

AD HOC AFFORDABLE HOUSING COMMITTEE MEETING, TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY, APRIL 16, 2013,  
SCHOOLHOUSE, TOWN CENTER, 765 PORTOLA ROAD, PORTOLA VALLEY, CA 94028

Present: Steve Toben, Chair  
Susan Dworak  
Bud Eisberg  
Wanda Ginner  
Judith Hasko  
Judith Murphy  
Jon Myers  
Andrew Pierce  
Onnolee Trapp  
Carter Warr

Absent: None

Others: Nick Pegueros, Town Manager  
Karen Kristiansson, Principal Planner

(1) Call to Order [7:00 p.m.]

Chair Toben welcomed the Committee and community members to the Affordable Housing Ad Hoc meeting, moved Item 6 up on the agenda, to follow Item 3, and asked for a motion to add an urgency item related to a request from Julia Dillingham of the *PV Post* for an update from this Committee. He suggested the Neighborhood Outreach subcommittee be tasked with doing a short article summarizing the Committee's process so far. The article is due April 19, 2013.

Ms. Ginner moved to add the urgency item to the agenda. Seconded by Ms. Murphy, the motion carried 9-0. The urgency item was approved for addition to the agenda as Item 7.

(2) Oral Communications

None

(3) Approval of Minutes: Ad Hoc Affordable Housing Committee Meeting Minutes of March 19, 2013

Mr. Eisberg moved to approve the minutes. Seconded by Ms. Trapp, the motion carried 9-0.

Community Meetings Update

Chair Toben: said he'd ask Ms. Dworak to write up some observations about the community outreach events, and while Mr. Pegueros provided a synopsis of the comments generated as a result of the several community meetings, he would love to hear the subcommittee's top-level observations and impressions of those meetings.

Ms. Trapp said they got off to a slow start, perhaps because people weren't terribly aware of what was going on. Three residents, in addition to the three subcommittee members, attended. It picked up a little bit at the next meeting and by the third meeting, we really had quite a good discussion. Each meeting was quite different from any other. They discussed Blue Oaks, and had very good discussions about second units. We ranged into other properties that could possibly be used for affordable housing, such as the Woods property that the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (MROSD) was given, because they don't know have a plan for it yet.

They heard differences of opinion about the second units. Although many people don't want more than one house on a one-acre lot, others didn't think that would be a problem and could be dealt with case-by-case. Creating second units by sectioning off part of a house was quite uniformly acceptable. We looked

at the possibilities of larger second units. The process for creating second units, which could possibly be further streamlined, has been put together quite nicely in a booklet the Town provides.

Ms. Murphy said the subcommittee hosted four large community meetings plus one at The Sequoias. Attendance was pathetically low, and people spent a lot of time expressing enormous mistrust of the process, concerns about how the Council had handled things previously, fears that things were going on behind closed doors, and that the Ad Hoc Affordable Housing Committee is just a sham operation.

It was often hard to move the discussion from that point to the fact that we're having these meetings precisely so that won't happen, that we were here to gather information and hear options and suggestions so we can have a larger and more creative process going forward. It was both disappointing and frustrating, but it's something the Committee needs to hear and take seriously. There is a great deal of concern from the community that it's not going to be done in a way where they have input. Somehow the input should be significant and yet we had meetings where not many people came, so we're in a dilemma there. It's important to proceed with great transparency and probably more interaction with the community than originally planned, in various ways at various levels.

A lot of fears were expressed, the most extreme being we're trying to turn Portola Valley into tenements. Others views were more moderate, but there's a lot of fear about what might happen in terms of density, who would occupy the housing and who would have control over it once it gets going. So there are a lot of fears that need to be addressed.

There was overwhelming support for second units. People have various concerns about them, but most consider that the obvious way to go. Second units could help solve the problem, but we'd probably have to change Town rules about them to a certain extent. Suggestions included changing zoning laws and size restrictions and interpreting setback rules more generously to make second units possible where they haven't been possible before.

Residents have a lot of second units hidden in the bushes and we need to bring them out to be part of the process. There must be a way for people to keep their little second units that already exist, and have them evaluated in a way that's private, confidential, etc., so that if a unit doesn't meet zoning laws they get into trouble. They wouldn't want to offer their second unit to help count toward meeting the Town's housing need and then have the Town come down on them or having to spend \$250,000 ramping their unit up to be a viable second unit. We need a process for people to put their toe in the water without jumping in the pool.

There were several novel ideas. With concerns about losing control providing affordable housing with tax money, they talked about doing it with a private entity or for a nonprofit where we didn't have to answer to so many agencies upstream, with so many rules and so many ways to lose local control. They suggested taking a broader look at where it might be done.

A lot of people stressed that affordable housing should be broken up, not all concentrated in one place. Having the eight units we've talked about spread out to two locations, four and four, would be much more palatable to the community. There was a lot of concern that we not reproduce the kind of animosity that there was around Natthorst and use a charrette process, as we did with Town Center. That methodology worked and at some point we should do something similar to engage and involve more people.

Ms. Dworak said Mr. Pegueros did a terrific job summarizing all the comments and organizing them by date and meeting locations. Anyone reading those comments could get a comprehensive view of what the folks in the community are saying. It would be difficult to state specifics, but the meetings definitely had some common denominators – second units, distrust and anger, a lot of venting. Ms. Kristiansson and Mr. Pegueros did a terrific job finalizing the script and streamlining the process. Ms. Trapp did a terrific job facilitating to keep everyone onboard, on the same train, heading in the same direction. The meetings went as well as they could have. We reached as many people in as many different ways as we possibly could have. We gave them a number of different means to participate. They could attend meetings or not. They could go online and look at information. They could email information. Phone numbers were provided. We even put together comment cards that were available not only online, but also through

emails that were sent and through the website. Folks could go into the Town Hall physically to complete the cards. Contact information was optional, so if they wanted to, they could reply anonymously. We gave folks a wealth of opportunity to reply.

Even with that said, and as great a job that Ms. Kristiansson and Mr. Pegueros did in providing information, people still want more information. They need additional details. They are looking for further clarity on issues. Not only for the current planning period, but moving forward for the next planning period. They want to look back and see what happened in the past so that we don't repeat the mistakes.

