd like to have a nice, safe alternative to the road. She said that when she grew up in Palo Alto, she was able to avoid University Avenue and ride on Hamilton and Forest Avenues; there is no such option in Portola Valley, she said – the only way to go is west. Ms. Lloyd said that she's glad that San Mateo County is fully supportive of bike routes although disappointed that the County hasn't come up with the funding for trail repairs under I-280 at Alpine Road. She said that the lower Alpine Road trail is a great alternative. She also pointed out that the other Stanford trail doesn't get much use, and if the money earmarked for the lower Alpine Road portion of the C-1 Trail isn't used for that purpose, she's concerned about where it would be spent.

Diana Gerba, Stowe Lane, Menlo Park (Stanford Weekend Acres) said that the Portola Valley Town Council's voice will carry some weight on this issue, and wanted to ensure that the Council understands how much this trail would affect her and her neighborhood. When one envisions a recreational trail, she said, they don't envision the reality of Alpine Road between Piers and Junipero Serra Boulevard. She said what's being discussed is actually a "glorified sidewalk" on a very busy, dangerous road, with five roads and driveways to cross. As a resident, she said it is extremely difficult to get out of her driveway even now, particularly during commute hours. She said that trying to make a left-hand turn off Alpine Road toward 280 is almost impossible, and the trail would exacerbate the situation. Taking the curve on Alpine Road at Bishop Lane on the way back home, she said, she's always afraid of being rear-ended when slowing for bicyclists.

Ms. Gerba said to fully understand her objections, and the objections of others at Stanford Weekend Acres, Councilmembers should see the situation for themselves during commute hours. She said they should park at Bishop Lane and Alpine Road, then walk to Stowe Lane and ask themselves, "Could this ever feel recreational? Could it ever feel safe?"

Rob Decker, Mira Way, Ladera, said that he is "dead set" against the trail as proposed by Stanford. He said that although he didn't hear his name mentioned among opponents, he'd submitted a "pretty thorough" survey of government documents and policies and safety research on bicycle safety by certified traffic engineers who specialize in bicycle safety.

Mr. Decker said that he'd cited about 70 studies, all but one of which found that bicycling on bidirectional, multi-use trails along busy roads that cross multiple intersections (such as two freeway off-ramps) is very dangerous in comparison to riding a bicycle on the street. Although it sounds counter-intuitive, he said, the evidence is not just a preponderance – it's overwhelming that such a trail would be hazardous.

Mr. Decker also read something that Alan Wachtel wrote to him in an email: "Given the trail's shared use, narrow width and potential intersection conflicts, and the problem of access to and from it in the wrong-way direction, it would be misleading to characterize it as somehow safe for recreational use of families and kids, commuting to school in Menlo Park, especially for inexperienced bicyclists." Mr. Decker said that Mr. Wachtel is a member of the Institute of Transportation Engineers, chair of the California Bicycle Advisory Committee, member of the Palo Alto Bicycle Advisory Committee, Government Relations Director for the California Association of Bicycling Organizations and has other bicycle-safety-related credentials.

In addition to the objections the Town Council has heard so far, Mr. Decker said – encroachment and reduction of the quality of life in Stanford Weekend Acres and the ethical issue of Stanford trying to wriggle out of a deal it made – the lower Alpine Road trail would not be recreational. He said that the road is polluted, dangerous and carries 25,000 cars a day; it's nothing like the section of trail just built in Portola Valley, which is lovely and has very few issues, crosses only two paths – an entrance to an equestrian facility and Ford Field. On the other hand, Mr. Decker said, the proposed connector between Ladera and Junipero Serra Boulevard would cross two entrances to the tennis courts, about 20 driveways in the Stanford Weekend Acres area, five roads that connect those driveways and dump out onto Alpine Road and two freeway off-ramps – one with a yield sign and one with a stop sign. According to Mr. Decker, these two off-ramps present the greatest danger of all, because bicyclists approaching them from the south are coming from the wrong direction; drivers are looking left, while bicyclists would be coming from the right. Again, he said, research indicates that riding against traffic on a bidirectional path at intersections such as this is the most dangerous thing in bicycling. The only way to mitigate that danger would be for complete separation of bicyclists and pedestrians from traffic, i.e., a tunnel under the freeway off-ramp or a bridge over it.

Mr. Decker said that he didn't think Portola Valley would take Stanford's money if the Town thought it would result in a trail that is so dangerous. Given the overwhelming safety data from legitimate sources and the multiple, legitimate objections from Ladera and Stanford Weekend Acres, he wants Portola Valley to say, "No, thanks" to this offer, tell San Mateo County to send the money back, and then work hard with Ladera and Stanford Weekend Acres to create an original Trails Grants Program. Furthermore, he said, some of that money could come back to San Mateo County to make minimal improvements, repave the trail and bolster the creek.

