

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING NO. 830 OCTOBER 26, 2011

Mayor Driscoll called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. 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  
Sandy Sloan, Town Attorney  
Denise Gilbert, Planning Commissioner  
Tom Vlastic, Town Planner

Mayor Driscoll announced the presence of members of the Teen Committee, and welcomed them.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Virginia Bacon, Golden Oak Drive, said that she's had an opportunity to walk the new C-1 Trail from Ford Field toward Arastradero Road. While she acknowledged the progress in cleaning up that area, she said that she's very concerned about the potential fire hazard along areas of the trail, particularly between the trail and the creek, and the liability it creates for the Town. She said she's also concerned about the area near the fish ladder, where she saw debris and eucalyptus very close to some of the Alpine Hills homes.

Jon Silver, Portola Road, said that he's concerned with the procedure the Town seems to be using to appoint new ASCC members. In this case, he said, if the Town Council just appoints a replacement for Jeff Aalfs (as he assumes his position as a Councilmember), procedurally that doesn't seem to be the right way to do it. Rather, it would be better to let the Council make the appointment as was done in the past.

CONSENT AGENDA [7:36 p.m.]

- (1) Approval of Minutes: Special Town Council Meeting of September 28, 2011 [*removed from Consent Agenda*]
- (2) Approval of Minutes: Special Town Council Meeting of October 5, 2011 (20)
- (3) Ratification of Warrant List: October 12, 2011 in the amount of \$167,015.83 (31)
- (4) Ratification of Warrant List: October 26, 2011 in the amount of \$552,783.26 (43)
- (5) Recommendation by Administrative Services Officer: Budget Amendment, COPS Funding restored (55)

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

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

No: None.

REGULAR AGENDA

- (1) Approval of Minutes: Special Town Council Meeting of September 28, 2011

Councilmember Toben moved to approve minutes of the Special Town Council Meeting of September 28, 2011. Seconded by Councilmember Wengert, the motion carried 5-0.

- (6) Public Hearing: First Reading of Proposed Wireless Communications Facilities Ordinance [7:40 p.m.]

- (a) First Reading of Title, Waive Further Reading, and Introduce an Ordinance of the Town Council of the Town of Portola Valley Adding Chapter 18.41 [Wireless Communications Facilities] to Title 18 [Zoning] of the Portola Valley Municipal Code and Repealing and Amending Related Sections in Title 18 [Zoning] for Conformity (Ordinance No. \_\_)

Mr. Vlastic, referring to the October 16, 2011 staff report, indicated that the Town Council considered the Wireless Task Force's recommendations and reviewed a draft of the subject ordinance at its May 11, 2011 meeting. A joint Planning Commission/ASCC study session on June 15, 2011 led to some modifications and clarifications, after which the Planning Commission held a two-part public hearing on the revised proposed ordinance, on September 15 and September 21, 2011. Among those speaking were various Task Force members, including resident representative Marty Tenenbaum, who lives in the Peak Lane neighborhood, and Planning Commissioner Gilbert. Both supported the proposed ordinance, which the Planning Commission ultimately approved and forwarded to the Town Council in the form of Resolution 2011-0001.

In addition to the normal public notices, specific notices also went to carriers that do business in Town so they'd have a chance to comment on it, Mr. Vlastic said. During the Planning Commission hearing, he continued, a carrier representative commented on timeframes in regard to permits.

Mr. Vlastic also explained that the Town has already received some applications for new wireless facilities, and has made good use of some of the procedural provisions in the proposed ordinance, in terms of requesting additional information.

Mr. Vlastic told the Town Council that the ordinance doesn't prohibit consideration of wireless facilities within any zoning district, but it does provide guidance as regards the Town's preferences. It also provides a detailed approach for application processing.

Ms. Sloan added that the proposed ordinance goes about as far as the Town is able in the context of federal law. In response to a question from Councilmember Wengert regarding Chapter 18.41.070.C., Ms. Sloan affirmed that the language in terms of timing parameters in the ordinance have been revised to conform with FCC requirements.

Councilmember Wengert also asked about landscape maintenance being a joint responsibility of the permittee and the property owner in one place, and elsewhere that both parties would enter into an agreement with the Town. Ms. Sloan said that maintenance is the responsibility of the wireless provider, but if the provider fails to perform the maintenance, it falls to the property owner to step in.