The number one common denominator was the timeline. People really felt rushed to get input and to put all of this together. Unfortunately, some of the common denominators were the sense of distrust from the past, for the future, that the Ad Hoc Affordable Housing Committee was formed just as a matter of process and not really as function. We were joined together and then divided and we were just going through the motions and we really weren't going to have an effect. Some community members felt that there was some predetermined agenda and no matter what they said it wouldn't have an impact. That could be one of the reasons folks aren't coming forward and speaking; they feel their voices won't be heard. The net was cast far and wide and we collected a number of unfortunately negative comments, but also some positive comments that will help the Town move forward.

Bud Eisberg said that in retrospect he wished we'd have sent out a Town mailer. No one's sure how many people or what percentage of residents are on the PV Forum. Aside from announcing the meetings, if we do reach out with any kind of communication, it should include some agenda items for people to respond to, hard questions. That would generate interest.

Ms. Ginner got the whole Town notice in the Alpine Hills newsletter, which hit 700 member families. I don't know how many of those are in Portola Valley, because there are some members in Woodside, Menlo Park and Palo Alto, but it's a large number. Do we have 1,500 houses in Portola Valley?

Chair Toben: 1,700 properties, roughly.

Mr. Eisberg said the meeting at Alpine Hills Tennis & Swim Club was the one was the best attended, aside from The Sequoias.

Ms. Trapp said two or three members of the youth committee came and left after five minutes.

Ms. Ginner said she heard concern about how much notice about this kind of process was getting out because I was watching on the PV Forum all the flap over the Priory turf versus grass, and from what I gather that's been a two-year process and there are people complaining now? Something else they just went through, the town went through the process, and at the end people say, "That's a really bad idea." And I hadn't heard about it. I don't know how you get to them, but there needs to be a way. Loudspeakers all through Town? A car driving around with loudspeakers? I'm being facetious but so many people that I know aren't paying a lot of attention, unless it's about schools and they have kids in school, or traffic lights, or something like that. There must be a way to reach more of them.

Chair Toben asked about reactions from other community members to the process that has been described by the subcommittee, and especially the comments that Mr. Pegueros put together.

Ms. Hasko said she wasn't attending those meetings, but my own reaction was they were useful, and we thank you for doing that. You put a lot of thought into it. The way it came over that maybe it wasn't well attended, but the people who were there were giving comments and they ran the gamut. Some were repeat comments. At this point I am starting to get a better general sensitivity, and I think that's step one. I personally think it was a great precept for our subcommittee, which is looking at the different ways of meeting the numbers. It's starting to help us form some context to make our presentation.

Mr. Warr had similar comments. I really appreciated it. I think it clarifies what we should focus on. Some good ideas came out of it. I also think there's probably some outreach ideas. I like the concept of the charrette, but it's complicated to organize. I participated in the organization of the charrette for the Town Center,

which took months of organization to get squared away. The planning is probably the most important part of that.

Another thing I've heard since then from people in Town is, "I don't have time to come to the meetings. Could you formulate concepts and ideas that we could respond to in a survey?" Not to say this would supplant this kind of meetings, but I think there's more interest than attention and maybe we could use a survey mechanism to get to those people who don't have the time or inclination but are concerned and are a part of the constituency that cares about what's going on.

Formulating surveys is complex and I have no expertise at all in that, but it might be a way to engage more people. Considering the small minority we're hearing from, I think we'd like to confirm the simpler things that are coming out of the meetings, to see whether they resonate with the majority. With a survey we would use the information we have to generate responses that indicate whether what we've heard has broad-based support.

Chair Toben asked whether any Committee members are survey design experts or know anyone in Town who's adept at this type of survey development

Mr. Pierce said that's the key, asking the questions properly.

Ms. Ginner said she she's taken monthly surveys and they rarely captured all of them. I invariably find that half the questions don't pertain to me. Has anyone looked at the feasibility and cost of videotaping these meetings and then posting that video on the Town website?

Mr. Pegueros said that typically his experience has been it can be expensive if you don't invest in fixed cameras and the infrastructure necessary to record the meetings. You need somebody to be present to video record the meetings. That can cost upward of \$200 to \$300 a meeting. And there's the issue of Internet bandwidth and the ability for people to watch it from their house because the video could be such a large file. There are ways to address those issues but they're not cheap.

Ms. Murphy said that the town should consider taking Ms. Kristiansson's presentation, covering the history and the facts, and honing it to make it more inclusive and more concise at the same time, resulting in a final product that's very educational and very valuable. That would be lovely.

Ms. Hasko said that's what a lot of people want – the short story, the short version. That might help people understand the issue or at least get accurate information about what we're doing.

Ms. Murphy said it could be a mailing. The Council's looking to see what we'll do as next steps. We could start by providing Ms. Kristiansson's presentation so that they have all of the facts and they say there are going to be "x" number of meetings, send your input, so that everybody has a notice about what's going on.

Mr. Pegueros asked whether Ms. Murphy was suggesting mailing out Ms. Kristiansson's Affordable Housing Community Meeting Presentation (red page 47 in the Committee's April 16, 2013 agenda packet) to the community. Ms. Murphy confirmed that was the document to which she was referring.

Mr. Eisberg said any communication needs a hook to get people interested. In terms of criteria, he's been thinking that whatever the Council does, it should look at solutions that require participation of all parts of Town, all neighborhoods, all subdivisions. In other words, get people thinking, "This is not my problem, but we all share in the solution that we're trying to do." Somehow get people thinking in that direction.

Chair Toben asked for comments from the audience.

Bernie Bayuk said that coming down the Westridge Hill to Alpine Road, there's usually an announcement on the fence and I think that approach would get the most exposure. Every neighborhood has some intersection where you have to turn. I'd recommend that a survey be made of such points where from the car it's right

there. "Important! Affordable Housing Meeting Tonight, 4/16." Something like that. You see it. It's right there in front of you.