Larry Horton, Senior Associate Vice President and Director of Government and Community Relations for Stanford University, said that while he wouldn't respond to factual inaccuracies he's heard tonight, he wanted to explain where things stand now and what's at issue. He said there's no Stanford proposal for a trail. There never was a Stanford proposal for a trail in Portola Valley. Stanford did work with Portola Valley for the Town to create its own trail. If San Mateo County accepts Stanford's offer, that gives the County a lot of money to see if it works for them to fix Los Trancos Creek to make it safe. As Mr. Mader pointed out, Mr. Horton said, San Mateo County could elect to do design and environmental review in one phase and then proceed after addressing all the questions about safety. He also said that he's very sympathetic to the situation of residents of Stanford Weekend Acres. The question facing San Mateo County, he said, is: "Should these funds be used to examine whether they can be productively used to provide a trail of the quality of the one in Portola Valley that goes all the way to Portola Valley and then hooks in with the trail that goes under Menlo Park onto Stanford lands?"

Gunter Steffen, Alpine Road, Menlo Park (Stanford Weekend Acres), said that we should have a safe trail but any attempt to put that trail along Alpine Road, along the heavy-traffic corridor with entrances and exits to approximately 200 residences just would not work. "No matter how you cut it," he said, "it's unsafe

now. Do you want to make it deadly?" Mr. Steffen said that as a bicyclist, he rides the trail both directions. It may not be the safest, he argued, but it would be a lot more dangerous using what is proposed instead.

Regardless of whether the trail would be eight or 12 feet wide, Mr. Steffen said, his car is too long for bicyclists to be able to go around him in his driveway and he would thus block the trail trying to leave his home. He said that Alpine Road is full of blind turns, with visibility ranging from 240 to 300 feet, traffic moving at 40-45 mph and as fast as 50-60 mph.

Mr. Steffen said that on one of the routes he travels to work is a 12-foot-wide trail along the Bay – shared by scooters, bicyclists, runners and pedestrians, some walking their dogs – he's had two crashes in the past four years because people are "pretty aggressive" and there are no "escape routes." Mr. Steffen concluded by saying that he agrees with most of the statements made in opposition to the trail and considers them reasonable. He urged the Council to not send the letter in support of the trail.

Shandon Lloyd said that she lived in Stanford Weekend Acres, at 2607 Alpine Road, for eight years, from 2000 until 2008, and indicated that if there had been a bike path then, she would have known where to look for people when backing out of her driveway. She said that presumably, when we get a plan together, we would work to make it safer. Right now it isn't safe, but with some money, engineering and studies, it would be safer. Accordingly, if San Mateo County accepts the Stanford funds, she said, the worst that could happen is that it would be safer than it is now.

Jeanette Hansen, Portola Road, said that she's a longtime resident of Portola Valley and feels that the trail plan is not a good one. She said the other trail, the one already in place, isn't very rural, and this one would not provide recreational opportunities for anyone.

Chet Wrucke, Cima Way, said that if we want a trail between Ladera and Portola Valley all the way to Junipero Serra Boulevard of the quality of the C-1 Trail now being completed in Portola Valley, we need a new route – possibly the one that Ms. Walter mentioned earlier. If the Town wants something really beautiful, he said, it has to differ from what exists today along lower Alpine Road.

When Vice Mayor Derwin indicated she was calling on the last speaker from the audience on the subject, Mr. Silver said that he objected to the way she was conducting the meeting. He said that isn't the way to run a hearing on an important topic. Going on, he said that a Regional Trails Grants Program would be a very reasonable approach. He also pointed out that San Mateo County has leverage as long as the deadline hasn't expired, and if needed, that deadline could be extended for two more years, provided that Stanford and Santa Clara County agreed to an extension. If San Mateo County worked with Santa Clara County to set up a jointly administered Regional Trails Grants Program, San Mateo County could relinquish some of the money. It would be a joint-powers type of agreement, he said. No matter how this comes out, Mr. Silver concluded, he wants to see his Town make the best decision, and hopefully serve as the catalyst for something better.

Vice Mayor Derwin invited comments from Councilmembers.