Councilmember Toben said that the proposed ordinance is one of the most impressive pieces of new legislation that he's encountered in his eight years on the Town Council, and described the set of regulations as "highly protective." He also said that he wanted to be sure that residents are aware of how aggressively the Town responded to what they had to say about wireless facilities a year ago.

In terms of Chapter 18.41.070.D., Councilmember Toben asked 1) about the origin of the initial 10-year life for wireless permits, and 2) whether the Town could apply a much shorter time period, such as two

years, upon renewal of a permit. Ms. Sloan explained that the original 10-year term comes from the FCC. Mr. Vlastic said a permit holder seeking an extension or renewal would have to go through the same questions in terms of technology, because the Planning Commission was concerned about ensuring an opportunity to gauge the technology issues before considering a renewal.

Councilmember Toben also inquired about Chapter 18.41.080.B.3. which he said seems to prohibit outright installations on residentially zoned properties that are developed. Ms. Sloan said that although it's not yet been tested, she believes the Town could defend against an application to install the kinds of wireless facilities specified even on large residentially zoned properties if they already have at least one residential unit on them. As she also pointed out, such facilities would constitute a commercial use.

In regard to Chapter 18.41.080.B.1. Councilmember Toben pointed out that it might be useful to indicate either the Planning Commission or the ASCC in the phrase, ". . . the commission finds that the mitigations reduce impacts to acceptable levels."

With no further comments and questions from the Council, Mayor Driscoll opened the public hearing.

Ms. Virginia Bacon asked whether it would be possible for a residential property owner to demolish residential structures and be able to lease space on residentially zoned land for wireless facilities. Ms. Sloan said yes, but the Planning Commission would still have to approve the application. As well, Mayor Driscoll added, it would be an expensive teardown.

Vice Mayor Derwin said she agrees with Councilmember Toben. Councilmember Richards said the ordinance proposed is great. Despite the fact that the Town's hands are tied to a certain extent by federal legislation, Mayor Driscoll said it provides an opportunity for the Town to fully evaluate the potential effects of any proposed wireless installation.

With the minor revision included, Councilmember Toben moved to approve the First Reading of Title, Waive Further Reading, and Introduce an Ordinance of the Town Council of the Town of Portola Valley Adding Chapter 18.41 [Wireless Communications Facilities] to Title 18 [Zoning] of the Portola Valley Municipal Code and Repealing and Amending Related Sections in Title 18 [Zoning] for Conformity (Ordinance No. \_\_\_\_). Seconded by Vice Mayor Derwin, the motion carried 5-0.

Mayor Driscoll closed the public hearing.

(7) Discussion: Planning Commission's Requested Clarification of the Meadow Preserve Provisions of the General Plan [7:58 p.m.]

Mr. Vlastic explained that the October 17, 2011 staff report was prepared to transmit the Planning Commission's questions about the Meadow Preserve. In considering the Neely/Myers use permit application for their property at 555 Portola Road, he said, the Planning Commission had identified certain issues with the General Plan language for which commissioners felt Council clarification was needed, particularly in light of changes the Council made at its May 25, 2011 meeting.

As Mr. Vlastic explained, in this case, the Town has the flexibility to consider either the General Plan as it existed at the time the application was filed or as it was revised through the Council's action. Among the issues of particular concern about the Meadow Preserve are agricultural uses, the presence of structures and their location, and the visual character.

Since distribution of the Council packets, Mr. Vlastic said that two additional documents have arrived, including one from Dr. Kirk Neely and Holly Myers (in attendance at tonight's meeting) giving their perspective of the planning conditions that they perceive in interpreting the language for the meadow area. The other document is a comment from Linda Elkind, Hawkview Street, who could not come to this meeting but wanted to offer her perspective.

The Planning Commission is hopeful that the Council's discussion will help provide guidance so that the Commission may bring closure to this longstanding use permit application.

Ms. Sloan said that while it's perfectly reasonable in this case for the Planning Commission ask for help in interpreting which General Plan language should apply, the Council should focus on the plan language generally without getting into any particular permit application.

Commissioner Gilbert, who worked with Planning staff to craft the questions for the Council's consideration, said she'd be happy to answer any Council questions about the Commission's perspective.