Mr. Myers attended only the first meeting, but after some clarification from the Town Council at its March 27, 2013 meeting, he wanted to understand how subsequent meetings went. It sounds as if the others were far more valuable. Ms. Murphy said there are really two issues, and maybe this is something we'll get into, but there's a conceptual discussion about affordable housing, but very concrete things are being discussed at the same time – Blue Oaks and the money from the sale of that land. When we're trying to just talk about the conceptual, we're constantly mixing in other issues and it gets confusing.

Ms. Murphy found a lot of it a little bit confusing. We felt as if we had a pretty clear mandate to go out and work on values clarification and get input to help us design a mission statement. It was at that level that we were dealing. We said repeatedly we're not here to solve the problems but to get people's ideas, what they want, what would be the ideal. Then at the Council meeting, they saw that what we'd designed was very much, "This isn't the time to go into specifics."

And then there really was pretty much a directive from the Council to help solve the problem of these eight units that need to be built. We're committed to build these units, where do we do it, how do we best do it, etc. I don't think we had heard that before, or maybe it got buried, but we had a design we were committed to doing.

Ms. Trapp said those things came up anyway, like Blue Oaks. The questions changed and Ms. Kristiansson rearranged the script so it was quite clear that Blue Oaks was an issue and the housing allocations needed to be understood.

Ms. Murphy agreed, but we found these conversations all wanted to go to the specifics anyway. People would express their fears but then they wanted to talk specifically about second units and how we should do it, specific locations, how we shouldn't do it there. People weren't very interested in talking about things conceptually. They wanted to talk about not in the theoretical.

Chair Toben wasn't at the March 27, 2013 Council meeting, but in reading the minutes got the impression that Vice Mayor Wengert invited the Committee to advise the Council on what criteria should be applied to the determination for development of the eight units. That's a little different from the Council wanting this Committee us to solve the problem with the units.

Ms. Murphy said Chair Toben's language is more precise.

Ms. Trapp said at the very beginning the Committee started looking for criteria.

Chair Toben agreed that the Committee has been given a revised mandate. In addition to the original charge to articulate the mission statement and criteria for determining how the Town's affordable housing goals will be met, the Committee now is also charged with giving some criteria with respect to what the Town does with the legacy of Blue Oaks. Those eight units that were supposed to have gone up in the hills have to go somewhere else.

Mr. Eisberg said the one large issue we haven't discussed or got much information on is the economics of a situation like that. We need a good understanding of that because these units are obviously capped in at a specific selling price. We're assuming a developer may receive the land as was the case proposed for 900 Portola Road. So we have to talk about this as a group and we're going to get questions from the public about this.

Ms. Ginner asked how these eight units fit in the context of the 64 units that have been discussed.

Ms. Kristiansson said the eight units are part of the current Housing Element, and 64 is the number we're starting with for the updated Housing Element for 2014-2022.

Mr. Eisberg asked how many Committee members have held their neighborhood meetings and what is suggested going forward.

Mr. Pegueros said no one's had a neighborhood meeting yet and he hoped that as a part of this discussion, the Committee could determine whether these meetings are necessary and what their objective should be. We need to come to some agreement as to how much staff support is provided to those meetings. In the five meetings held already, we've found that people want specifics, details, and answers that really only he and Ms. Kristiansson are able to answer. Given that need, what role does staff play in the nine additional meetings?

Mr. Eisberg attended two of the community meetings and would be comfortable using the script that was in the packet – it's pretty good – and not having Mr. Pegueros or Ms. Kristiansson in attendance.

Ms. Trapp said we could use something like the cards for questions that can't be answered on the spot.

Ms. Dworak added that it would be helpful to include with the script a further summary, such as what Mr. Pegueros prepared. To use a word that Ms. Trapp used, we really had to dig for comments, because when we went out to the community, especially when we first started the meetings – and they did progressively become more streamlined – when we asked for values, people were saying, "Values about what? Values about affordable housing in general? Values about eight units? Values about 64?" And again, people were looking for more information, more detail, and more clarity. There's only so much you can do in the limited period of time in those meetings.

But if we can do a couple of things, and that is perhaps add to the materials that are on the website, put more detail. Perhaps even add the script and a summary. I'm happy to volunteer to do whatever I can to help with that administrative process. In other words, to take your summaries from the meetings, look at the common denominators and make one list. These are the comments, categories of comments that came from those meetings. And let people know that this is a continuing process. Because we did originally have a deadline of April 11 for commentary and we switched that to today, April 16. We don't want people to think that if they didn't get your comments in, we're done. This is a continuing process. We will have additional meetings.

When we have those meetings, here is the script. The summaries would be good suggestions for people to use. Here's where we've been. We've already talked about – these are the values.

Ms. Dworak said others could echo those values or go into more detail. Mr. Eisberg is right; they want to get into the economics. They want to get into the feasibility. And then the conversation starts flowering, so we can streamline with the nuances.

Mr. Warr said we can also ask them to do their homework. Refer them to the FAQs or something in advance.

Ms. Ginner compared what Ms. Dworak described to an executive summary. Everybody expects those now and I think it would be extremely helpful.

Mr. Warr said that would get people's attention. That's why actually using this kind of summation from the current meetings and turning that into some kind of a survey vehicle so that we can get confirmation of the values that seem to rank highest and things we need to continue to investigate. It may be a faster way, even a more effective way, to attend to more people.

Chair Toben said he's unsure as to how to proceed with the survey design. We're going to need to consider that carefully. Design of the questions is important. I do sense that there are some paths to follow about communication. In response to his question, Ms. Dworak agreed pull the common denominators as she'd described from Mr. Pegueros summary. Chair Toben said then maybe that could become the preamble for a survey instrument of some sort.

Ms. Murphy said that after the Council's March 27, 2013, the subcommittee deferred moving ahead with the individual neighborhood meetings until tonight, to clarify what exactly we wanted to go on at the

neighborhood meetings. Do we want to take the directive that came from Vice Mayor Wengert at the last meeting and shift what we're doing? I still don't know the answer to that question.

What does the Town want from us the most? Does the Town want us to do the values clarification and get criteria for eight units? Is that our main job? Or is our main job to work on a 2014 2022? Because specific questions come about – "Where are these going to get built? How are they going to get built?" Those questions pertain more to the eight. So do we just say we're not here to talk about that now? You ask a question about one thing and get an answer from the other box. It makes it hard to know even at a neighborhood meeting which of these things we'd talk about.