Councilmember Toben, noting that he's about to conclude his term on the Town Council, requested a moment to digress. He said that he's been reflecting with a sense of reverence and even majesty on the assemblage in the audience. He said it's been a great privilege to bring the Town Council meeting to The Sequoias for the past six years, and tonight is especially poignant because he estimated seeing some 250 years of Town service experience represented in the room. He called out a few names to recognize:

- Jean and Bob Augsburg, who led the efforts of The Sequoias to support the Town Center project, mobilizing people at The Sequoias to make a major contribution to the project.
- Marion Softky, a legend in the community for her decades of reporting, all aimed at making Portola Valley a better community.

- Dave Boyce, a steadfast voice for the Fourth Estate, reporting on Town news credibly, honestly and soberly.
- Andy Browne, a stalwart member of the Town's Nature and Science Committee.
- Marge DeStaebler, a legend in Portola Valley schools and on the Town Conservation Committee.
- Jeanette Hansen, serving more than a decade on the Trails and Paths Committee.
- Jon Silver, a "pantheon of gods" when it comes to Portola Valley public officials.
- Marilyn Walter, one of the finest trails advocates ever.
- Bud and Onnolee Trapp, "super-citizens" who Councilmember Toben said have inspired him for years with their dedication to engaging citizens in the business of their government, with no matter too small for their attention.
- Ray Villareal, a long-time member of the Portola Valley School Board.
- Bev Lipman, who – mostly single-handedly – raised \$1.5 million to secure a priceless trail segment.
- Mike Schilling, a distinguished alumnus of the Architecture and Site Control Commission.

As Councilmember Toben put it, "it's just extraordinary, and let no one ever suggest to me that citizenship doesn't matter, that volunteerism doesn't matter." He said it's profoundly moving for him to be part of a Town where the residents take so seriously their obligation to make this a better place.

Going back to the item at hand, Councilmember Toben said that he's grateful for all of the remarks made at tonight's meeting and submitted in writing. He has concluded, he said, that the Town ought to take a strictly neutral stance with respect to San Mateo County's acceptance or rejection of the Stanford funds for this project. He said that his rationale begins with the Town's role, which is not as the decision-maker. He said that the majority of the most acutely concerned stakeholders are not Town residents, but rather residents of Ladera and the Stanford Weekend Acres area. That Ladera is within Portola Valley's sphere of influence will only become relevant, Councilmember Toben stated, if and when Portola Valley sets out to annex Ladera.

Councilmember Toben said that he doesn't feel he's in a position to represent those voices, as an earlier speaker had indicated. He said the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors has a tough job ahead in making this decision, and said that tonight has provided an opportunity for citizens to rehearse their comments on a live microphone, because they may have an opportunity to do it again soon at a San Mateo County Board of Supervisors meeting.

The argument about the proposed trail striking a blow for sustainability doesn't impress Councilmember Toben, he said, because most of those who are committed to bicycle commuting wouldn't use a trail designed for this purpose but would continue using the road as they do now. He said that he's delighted that the Ladera Community Association has organized itself to debate the issue and come to a conclusion. But as an elected official in Portola Valley, he said, he's concerned about giving an undue impression to the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors, and he isn't inclined to take an official position. He said that he's happy to have the San Mateo supervisors either accept or reject the funding, and recognizes arguments on both sides, but is not prepared to take a position either for or against.

Councilmember Wengert said that Portola Valley's position in this matter is interesting considering the Town's recent experience in working with Stanford on a project with a terrific outcome – the portion of the

C-1 Trail just being completed in the Town. She said that she's been directly involved in some of the discussions and negotiations with Stanford and has had only positive experiences.

She wanted the record to reflect that the process worked as Mr. Horton described it; Portola Valley really did manage the process, design the trail and implement all facets of the construction and design work in unfettered fashion. Thus, she said, she has no doubt that if the trail proposal moves forward, the process would proceed as Mr. Horton described.

Still, Councilmember Wengert continued, there is no doubt that the situation is extremely difficult relative to the remaining portion of the trail – and very significantly different, she added. She said that it's given her pause seeing, hearing and reading about whether the issues related to the lower Alpine Road portion of the trail are such that the Town should come forward with a specific opinion about it. A strong proponent of trails and Safe Routes to School, she said that she believes multi-use trails can work. She said the proposed trail width (12 feet) would be a positive for any trail that would be constructed. That said, however, she stated that she agrees with Councilmember Toben about Portola Valley not taking an official position on this issue. She also said that she'd like Portola Valley to go on record to relay the fact that the Town's experience with Stanford has been extremely positive. She said that she'd like the Town's letter to the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors also to encourage production of some new ideas. Whenever she sees a situation in which very smart, well-informed people spend a lot of time and end up at an impasse with intractable opinions on both sides of an issue, Councilmember Wengert said, it tells her there's a need to think about it in a different way.