Mr. Silver, who attended the Planning Commission meeting when the Commissioners discussed their approach to the questions for the Council, said that the staff report and related documents were impressive. He said that in this case, the pre-existing language in the General Plan should apply to the Neely/Myers application and any others that were in the pipeline at that time. He also said that it's important now to get the language right, to "really nail it" going forward. He said that reference to historical agricultural uses is an important element to include, and he suggested, too, that after discussing it the Council send it back to the Planning Commission to prepare another revision for the Council to review.

As Mr. Silver sees it, the public was blindsided when the Council received a letter that influenced its decision at a meeting that same night. He indicated that he didn't believe that was the intent, but that's what happened.

Ms. Sloan suggested that the Council begin by discussing whether the Planning Commission should apply language in effect at the time an application is deemed complete, or whether it should consider an application in accordance with any subsequent changes.

Councilmember Toben suggested that the principle about the old language is intended to support the applicants' interests, in that they think they're dealing with a certain set of rules. However, if an applicant considers later language more advantageous, he asked whether that same principle should apply. Ms. Sloan agreed about the principle he pointed out, adding that yes, the Town could work with the applicant to apply later language instead.

Councilmember Wengert said that in this case, the old version seems to favor the applicant's interest in some features while the new version favors that interest in other respects. Ms. Sloan said that the choice in terms of any particular application would be one or the other, but there could still be latitude in the interpretation.

In response to Councilmember Toben's inquiry about the change in language with respect to present agricultural uses in particular, Mr. Vlasic said that as it existed before the Planning Commission forwarded amendments to the Council for action at its May 2011 meeting, the General Plan didn't include the Meadow Preserve restrictions. Those restrictions, he explained, were contained in a Council resolution, and the Planning Commission's work on the General Plan amendments was undertaken in part to incorporate information so that the updated Open Space Element in the General Plan reflected the intent of that resolution.

Mayor Driscoll said that some of the terms used are imprecise. Using "natural" as an example, he pointed out that 2,000 years ago, what's now the Meadow Preserve probably was a redwood forest, which would be "natural." In its current state, he said, it's probably not "natural." He also noted that the idea of "keeping" the Meadow Preserve in a natural condition implies that it's already in a natural condition. Inevitably, he added, the general nature of such terms – particularly in light of the fact that a General Plan is intentionally general – requires interpretation. His own interpretation of "natural" in this context, Mayor Driscoll said, means it isn't "heavily modified recently by man," with structures, concrete, paving and such things.

Councilmember Richards agreed that the General Plan should be general in nature, and that the traditional approach of using language in effect at the time an application is deemed complete makes sense.

Councilmember Wengert said that although the language needs some fine-tuning; she also agrees that the old language should be the "default" position. She noted, too, that the Council's action in May 2011 had some unintended consequences and created some issues, particularly for the Planning Commission to deal with on any application going forward.

Mayor Driscoll also indicated that the general policy of using ordinances and General Plan provisions in existence at the time of an application makes sense, although the Town would be open to an applicant's request for an interpretation based on subsequent changes.

In response to Councilmember Toben, Mr. Vlasic said that the Meadow Preserve has been identified as such in the General Plan for a long time. Councilmember Toben also asked how the phrase "present agricultural uses maintained" could apply when there are none. Ms. Sloan pointed out that the phrase had been in the General Plan for perhaps 20 years, so it wouldn't necessarily remain current. Councilmember Toben also said that it's a bit confusing to talk about changing the language in the provision being discussed for general reasons not necessarily related to a particular application, when the only Meadow Preserve in Town is located on a single property. He asked to hear from the applicant.

Ms. Myers said that she and Dr. Neely understand the struggles with the language in the General Plan, and that they're not able to state a preference of one version over the other. Dr. Neely added that both versions are full of ambiguities and inconsistencies.

Councilmember Toben suggested that Dr. Neely and Ms. Myers might choose to suspend the application until such time as the language issues are worked out. Ms. Sloan said they could do that, and that it's also possible for an applicant to request a General Plan amendment and propose language themselves.

Dr. Neely indicated that the application, although since revised, is three years old, and there's no way they could be sure the Town would agree to whatever language changes they might propose.

As Mayor Driscoll observed, an outcome cannot be preordained.

Ms. Sloan said that other questions to address involve the meanings of the terms "largely open" and "existing character" as well as "present agricultural uses."