Mr. Warr said one thing that's clear from the input so far is that there's no support for a concentration of the affordable housing. Maybe that's just what we can say, that from a criteria standpoint, we don't want the units all in one place, but distributed somehow. Or that could be part of a question:

Would you support all of the units in one area and actually creating a zoning district that's distinct from the rest of the Town? Or would you want somehow these units to be distributed? And if they're distributed, how would you distribute them? Do they necessarily need to be in a farm on the scenic corridors?

One family might say, "We'd really like four little houses on our property because that matches the profile of our family. That's the way we'd like to do it. I don't want to a main house and a little-bitty guesthouse. I'd like four 1,500-square-foot houses that all add up to 6,000 square feet."

Maybe there's a way that actually does a better job of answering the broader needs of affordable housing. Another way might be for us to start developing and floating some ideas. If we essentially do this as an iterative response where we say, "We have some community input. We're going to work on ideas that may be the answer this community input and put them out there in front of everybody. That would be a hook because all of a sudden, you'd get great support or visceral reactions.

Ms. Hasko adds a question on the process. The neighborhood meetings, to me, were intended to draw neighbors into a small setting to help them feel more comfortable making comments. I'm not so sure it would happen that way, and wonder if it makes sense to keep on the goal that if we have increasing attendance at the community meetings. Now that people are a little bit more engaged and we're getting some good feedback, should we have four or five larger meetings at the church, or maybe at a school?

Mr. Warr said with the new format, we actually have things for people to respond to. We can say, "We sent out some feelers and got some direction and here are a couple of different ideas." Then people will show up.

Ms. Murphy would defer the next cycle the meetings until some of other subcommittees have done more on their projects so we can discuss those things as well.

Ms. Trapp said if we're thinking of setting up meetings throwing out the hope of talking about where to put the eight units, people would focus on that and not look at the other things. We need a way to get the other kinds of input that the Town Council needs to go ahead with the next Housing Element.

Ms. Murphy said that as people discuss those eight units, their values would become very clear, so we could get to the larger issues by talking about it.

Ms. Trapp said that unfortunately when people focus very strongly on a situation with which they have had some amount of unhappiness and they're looking how to do something, they're not necessarily thinking of other ways to do other things. They want to know what to do about the eight Blue Oaks units.

Mr. Warr said if you figure out a pattern with how to deal with eight units, as Ms. Murphy suggested, you might find the pattern for how to deal with more. And if you find a way that gets broad-based support for the eight, that could become a way to respond to the bigger picture.

There are things here that I found interesting out of the list, actually coming back to some of the commercial or institutional properties and focusing on answering their needs, potentially on their own facilities.

Chair Toben said that to the extent possible, the Committee would be best served by sticking to the scaffolding that the Council has put before us. So that when we go to our communities, our neighborhoods, the conversation should be organized around this notion of values, and within the broad housing program we have, what values criteria we should consider – specifically with respect to our multi-family obligation that we attempted to deal with in this current planning period. What criteria should be considered for the legacy of Blue Oaks? The word “criteria” is really important. That’s the Council’s agenda. That’s what we need to deal with, what we’ve been told to articulate. But it’s going to require very clear articulation of the agenda for these meetings and some very thoughtful and energetic meeting management to keep the frame in place.

Ms. Ginner asked Chair Toben whether he’s using the terms “multi-family” and “affordable housing” interchangeably?

Chair Toben said no, he’s using “multi-family” the way our Housing Element does – one parcel with multiple units.

Ms. Kristiansson said it doesn’t have to be one building with eight units. You can do it different ways – duplexes, triplexes, that sort of thing.

Ms. Ginner asked whether it has to be low-income housing?

Ms. Kristiansson said we’re discussing moderate-income housing.

Mr. Warr said that second units in particular are below market rate (BMR), essentially by size. There isn’t a control requirement and I think that might be part of the criteria you could end up with, and then be able to make a market rate or self-selecting solution that because of the size limitations, you don’t have involve the government, because it becomes much more complicated once the government enters the picture.

Mr. Wells pointed out one thing that seems to be missing. He attended the Council meeting where Vice Mayor Wengert postulated that we had to spend the Blue Oaks money on eight BMR units. That is totally incorrect. Mr. Pegueros was very helpful and provided documentation. From the 1990 Housing Element forward, the end result of the wonderful invention of the inclusionary housing fees for subdivisions and lot splits was for the money to go into the in-lieu fund to be used to support affordable housing.

Nothing about building anything – medium, large or what-have-you. Following the parallel track, we went through the exercise of requiring Blue Oaks to set aside two big lots, which were cut into eight little lots for BMR housing. They couldn’t do it. They tried to get a developer to do it. The Council went through all the Stations of the Cross, and none of those documents postulates or even implies that the Town has to spend the proceeds from the sale of Blue Oaks back to the property owners association. Nothing in that whole lifetime of the all of various Housing Elements, nothing postulates that the Town must spend the Blue Oaks money on eight units. Actually, the Town took the money and put it into the in-lieu fund. I don’t know where that stands now; maybe Mr. Pegueros knows the total amount. But even if the Council, when it deposited that money in the in-lieu fund, claimed that it could only be used for eight units someplace in a cluster, which is what it seemed to be – there’s nothing, absolutely nothing to prevent them from undoing it if they did it.

I read all 48 pages of the agenda packet and it’s lacking in the specific information this Committee needs on the difference is between an affordable housing unit on its own lot and second units that are sponsored and supported by the property owner. There’s a big difference in how those play out, and I think you ought to go back to Ms. Kristiansson and ask her to bring up exactly where these marginal levels fit in affordable-housing income ranges. How much is there for housing and do the economics of what people are making here. That hasn’t been done. There’s nothing anywhere near specific enough to have people know the difference between a second unit and a BMR.



Mr. Pierce said he thinks the Committee is being asked to do two things. Originally we were asked to do one thing, which was, as I understood it, to assist in the early stages of development of the General Plan amendments for the next eight years and making sure we don't run afoul of the requirements for our Housing Element. And get a few people, including members of this group, how to do that.