Councilmember Richards said that his colleagues put things so succinctly that he doesn't have much to add. A big believer in design, he said, he is flummoxed that all the discussion about the proposed trail is taking place in a context in which there's not even a trail design to consider. He said that while the arguments against the trail from a safety standpoint seem to be good ones, he believes that design can do amazing things. At the same time, Councilmember Richards said he's swayed by Councilmember Toben's opinion that Portola Valley should take a neutral position, and by Councilmember Wengert's idea that the Town's letter make a suggestion to consider ways to make it better and pass along information about Portola Valley's experience with Stanford.

To summarize, Vice Mayor Derwin said:

- Councilmember Toben favors a neutral position, with no letter.
- Councilmember Wengert favors a neutral position, with a letter including comments.
- Councilmember Richards agrees with Councilmember Wengert.

Vice Mayor Derwin said she would have favored sending the letter as it was written, but made several additional points:

- The Council has actually weighed in on sphere-of-influence projects such as the Stanford Medical Center and Rosewood, and even outside the Town's sphere of influence with the Cargill Project.
- She's very sympathetic to the Stanford Weekend Acres residents and hopes that they get relief no matter what happens, and thought that Mr. Mader had addressed that to some extent in the letter he drafted to the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors.
- The trail is already in use and already dangerous, so accepting the funds would present an opportunity to make it safer, and to repair Los Trancos Creek with Stanford funds rather than San Mateo County's.
- The shared-road concept is an emerging one in the U.S. It's a challenging notion to build multi-use trails, but it is done elsewhere.

Vice Mayor Derwin concluded by saying that she believes the approach to take would be for Portola Valley to send a letter that does not take a position. Councilmember Wengert agreed to work with Mr. Mader on a revised draft. Councilmember Toben said that he would want to see the revised draft first.

Ms. Howard said that she would put the issue on the consent agenda for the Town Council's Special Joint Meeting with the Planning Commission on October 5, 2011.

- (7) Recommendation by Councilmember Toben and Town Attorney: Response to 2010-2011 Grand Jury Report, "County Officials Need to Make Noise about Aircraft Noise," dated July 6, 2011 [9:00 p.m.]

Mayor Driscoll returned to the dais.

Councilmember Toben indicated that he "took the standard approach" in drafting the letter of response to the 2010-2011 Grand Jury Report, "County Officials Need to Make Noise about Aircraft Noise." He indicated that letters of concern about aircraft noise continue to come in, including one from The Ranch just a few days ago.

Vice Mayor Derwin moved to approve the drafted response to the 2010-2011 Grand Jury Report, "County Officials Need to Make Noise about Aircraft Noise," dated July 6, 2011. Seconded by Councilmember Wengert, the motion carried 5-0.

- (8) Reports from Commission and Committee Liaisons [9:01 p.m.]

Vice Mayor Derwin:

(a) Newsletter Committee

- Working on the November 15, 2011 publication.
- Story ideas should go to Julia Dillingham.

(b) Sustainability Committee

- A total of 55 people have signed up for the Acterra High Energy Homes program, and the program is already one-quarter of the way to the program's energy goals.
- Power Down will go out to homes and audit electricity use in homes that don't have Smart Meters but have solar power, and Vice Mayor Derwin said that she'd be the test case for that on October 7, 2011.
- Energy Upgrade Portola Valley percolates along. Several committee members thoroughly reviewed the Acterra High Energy Homes program software, identified bugs and will report their findings to Acterra,
- The Smart Strip Guide is almost complete; again, Vice Mayor Derwin said that she'll be the test case.
- Work continues on the "Did you Consider" roofing flyer.
- Home Energy Detective kits are almost ready for checkout from Town Hall.
- Tuesday Harvest, the Tuesday speaker series, will begin in November.

(c) League of California Cities

Vice Mayor Derwin attended one of the three days of the League of California Cities Annual Conference in San Francisco in September 2011. In addition to hearing General Session speaker Dave Barry, the Pulitzer Prize-winning author who wrote a syndicated humor column for *The Miami Herald* for 25 years, plus numerous comedic novels and parodies, she attended sessions on:

- *The Smart Grid: What Cities Can Expect* as California's power grid is changing with the participation of three investor-owned utilities; the session also covered electric vehicles, Smart Meters, renewable energy and energy efficiency
- *CEQA and Greenhouse Gases: Lay Perspectives on New Regulations* released last year; the session also covered ways to determine whether a project's GHG emissions are significant, appropriate mitigation measures and how to streamline the process.
- *The Effects of Health Care Reform on Section 125 Plans*, which suggested a possible need for Portola Valley to revisit the idea of employee contributions to help offset the increased costs anticipated.