In terms of "largely open," Councilmember Wengert said the Planning Commission needs to understand whether a) it's up to the Planning Commission to interpret the definition or whether b) the Council should provide guidance specifically with respect to structures in the context of "largely open." Mayor Driscoll said that if the Council intended to disallow structures in the Meadow Preserve, that would have been stated explicitly, and that to him, "largely open" provides some flexibility in terms of allowing some small structures that don't detract from the open appearance but are appropriate for property maintenance.

Rusty Day, Pinon Drive, said that the General Plan is a carefully crafted document that Portola Valley has invested 30 years in assembling and has amended it six times. Its structure should be understood and respected, he stated. There's been no discussion tonight of the General Plan's land use components, which he said govern the application that the Town Council and Planning Commission are trying to define in an ad-hoc way. In terms of land use, he continued, the parcel in question is assigned to two different categories of land-use, covered in Sections 11 and 12. He also claimed that both land-use and open-space portions of the General Plan define "open."

According to Mr. Day, Portola Valley adopted the General Plan as mandated by the state law, which also requires that building permits and subdivision maps be consistent with the General Plan. He said it's the Planning Commission's job to call upon Town counsel and staff, hear public comment, and apply the

General Plan to applications it receives. In contrast, he said that going through words in isolation is an ad-hoc approach of trying to tailor the General Plan to meet the perceived needs of an applicant.

Mr. Day also said he wanted to know why the Council added "property owned by the Town" language, because he believes that action "completely turned the General Plan on its head." The General Plan is specifically and explicitly designed to provide principles for the regulation of private land and the development thereof, he argued, and to set the framework for the application of Zoning Code provisions.

Mr. Silver, impressed by Mr. Day's observations and agreeing with his comments about the General Plan's application to privately owned lands, reiterated two earlier points: 1) in this case, the application should be governed by the old language, and 2) the Open Space element should go back to the Planning Commission to work on the wording and then come back to the Council.

Councilmember Wengert pointed out some of the history of the Council's action in May 2011. She said she participated in the Ad-Hoc Spring Down Master Plan Committee, which she described as one of the main drivers to the new definitions for open-space preserves that the Council adopted at its May 12, 2010 meeting (Resolution No. 2489-2010), which were to be applied to the Town-owned Spring Down property.

Councilmember Toben said he'd like to hear Commissioner Gilbert regarding whether she feels the Council has provided sufficient direction for the Planning Commission to undertake clarifying the language in the General Plan.

Commissioner Gilbert said that she understands the Council wants the Planning Commission to apply the Meadow Preserve definition that existed when CUP X7D-169 was filed, but she isn't clear whether the Council wants to provide guidance about how to interpret "present agricultural uses."

Councilmember Richards said that he believes the Planning Commission has latitude to consider historical agricultural uses as among the intentions of the General Plan. Mayor Driscoll agreed, noting that the character of the Meadow Preserve is "a visual thing."

Mr. Day said that before the Spring Down issue arose, the General Plan included land-use categorization of different residential areas. He said that the place to look in terms of the Meadow Preserve is the Land-Use Element of the General Plan (Section 2126), which says, "It should be possible and practical to preserve a large amount of the area in a natural state. In particular, it is desirable that the natural character of the open ridge leading up to the Windy Hill Open Space Preserve and the orchards and meadow adjacent to Portola Road and town center be retained." Mr. Vlasic said that the general characteristics noted in "orchards and meadow" are more specifically defined as "Orchard Preserve" and "Meadow Preserve" in the other elements in the General Plan.

Councilmember Toben likened the Planning Commission's task in applying the facts of the Neely/Myers application to the phrase "present agricultural uses maintained" to trying to fit a square peg into a round hole. In terms of policy, he said, when the Council considered the General Plan amendments in May 2011, he envisioned the potential for row gardening. In the same way that the Town has applied forward-thinking insights in terms of sustainability, with the first municipal LEED Platinum complex in California, and in its review of septic systems in light of greenhouse gas effects, etc., he noted that limited-impact agricultural production that enables local experimentation might be worthwhile in terms of augmenting the food supply, and it wouldn't harm the visual values of the meadow.

Mayor Driscoll said that in the end, the General Plan is trying to maintain a balance between private property rights and the public good, and attempting to avoid putting undue burdens on property owners without trying to turn the whole area into a giant national park. He said he appreciates the time and trouble the Planning Commission took to raise these issues for the Council.