There's a whole other issue with what to do with "x" amount of dollars from Blue Oaks. That's the Town Council's problem. It really is. I don't think we signed on to take care of that. That's not how I understood it. And if they want to get public input on that, then really that's a Town event. They've had events that I've been to where everybody's vented opinions in one form or another. But for us to go out and talk to people about both of those issues at the same time does not seem to me to make sense. It has to be one or the other. There is a difference between the 64 units and how we plan for those units and what are we going to do with the money that would only account for one-eighth of that anyway if you spent it on eight units. You could spend it in a different way but that's a completely different issue, which the Council created for itself over the multi-year period, I don't know that it's our job to figure out what to do with that money. If it is, we ought to do that instead of working on the General Plan. Those are two completely different things. They tie together obviously in some way, but the intersection is not as big as it might be.

Chair Toben said we have a request from the Council to add this issue to our mandate, and I think it's fair to respond that the original assignment is big enough and we may not be able to accomplish resolution on all of these issues. And still we do have that before us, so I'll think about how we can address it.

Mr. Pierce added that his point is not that we should say we can't do this. My point is I don't think we can do public meetings with an ever-changing mandate. I don't think we can do public meetings on the Blue Oaks money, because that's been discussed to death, and it will be discussed long after this Committee is over with. We're not going to resolve that, so I'm not interested in having a meeting in which people talk about something that's going to go on for the next two years.

Mr. Warr said he's wondering if the process of helping the Town develop criteria to deal with the Blue Oaks money might help lead us to the criteria of dealing with all of it.

Chair Toben said that's a reasonable supposition.

Mr. Warr added, that isn't what the charge is, but as a Committee we could decide that's a good way to deal with it. Or not deal with the eight units right now but then make a recommendation as the report comes out suggesting that the Council think about using this as the way to deal with the current situation.

Mr. Eisberg said that in terms of the eight units, there may be some time pressure due to the fact they have to be answered for in the current Housing Element. It could go on for more years, but there still has to be some sort of answer.

Chair Toben said we have a good list to work with in terms of planning the next steps, and he'll work with staff based on these comments to try to define some ideas for further outreach and get back to you.

(4) Roundtable Discussion [7:59 p.m.]

Chair Toben said Mr. Pegueros would lead the discussion. Chair Toben's only offering at the front end is just an observation that this process has really taxed our staff resource substantially. It's all been useful, in my opinion. What I observed in the product from Mr. Pegueros and Ms. Kristiansson – both the meeting notes and the bin list – this is a step forward in terms of Committee understanding about what's entailed. This is a complex problem. At the same time, it's fair to say that the Council hadn't anticipated that this would be quite so involved or be quite so costly. And there's an opportunity cost as well. The Town Manager has a very substantial number of responsibilities and we're in budget season, so there's not a lot of headroom, I suspect. He's not complaining, I can assure you, but my observation as a veteran of this Town's business is that we have to be mindful of how much more we can ask our staff to shoulder, both from the standpoint of protecting taxpayer dollars and the human resources

(4a) Committee Charter      (4b) Town Council's clarification of deliverables provided on March 27, 2013

Mr. Pegueros said we've already started talking about the process quite a bit. The agenda packet includes a copy of the Charter, just as a reminder of what the Council has asked us to do; in the event the Committee wants to refer back to it. It has three very distinct functions and we've talked about them extensively, but I do want to talk a little about what the Council discussed at its meeting on March 27, 2013. As was mentioned earlier, Vice Mayor Wengert offered some clarification or more specific direction to the Committee, in part because there was some concern that we were working in the clouds and that wasn't necessarily where the Committee wanted to be. What occurred at the meeting – and the meeting minutes are in the packet as well – was Vice Mayor Wengert asked the Committee to consider two things (page 22). She said, "Perhaps we can redirect the Committee to helping us (the Council) define the criteria for finding that location" – that location being where to build the eight units from Blue Oaks. Her second issue (page 22, bullet point 2) was to identify new ways to encourage second units. So those were two clarifications or perhaps additional burdens that were placed at that meeting.

I think the Council is expecting, or would like, some feedback on where the Committee wants to go with relationship to the original charter and this additional clarification we've already discussed to some extent. Just for good measure, I asked Mayor Richards to put an item on the next Council meeting agenda (April 24, 2013) for me to report back on what happens tonight. So I'm looking to the Committee for some feedback as to how the process should move forward and the how much time you envision you'll need to achieve those goals or to get to where you'd like to be.

Ms. Ginner said that part of her confusion about the eight units versus the 64 was the Town Council's discussion about eight moderate-income units. It didn't say multi-family, and what I think I'm hearing is they have to be multi-family.

Ms. Kristiansson said they don't have to be multi-family. The original intention at Blue Oaks was going to be four duplexes but they do not necessarily have to be multi-family.

Ms. Ginner had a question about whether new ways of encouraging second units is something that must be done before the Town Council to start updating the Housing Element? Or could the Committee work on that following the current rush to get a report to the Town Council by June 12, 2013?

Ms. Kristiansson said a number of ideas pertaining to second units are already in the Housing Element and the Council's intent probably was to get some feedback from the Committee as to which ones should be analyzed in more detail in moving forward into the Housing Element process. It's not necessarily for the Committee to say, "Definitely do X, Y and Z," but maybe, "You might want to look more into X, Y and Z, but don't even bother with A or B."

Ms. Ginner said it sounds like one more load that's making it look increasingly impossible.

Mr. Warr said it's dangerous when we start trying to look at all the available sites and try to figure out where the Town should go. It's a charge that we could do, but I think it's different.

Ms. Murphy said something that could be very valuable is if the Committee, with help, creates a map of the potential sites, because there's a lot of confusion about even "potential." I don't think we should choose one absolutely, or even prioritize them, but where could they possibly go? What are the options? All the way from clustered to not clustered, because then people have something concrete to react to.

Ms. Trapp said it could go with a zoning map so people really have a clear idea of what already exists in the Town.

Ms. Ginner said but if you're start talking about the Stanford Wedge or Pony Tracks Ranch, those belong to somebody else. How could you put them on a map as possible?