(d) Council of Cities

- California Attorney General Kamala Harris was unable to attend the September 23, 2011 Council of Cities dinner meeting in East Palo Alto so her associate Suzy Loftus, a former San Francisco prosecutor, attended and reported on realignment of public programs from state to county control (AB109).
- Many people in attendance made for a very rich discussion, according to Vice Mayor Derwin.

(e) Housing Endowment and Regional Trust (HEART) of San Mateo County

- Vice Mayor Derwin joined a HEART subcommittee to make the program more relevant to people, reduce fees and to help retain members.

Councilmember Richards:

(f) Conservation Committee

- Discussed individual open space parcels in Town.
- Working on invasives that are cropping up and ways to control them, as well as an update to the native plant list.
- A panel discussion is set for October 4, 2011 on the balance between fire safety and habitat.
- Talked about a landscape class that the water company is offering.

Councilmember Wengert:

(g) Planning Commission

At its September 21, 2011 meeting, the Planning Commission:

- Discussed a request involving a pervious-surface sports court material for use at 55 Golden Oak Drive.
- Approved a proposed lot-line adjustment at Alpine Road and Rapley/Simonic Trails, although an easement issue remains unresolved.
- Continued the public hearing on the Town's proposed wireless communication facilities ordinance, which should come to the Town Council within the next month.
- Discussed the special joint meeting with the Town Council scheduled for October 5, 2011.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS [9:18 p.m.]

(9) Town Council September 16, 2011 Weekly Digest

- a) #1 – Email from Danna Breen to Angela Howard regarding School Siren – September 16, 2011

Mayor Driscoll reported that the concerns about loud sirens at Corte Madera School, as well as noise issues related to trash pickups, have been resolved.

- b) #2 – Mailing to Portola Valley residents – "History Happens Here" – October 1, 2011

Ms. Howard said that any residents interested in attending this program can go admission-free to the History Museum in Redwood City on October 1, 2011. All they need is identification showing Portola Valley residence.

(10) Town Council September 23, 2011 Weekly Digest

- a) #2 – Letter to Jeff Aalfs from Sandy Sloan congratulating him on his appointment to the Town Council – September 20, 2011

Council congratulated Jeff Aalfs, who was seated in the audience, on his appointment to the Town Council. He will begin his term at the December 14, 2011 Council meeting.

- b) #3 – Memorandum to Town Council from Howard Young informing of response to inquiry concerning sewer odors at West Bay Sanitary District's Corte Madera Pump Station - September 23, 2011

Mayor Driscoll said that it was good to see West Bay responding well to the odors issues. He mentioned the Sanitary District's use of a device called an Odalog that actually measures odors.

- c) #4 – Memorandum to Town Council from Brandi de Garneau regarding Group Incentive Program for Energy Upgrade California – September 23, 2011

Councilmember Toben said that he is somewhat skeptical of the notion of a competition as a winning tactic, and would like to know about the time involvement required. He wasn't sure that it would get the appropriate "bang for the buck." An even larger question, he said, is whether this approach would be consistent with keeping our eyes on the big picture. He said that we can be very busy and feel as if we're making some progress, but it's also important to know that we're "moving the needle."

Mayor Driscoll added that, as one of the pilots of the Solar City opportunity a couple of years ago, group purchasing opportunities are a good thing that the Town can facilitate.

Ms. de Garmeaux said that she's done a lot of research on what motivates people to undertake energy efficiency improvements in their homes, and based on the studies she's reviewed and the webinars she's watched, competition is among the most motivational tools. She said that if the Council would like to see more about how competition is effective, she would be happy to provide the information. In terms of the group buy, she said this would minimize the "paralysis by analysis" problem that grips people when they face so many choices they make no decision at all. In addition, the group buy can reduce the cost of the assessment by up to 60% and solar costs up to 25-30%. Furthermore, she said, solar people are attracted because it's something people can see, as opposed to insulation and other behind-the-scenes energy-efficiency improvements.

- d) #6 – Notice that the Town Council approved a pilot "Model Plane Flying" Program on the Town Center softball field

In response to Vice Mayor Derwin's inquiry, Ms. Howard said that the signs have been posted in four locations, but apparently no pilots have flown planes yet. Councilmember Toben said that he considers the tone of the language on the signs "unnecessarily aggressive." He cited Rule 2 as an example, "Non-flyers stay off the field during flight operations." He would prefer something softer.

ADJOURNMENT [9:25 p.m.]

Mayor

Town Clerk