Mr. Silver said that the Council's efforts are appreciated as well.

Ms. Myers said that the Planning Commission also raised questions about the language that existed in the General Plan when they filed their application, and those questions still remain.

Commissioner Gilbert explained that she's taking two things from this discussion: 1) general comments from various Councilmembers on interpretation of the terms, and 2) that the Planning Commission will continue to apply its judgment. She said that she believes the Council's broad guidance is sufficient to proceed. Mr. Vlasic said that staff also would offer recommendations to the Planning Commission based on tonight's discussion.

Mayor Driscoll said that the Council will put the matter on the agenda for discussion at a future Council meeting and then refer it back to the Planning Commission.

- (8) Recommendation by Town Manager: Introduction of Ordinance Repealing Chapter 10.08 [Administration] of Title 10 [Vehicles and Traffic] of the Portola Valley Municipal Code [9:00 p.m.]
- (a) First Reading of Title, Waive Further Reading, and Introduce an Ordinance of the Town Council of the Town of Portola Valley Repealing Chapter 10.08 [Administration] of Title 10 [Vehicles and Traffic] of the Portola Valley Municipal Code (Ordinance No. \_\_\_\_)

As Ms. Howard explained, the ordinance – adopted in 1968 – is outdated and this proposal is basically a "housekeeping" change.

Councilmember Toben moved to approve the First Reading of Title, Waive Further Reading, and Introduce an Ordinance of the Town Council of the Town of Portola Valley Repealing Chapter 10.08 [Administration] of Title 10 [Vehicles and Traffic] of the Portola Valley Municipal Code (Ordinance No. \_\_\_\_). Seconded by Vice Mayor Derwin, the motion carried 5-0.

The Second Reading is scheduled for the Town Council meeting of November 9, 2011.

- (9) Discussion and Council Action: Heather Renschler of Ralph Andersen and Associates with Development of Town Manager Recruitment Materials (147) [9:02 p.m.]

Ms. Howard invited the Council to make comments, suggest changes and/or ask questions about "The Ideal Candidate" recruiting materials for the Town Manager position.

Councilmember Toben said based on the qualities listed, no one could match the description, and he's concerned that the "idealization" would deter potential candidates. He said that the superlatives used didn't provide a measured enough description to be useful.

Mayor Driscoll pointed out that the description does in fact apply to the "ideal" candidate, but he asked Ms. Renschler whether this draft varies considerably from others that Ralph Andersen and Associates has done. She said that it does, and agreed that it includes a lot of qualities that would be difficult for one individual to possess. However, she noted that individuals would come forward with varying degrees of the qualities and attributes listed. She also said that she hoped to learn what Councilmembers feel most strongly about – e.g., general community development? Planning issues? Dealing with specific engagement? As Ms. Renschler explained, tonight's Council meeting was scheduled into the recruiting timeline as an introductory discussion, and the draft was intended to provide Councilmembers with a starting point. She said that the Council might consider assigning fine-tuning of the draft to a subcommittee.

Councilmember Toben said that the qualities might be prioritized, and that it might be helpful to identify the kinds of experiences that would be well-suited for the position – such as chief administrative officer for a medium-sized city, deputy planning director for a larger city, etc. – that might help stimulate the interest of appropriate candidates. Ms. Renschler said that a broad outreach is sometimes purposeful, because

such people may be within a municipal department elsewhere, in county government, even in the private sector. She said that her firm typically circulates information about a position electronically, via telephone and with selective advertising. She said, too, that it would be helpful to know whether the Council prefers to limit the geographic scope of recruitment – e.g., within California only? Throughout the western states? Because of the housing market situation, she said, her inclination would be to recruit within California, and California candidates also would be more likely to be knowledgeable about pertinent planning law, CEQA, and public finance issues. She said that likely candidates might be department heads, current town managers or city managers.

Vice Mayor Derwin pointed out that Portola Valley is a very small town with a very involved populace and limited staff, so the Town Manager must be able to work with volunteers. Ms. Renschler indicated that would be evident by virtue of the number of committees and commissions that the Town has, relative to its population.

Councilmember Toben asked how the "ideal candidate" material would be used. Ms. Renschler said that the final text would appear on the back page of the proposed brochure in the Council packets.