Mr. Toben said that's what Zoning does. We're all subject to whatever zoning applies to our area.

Ms. Ginner asked, so they could carve some acres from Pony Tracks Ranch and create an after-the-fact zoning district?

Mr. Warr said he thinks we need to tell the Council that finding where their eight units should go and how it should go, is premature. If our charge really is about establishing criteria based on the values of the Town, we need to:

- 1) Develop the values of the Town and then what the potential solutions are to answer those
- 2) Go through one or two or several feedback cycles with the community, saying these are the things that we think we could potentially do to answer these values.
- 3) Cobble that together that together as our set of recommendations

There might be a secondary charge, to go out and find the right site that meets the criteria. Jumping in right now to where should those eight units should be – on one end you could presuppose that all eight units have to be together, or you could say the Town should take \$42,000 per second unit and provide a subsidy for the next 10 years to every second unit that happens, and that would be the way to make sure that second units happen, rather than doing it all in one place.

Ms. Ginner said that's what she thought was in bullet point #2.

Mr. Warr said he thinks there's a mixture, but we should actually attend to the basic wishes of the Town first; think before we tell them how to spend the money.

Ms. Ginner asked whether that's something that could be done later.

Mr. Warr considers second units part of the criteria. Another is to distribute them. He thinks we'll probably come up with ways to congregate units together. What does congregation mean? Does it mean a maximum of two or four units per acre? Or a maximum of 17 or 20 units per acre? Arriving at the criteria is important before we even try to attend to this.

Then if the Council comes back and says, "You should attend to sites," as a Committee we need to say, "Stop. We can't do that yet. We can't go out and identify sites because we don't have any criteria to identify sites in the first place." If we start going out and identifying only vacant or only under-utilized sites, we might miss opportunities, some of which are actually in the suggestions, of increasing density on institutional sites, commercial sites, where there's already activity and you could overlap parking use and all kinds of things that are part of typical planning strategies.

Ms. Murphy said the map came up because at one meeting someone said the Town already owns seven parcels along Alpine Road. Why don't they just put these housing units on those seven parcels?" They were so certain this was true, that the Town owns seven small parcels along the road.

Mr. Myers said he thinks we're saying is we should come up with criteria and potentially the first application of the criteria is these eight units. But we should see our charter through and develop criteria that could apply to 40 units or 30 or eight, five years from now or six months from now – it doesn't matter. But we set criteria and then stop and say, now the next thing is to apply those criteria to the specific issue of what to do with the units.

Ms. Dworak said something they heard in all of the meetings, another common denominator, is which came first, the chicken or the egg? Are we putting the cart before the horse? I know we can put our heads together and resolve it somehow, but folks were saying we want to come up with criteria, but we don't know how to provide criteria without more information, more details, and more clarity, for example a map. We don't know how to frame our values. We need some kind of boundaries, if you will.

Summarizing the summaries will serve as examples of we're looking for – for example, “this is a criterion” or “this is a value” – because folks weren't able to do that without seeking more detail and venting and whatnot.

I would like Ms. Kristiansson to clarify something else that kept coming up in meetings about the eight units. People asked whether we have to necessarily build them. I believe you said no, we don't have to build. Hypothetically, if two new second units come over the horizon in the near future, those two could be considered part of the eight and then would we just have to find six? If you could clarify that here and in the FAQ's, that would be helpful.

Ms. Kristiansson said second units are difficult because we already have a second-unit program. But I think there are other options that were talked about. Certainly housing in the Sequoias, if there could be something worked out –

Chair Toben said the broader question he heard is whether the Town has to see to the accomplishment of construction of units. My understanding is the Town is obligated to plan for and encourage the development of housing at the levels dictated by the original Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), and I see that as the extent of our assignment.

Mr. Pierce said he doesn't know that we yet have the answer to one of the questions from the last meeting, about the constraints on what can be done with the money from Blue Oaks. It's already been transformed into money and it wasn't supposed to be money to begin with. Can we spend it on athletic fields or Town salaries? Probably not. Can we spend it on second units? Maybe. Can we spend it on encouraging additional units in certain locations? Certainly. But what are the actual constraints?

I don't think this committee is land developers. The people who do land development are a) nonprofit organizations actually do it, and b) the Town Council in closed sessions probably decides how much we are going to spend. We are not the people who will run out and buy property for the Town. What we can do is develop criteria. People tell us they absolutely don't want eight units in a small area. That's far too many – I don't necessarily agree, but if that's what we hear – so that's one criterion. We're not going to tell them where, though, because we just don't have the expertise or knowledge for that.

So I think that's how we can wrap those two things together. Tell us what the rules are about the money and then we fold it into our other task, which is having a Housing Element that doesn't get the Town in trouble and meets the requirements of the citizens.

Mr. Warr said that even dealing with the money right now is premature, because they don't have the tools yet. He thinks we should push back and tell the Council we need to focus on the criteria to accomplish the goal, without changing the character of the Town and supporting the overall broader goals of the other elements of the General Plan. Then we work through a cycle of feedback with the community to finalize and formalize the criteria. Then we encourage them to wait and understand that when developed, those criteria will be the best tool possible to know what to do for the eight units they feel obligated to do.

Ms. Hasko agreed that criteria development and prioritizing makes a lot of sense because themes started to become apparent even after the first meetings, and we'll probably see that happen more and more. In the course of that process we are getting ideas about encouraging second units, so I think that's something we can't be definitive about. We certainly can be gathering information on the way that will help develop more ways to encourage second units.

(4) Roundtable Discussion

(c) Process to achieve deliverables [8:17 p.m.]

Mr. Pegueros said that since they were unsure about where the conversation would go, he and Ms. Kristiansson drafted a possible revised work plan (distributed to each Committee member).

If we look at the April 16, 2013 meeting's discussion of process, there's a question, "Does this draft revised work plan work?" Clearly you haven't had an opportunity to look at it, but some of the other questions concern whether we should we modify it and what assignments should be given to the subcommittees.

As this draft shows, there are three meetings after tonight. One recommendation might be to talk about the Blue Oaks funds at the next meeting. After hearing it discussed I may think slightly differently now, but one idea to potentially help the Committee was for staff to do something like what Ms. Dworak suggested, and as Ms. Murphy suggested, look at all the information we've received so far, prepare a draft for some of these deliverables, provide that draft to the Committee for review and recommend changes.

Then on May 14, more specifically, discuss proposed Housing Element programs for 2014 and finalize them on the May 28. One thing I shared with the Committee in the beginning is that we have finite resources both on volunteer and staff levels, so I think this may potentially be one way we can get to the end. But again, it's the Committee's process and we're really looking for your buy-in and your construction of the process that gets you where you'd like to be.

Mr. Warr said he doesn't think we should talk about the Blue Oak funds at all, because it doesn't attend to creating criteria. It doesn't give any tools to the Council to decide if they should or should not buy property, or if they should go to The Sequoias and it really ought to answer more of the housing needs because it has land and is the biggest employer in Town besides the school district.

Cindie White said she agrees with a lot of what she's heard, but in terms of the \$3 million from Blue Oaks, she's concerned that if the Committee doesn't deal with it, the Town Council can just go off and spend it as they wish. I want to just make sure the Council realizes it's on hold and will come back to public analysis, if you determine it should be done now.

Mr. Pierce said we could float the Housing Element first with Blue Oaks nested in that, with the understanding of what can and cannot be done with the money. Doing the Housing Element first and Blue Oaks second makes more sense to me. People have said in discussing Blue Oaks we may get some ideas about criteria, but I think it also goes the other way. If we know what we want, it's a lot easier to figure out what to do with \$3 million.

Chair Toben said that seems consistent with Mr. Warr's viewpoint. So I sense the Committee is certainly moving forward, deferring the April 30, 2013 conversation about Blue Oaks to some later date, if ever.

Mr. Eisberg requested an answer to the question about whether the Blue Oaks money must be spent on those eight units.

Mr. Pegueros said most of the Bin List questions have been answered, and the answer to this one is in No. 13 of the FAQs. In the certified Housing Element, the Town committed to do certain things with Blue Oaks. One was to build there, another was to evaluate other sites and eventually sell Blue Oaks and use the proceeds to buy and build elsewhere in Town. I think the Town Council takes those commitments very seriously and arrived at the conclusion that the proceeds from the sale of Blue Oaks needed to be spent on a project in Town that results in eight units. Whether those units are at one site or scattered around – however it's done – since the 900 Portola Road discussions there have been no other discussions about how that would be achieved.

Mr. Warr asked whether that's a legal decision or what the Council wants to do.

Mr. Pegueros replied that the Housing Element responds to a legal obligation. The state has accepted that program. As part of the next Housing Element, we will be required to tell them what we did and what we plan on doing. The obligation is there and we have to fulfill it. I'm sure lawyers can argue either point, but the bottom line is there is the obligation, we made a commitment and have to account for it in this cycle. And then we have to plan on what we're going to do to accomplish it in the next cycle because we didn't accomplish it in this cycle.

Mr. Warr said he thinks there are a lot of ways to deal with that. If you had free land or access to a development opportunity, you'd be able to fund the construction of eight units at \$375,000 each with that \$3 million. One thing that's become clear to me is that we can't use that money to fund existing programs but actually use it for new units. It might be that you look at an institutional property, a commercial property, and an open-space property – other places. Or it might be in the form of finding an existing nonprofit or some other mechanism to fund construction. Having the criteria would help in evaluating the options.

Ms. Murphy said that considering the tight timeframe, even if we eliminate the Blue Oaks discussion, we need to stick to the values and criteria issues and the clarifications. Still, we'll be hard-pressed to do it in a way that includes the whole community, to do a go-around, to make sure we get feedback from everybody. Specifically, when we meet in a month, what should we all have done in the interval? What should we have accomplished so we're not going to be having the same conversation again when we come back together?

Chair Toben said we seem to be well positioned to invite wave two of community input. There is plenty of good material now that can be presented in interesting and arresting forms with hooks, to use Mr. Eisberg's term, that will sharpen the conversation a bit for purposes of a new effort at community outreach. We haven't determined precisely how we'll communicate all that, but my sense in this conversation is that maybe individual neighborhood meetings wouldn't be the most efficient or productive way to proceed. Maybe the best approach would be a couple of larger events where a compelling teaser would get folks to come and provide the kind of additional input we're looking for. Those could take place perhaps sometime in the next 30 days.

By the way, this Committee was selected in part on the assumption that you yourselves would articulate and embody and together represent diverse points of views in terms of the values. You're not just messengers, but you are the message in part.

Ms. Murphy said the Committee members have been pretty careful to be messengers. I was trying really to stay out of saying anything about what I thought or how I felt.

Chair Toben acknowledged that, but said, "At the end of the day you're going to have to take your stand. That's coming up." In fact, for the April 30, 2013 meeting we're proposing a first pass at a mission statement.

Ms. Murphy said before the larger community meetings, it would be good to have something from this subcommittee about options so people can speak out in favor of an idea or against it – something that triggers a thought, rather than doing it all in the abstract.

Whether they can meet this timeline is the other issue. I don't see how they can get together a sample program of a variety of things based on that, get it formed up and plan for a bigger meeting and have that digested in two weeks. Whoa! That's not going to happen.

Mr. Warr said the first thing is categorize the input, saying these are issues of concern and these look like potential answers. Actually go through the input and provide some potential solutions to the second-unit question and the question of how you congregate units. Deal with it as congregations or groupings associated with other uses rather than calling it multi-family housing.

I actually think people will be more responsive. Some of the community input is backlash associated with the concept of all those units being on one property and that being the only thing is I think part of the Element that is different from the Town. We have lots of different other kinds of buildings and other kinds of properties. If we look at properties that are used differently than single-family homes and differently than open space and think about those as maybe where some of that congregation might be.

Chair Toben said he didn't expect to resolve to a fine degree the final process here, but we have decent guidance from the Committee about ways to further refine the work plan for the next month and a half.

Mr. Pegueros said he's hearing the Committee needs more time to do this and honestly I don't have much time available personally. So perhaps the Committee could consider taking a recess or perhaps have another

meeting to start this distillation and categorize the input. Then take some time off to hold your meetings. When does the group envision having the public outreach meetings?