Vice Mayor Derwin said that the materials should include facts that indicate how progressive Portola Valley is, and how far ahead in terms of sustainability. Mayor Driscoll agreed that there should be more emphasis on being leaders. Councilmember Toben suggested that Vice Mayor Derwin apply her writing talent to helping fine-tune the materials.

Ms. Howard said that she wants to get revised materials back to the Council for its November 9, 2011 meeting. Vice Mayor Derwin said that she'd work on the materials with Ms. Howard and Ms. Renschler.

Councilmember Toben noted that qualifications call for a bachelor's degree with major course work in public administration, business administration, etc., which by implication would rule out a sharp English major who decides a few years after graduation to go for an MBA. Not at all, Ms. Renschler replied, because that same sentence includes the phrase "or a related field." Furthermore, she pointed out that the "Review of Qualifying Experience and Education" section that follows the educational qualifications section offers the opportunity to match related experience. Ms. Howard pointed out that the education qualifications also were included in the job specifications that she supplied to Ralph Andersen and Associates.

Vice Mayor Derwin agreed with Councilmember Toben that the wording should be changed to make it clearer.

Referring again to the proposed brochure, Councilmember Toben called attention to the "Position of Town Manager" panel. Noting that the first paragraph indicates that the Town Manager performs the functions of Finance and Purchasing Officer, Treasurer, Personnel Officer and Property Director, he suggested also listing Director of Emergency Operations. Mayor Driscoll agreed, adding that it should be at the top of the list.

Councilmember Wengert said she liked the "look and feel" of the brochure, and Mayor Driscoll said it corresponds well with the Town's website as well.

Mayor Driscoll said that during the interview process, it will be important to assess the potential longevity of candidates. Ms. Renschler said that while emphasizing that the position would be viable for a wide range of candidates, she also can use terminology such as "seasoned" and make references to years of experience to help address that issue.

In terms of the timetable, Ms. Renschler noted that the holidays usually bring a lull to recruitment, because so many people are focused on family and other things. Thus, she said, they're hoping to have applications in by January 16, 2012. She asked whether the Council would prefer having a subcommittee work with the recruiter on the review of résumés, or if the entire Council wants to be involved throughout



the process. Mayor Driscoll said that when he and Councilmember Richards agreed to serve on a recruitment subcommittee at the July 13, 2011 meeting of the Town Council, they expected to be involved in reviewing résumés.

Ms. Renschler asked at what point the process would then go back to the full Town Council. Would all Councilmembers want to meet and vet the finalists in person? Ms. Renschler said that Skype or some other Internet methodology at a subcommittee level might be used in lieu of face-to-face, saving time and money for both the employer and the potential employee.

Mayor Driscoll, who said he frequently runs CEO searches for companies, said that more and more recruiters at that level are tending to adopt that kind of process, whereby the recruiter conducts and records the first interview. Because recorded interviews conceivably could become public record, Ms. Renschler indicated that Ralph Andersen and Associates hasn't recorded the Skype interviews. Ms. Sloan agreed, stating that it's better to have the recruiter and subcommittee go through the applications. She also said that the Council need not decide on an approach yet, but wait to see how many people apply.

Ms. Renschler asked whether the Council wants to focus on people with California experience as a priority, or whether to consider others without that experience but from a similar community. Mayor Driscoll said that seems more a question about relocation costs than candidates' state knowledge, and that the Town probably doesn't want to get involved in major relocation expenditures. He said that the recruiter should look at all candidates, though. If someone clearly stands out, Councilmember Wengert said, the California experience may be less important.

In terms of compensation and benefits, Ms. Renschler asked whether the Council is ready to indicate the level of compensation, or a range. The draft brochure says, "The salary for this position will be consistent with the Town's recent compensation practices and will include a benefit package with CalPERS retirement (2%@55)." She said the language also indicates that Portola Valley participates in Social Security and that the Town Council will negotiate an employment contract with the selected candidate which may include moving and relocation assistance. Mayor Driscoll said that he didn't think the Council would be willing to change the compensation structure tonight.

Ms. Renschler said a precise start date for a new Town Manager has yet to be determined, but she asked whether it's reasonable to expect to announce a decision and approve the contract in a public session around mid-March 2012. Mayor Driscoll said that he'd rather aim a month earlier. Ms. Renschler said that working with a subcommittee would make that feasible.

Revised recruitment materials will be presented at the Town Council meeting of November 9, 2011.

#### COUNCIL, STAFF, COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(10) Discussion – Proposed Naming of "C-1" Trail and Ribbon-Cutting Ceremony [9:30 p.m.]

Mayor Driscoll said that the Trails and Paths Committee members think highly of the C-1 Trail work that's been done so far, and would like to use the ribbon-cutting ceremony as an event to draw attention to Portola Valley's trail system. Although the trail has a name – the Dwight Crowder Trail – the Committee also has discussed possibly renaming the trail.

Councilmember Wengert suggested a name-the-trail contest among students at Corte Madera School. Mayor Driscoll said he'd mention that to the Committee, and suggest setting a ribbon-cutting date in the spring of 2012, once the landscaping is complete.

Council agreed to a Ribbon Cutting Ceremony in spring 2012 and discussed children from Corte Madera holding a contest to name the trail.

(11) Reports from Commission and Committee Liaisons [9:35 p.m.]

Vice Mayor Derwin:

(a) Resource Management Climate Protection Committee (RMCP)

The RMCP Committee meeting on October 14, 2011 revealed that:

- Copious funds are available for the Energy Upgrade Program, whereby residents can obtain up to \$8,000 for energy upgrades.
- Some cities are providing additional funds or incentives.
- The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) is launching a rebate of \$300 toward an energy assessment (which runs about \$500).
- The San Mateo County California Housing Finance Agency (CHF) is offering 3% fixed-interest loans for 15 years for energy-efficiency work.
- The Climate Action Template tool is about ready, and Portola Valley will be among the communities to use it next year.

(b) Cultural Arts Committee

- A large crowd enjoyed music, hors d'oeuvres, wine and excellent art at the October 15, 2011 reception for the nine Portola Valley artists whose work is on display at The Priory's Kriewall-Haehl Gallery.
- Portola Valley musicians Angela Schillace and Kari Rust provided music for the event, with Thomas Fogarty Winery and Portola Vineyards pouring complimentary wine.
- Open from 3:00 to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday through November 5, 2011, the exhibit features works of Foster Beigler (linoleum wall sculptures), Brigitte Carnochan (photography), Deirdre Clark (paintings), Nina Else (ceramic sculptures), Kalani Engles (paintings), Candace Gaudiani (photography), Bonny Novesky (acrylic prints), Adele Seltzer (monotypes), and Roger White Stoller (sculptures).

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

- Vice Mayor Derwin attended a HEART meeting and a housing conference.

Councilmember Richards:

(d) Architectural and Site Control Commission (ASCC)

- During their meeting on October 10, 2011, ASCC members questioned why they hadn't been given an opportunity to review and comment on the C-1 Trail landscaping plan.
- Resident Linda Yates voiced concerns about driveway improvements at the October 24, 2011 ASCC meeting, and asked whether the Town should consider requiring more up-to-date, environmentally friendly materials.

- Also at the October 24, 2011 meeting, ASCC conducted a preliminary architectural review of a request for approval of plans for additions to and repair/remodeling of the existing historic Superintendent's House and Office and other site improvements at the Lauriston-Willowbrook Farm. The applicant is working with an architect who specializes in historic structures.

(e) Conservation Committee

- Members discussed the C-1 Trail at the Committee meeting on October 25, 2011.
- Judith Murphy is lined up to serve as the Committee's new chair.

Councilmember Wengert:

(f) Bicycle, Pedestrian & Traffic Safety Committee

- Although it wasn't a Committee meeting. Mayor Driscoll and Councilmember Wengert had an informal get-together with nearly two dozen local bicycling team leaders, and reported a positive discussion about the bicyclists' concerns, issues, and ideas. Police Commissioner Ed Davis and San Mateo County Sheriff Greg Munks also took part.
- Earlier in the Council meeting, when Item 8 discussion began, Mayor Driscoll noted that 19 applications for membership on the reorganized and renamed Bicycle, Pedestrian & Traffic Safety Committee had been submitted.

(g) Planning Commission

- At its October 19, 2011 meeting, the Planning Commission discussed the project on Santa Maria Avenue for which the applicant is requesting a deviation that would allow replacing a deteriorating carport with a two-car attached garage and increasing the living area of the residence by 327 square feet with minor kitchen, bedroom and bathroom additions. The addition has been designed to meet the 25% limit for a deviation as set forth in Town Resolution 2506-2010, applicable when work is being done to increase stability of improvements on a property.

Councilmember Toben:

(d) Emergency Preparedness Committee

- The main topic at the EPC's October 13, 2011 meeting was of the current condition of the Citizens Emergency Response Preparedness Program (CERPP), which has engaged a consultant to help with public relations designed to raise awareness and thus help recruit volunteers.
- Some of Portola Valley's ham-radio geniuses – including EPC Chair Chris Raanes, Secretary Derry Kabcenell and Ray Rothrock – are doing extensive technical testing on October 29, 2011 on facilities that might be brought to bear in terms of broadcast capability in the aftermath of a disaster. They've developed a matrix defining pros and cons of six different early-alert system options, Councilmember Toben explained, noting that an AM frequency may turn out to be a better solution for this purpose rather than a previously discussed low-power FM transmitter.

- Councilmember Toben indicated that the Town has some funds set aside that can be used to its emergency prep purposes, and he's developed specifications for a consultant to help "bulk up the troops." A discussion about this is on the agenda for the Council's meeting on November 9, 2011.

(e) Parks and Recreation Committee

- Meeting on October 17, 2011, the Parks and Recreation Committee discussed the possibility of installing a skateboard ramp park on the Corte Madera Elementary School campus. Councilmember Toben noted that resident Patrick Sullivan and other proponents have some serious outreach still to do, because the subject hasn't been broached yet with Portola Valley School District Superintendent Tim Hanretty. Ms. Sloan said that she'd research liability issues.
- It appears that there may be a window of opportunity to obtain on-again, off-again grant money for the Ford Field renovation. The plan is to complete renovations in time for the spring 2013 season. Councilmember Toben said that as with the Town Center project, when he and Mayor Driscoll were embedded in the fundraising team, the Council needs an embedded presence in the Ford Field fundraising effort.

(f) SFO Airport/Community Roundtable

- An Airport Roundtable Committee meeting is scheduled for November 7, 2011.
- Councilmember Toben said that he's working on drafting a letter to U.S. Representative Anna Eshoo asking for her involvement with respect to sharing information from the FAA.

Mayor Driscoll:

(g) Trails and Paths Committee

- Equestrians are requesting equestrian crossings with appropriate signage. One is at the base of Hayfields Road where it meets Portola Road, and another in the vicinity where Sausal and Hillbrook Drives meet Alpine Road.
- Mayor Driscoll said that Public Works Director Howard Young has created a plan to build a platform at road level where Hayfields and Portola Roads intersect, where there's good visibility, but he's reluctant to make a formal equestrian crossing there for liability reasons.
- A signage alternative that Mayor Driscoll said that equestrian members of the Committee seemed to like would be posting CalTrans-standard signs at the entrances to Town that say something such as, "Horse-Friendly Community – Be Cautious."

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS [10:00 p.m.]

(12) Town Council October 7, 2011 Weekly Digest – None

(13) Town Council October 14, 2011 Weekly Digest 165

- a) #1 – Memorandum to Town Council from Leslie Lambert regarding Architectural & Site Control Commission Recruitment – October 13, 2011

ASCC member Jeff Aalfs will leave his ASCC post when he begins his term as a Councilmember in December 2012, and Jeff Clark's term expires at the end of that month. To date, Ms. Howard said, Mr. Clark has expressed interest but no other candidates have yet come forward. She noted that in addition to normal outreach on the Town website and via PV Forum, recruiting ads have appeared in the *Almanac*. With only two more Council meetings expected before year-end, the October 28, 2011 deadline will be extended to the end of November 2011 and interviews conducted in January 2012.

b) #2 – Mailing to all Portola Valley residents regarding Sudden Oak Death

Mayor Driscoll indicated reading that an alarming 70% of SOD testing in Portola Valley is positive, up from a 26% average over the 2008-2010 period. According to an October 21, 2011 *Almanac* article, the 2011 results, posted on UC-Berkeley's Forest Pathology and Mycology Lab website, showed that 242 of the 344 samples gathered in Woodside and Portola Valley tested positive for the disease.

(14) Town Council October 21, 2011 Weekly Digest – None

a) #3 – E-mail from Howard Young to Sonia Dhillon-Marty regarding final signoff on the permit – October 14, 2011

ADJOURNMENT [10:08 p.m.]

---

Mayor

---

Town Clerk