Chair Toben said sometime in the next 30 days, but that's not very helpful.

Ms. Dworak asked whether others feel the need to have neighborhood meetings. If we have cast the net far and wide and we gave people the opportunity to come in the morning, in the afternoon, in the evening, and multiple different venues and multiple different ways to respond, should we really have community meetings? Or should we make more progress on the values and the criteria and have something for folks to look at and then have either a repeat of the meetings at the same locations? Or the neighborhood meetings?

Ms. Ginner said she basically told my friends and neighbors not to talk to me about it until we had a neighborhood meeting. Is there any prohibition against my having that neighborhood meeting so I can tell them they can all come?

Chair Toben said she is most welcome to do whatever form of outreach she'd like.

Ms. Murphy said the overwhelming voice that we heard at the community meetings was people who were anti and afraid, so a lot of the criteria that came out were, "We don't want this, we don't want this." We haven't heard much of anything from people who are thinking, "This a good idea. Portola Valley needs this, and if it could be designed appropriately, we could do this or that."

So I think we've heard a lot of negative and not much positive. Maybe at the neighborhood meetings people could talk about pros and cons and positives, because there are people who think we should be doing it as opposed to people thinking we shouldn't. All we do is plan, we don't ever build. We just have to buy our way out of this. There are people who actually think we could and should do it, and they're in the woodwork somewhere.

Chair Toben said he's hearing let's not rush forward with more public meetings within the next 30 days. We have a work plan before us. We all committed to these particular dates, including the next one on April 30, where the staff has proposed to take the greatest hits from the community outreach so far and give you all something tangible. At that point, maybe you decide about the need for a further community outreach effort that's more formalized.

Is everyone clear about the value in coming back two weeks from today – put aside the Blue Oaks issue for a minute – to address the whole idea of the committee's assignment? Based on what you believed derived from the community and from yourselves, we have something related a mission statement. It's a straw man proposal. We know it won't be what we decide upon, but it gives us something to focus on.

Ms. Murphy said that if Mr. Pegueros is overwhelmed and we have progress to make, it might be wise to not meet in two weeks. Skip that one and continue to move for a month and come back with things more accomplished.

Ms. Hasko asked what would be accomplished during that month. The distillation of the comments can help us refine the community meeting agenda or survey. Our subcommittee still has some deliverables to put together and that would probably help people discuss the possibilities. And then we could reach out armed with that distilled information.

Chair Toben said we ought to proceed with our April 30 timetable for right now. We can certainly defer at that time and determine whether a break is indicated.

Ms. Ginner asked whether the criteria for assessing options means coming up with the first cut on the prioritized values for something that could be put in the Housing Element.

Ms. Trapp asked, do you mean assessing options for what the Town Council should be doing in the future?

Mr. Pegueros said yes, options for assessing future programs.

Chair Toben said we have a plan for at least the next two weeks, with a lot of homework to be done – refining and putting material together in a coherent proposal for discussion on April 30, after which point we'll assess regarding a new way of community outreach.

Mr. Warr There was discussion about what the second and third subcommittees would be doing.

Mr. Pegueros said when the Committee discussed the subcommittees, there was some confusion as what the third group would do.

Mr. Warr suggested the second and third groups meet together once the distillation of the comments comes out.

Chair Toben said it would have to be noticed as a public meeting.

Bernie Bayuk, Paloma Road, Westridge, asked whether the Committee could write an executive summary of each meeting with conclusions and recommendations and print it in the *Almanac*. That would be a way to build a following. What happened here? I've been here the whole meeting. I don't know what happened. I sat here and I couldn't write it. You've been talking about we'll do certain things. I guess those are conclusions. A report should have recommendations.

Chair Toben said the objective certainly is to let the larger segments of our community know what's going on.

(5) Wrap up and discussion of April 30, 2013 Meeting Agenda [7:42 p.m.]

Chair Toben said we need to start pulling it to a close. We have some building blocks in place for planning for the next meeting.

Mr. Myers said he feels that for the Committee to be successful tonight, we should have a defined process. If we have one, it's not clear to me. I know it's going to be in two weeks. Who is going to do what before going off and coming up with that and then sending it to us, and then eventually we get to it. I'd rather walk out and know exactly what we're all going to do for the next six weeks. The objective would be tonight just to have the process defined. I think there's still some confusion.

Chair Toben said that from what he's heard tonight, the Committee seems poised to do some significant initial drafting on mission statement, criteria and assessing options with respect to certain Housing Element programs. We've heard a lot of good comment about how to blend with the issue of the legacy of Blue Oaks. I value very much the comments you all have offered about how we can make this somewhat coherent.

So on April 30, you will be presented with a document that includes a draft mission statement, some value criteria pertaining to the diverse programs in the Housing Element, incorporating some of the commentary we've heard tonight with respect to Blue Oaks, and that would be available to this Committee for action April 30.

Ms. Murphy asked whether that's all staff work.

Chair Toben said it's largely staff work, but certainly with contributions from subcommittee 2, and any other contributions would be most welcome and much appreciated. There's been some healthy dynamic flux in this conversation tonight, which has affected the way this looks from now until June 12. Because it seems that this work plan will require significant revision, I can't answer Mr. Myers' question beyond April 30.

Mr. Myers recapped; what was planned for May 14 will be on April 30 instead, and staff will do most of the work, with whatever contributions they ask of us. This is 90% percent of the work, though; a draft of criteria would be a huge step. Wasn't that what the second group was supposed to do?



Ms. Murphy said subcommittee 2 would meet in the next week or two, taking the working plan and trying to come up with some communication summary we find helpful to understand the lay of the land and some points or outline for the Town to consider. I think we can do that.

Mr. Pegueros asked whether that would be of value to the group. Does the Committee want a subcommittee to look at the current programs, assess their success, and report back to the whole Committee?

Ms. Trapp asked whether we have enough information to do that.

Mr. Eisberg said we've talked about some of this and will talk mainly about some programs the Town can use to produce units. We have three, maybe four, and if we have any new ideas. So I think it would be fairly simple.

Mr. Myers asked whether we should do that or skip it. Whether it's helping the Town. This is a huge chunk of things. Draft a mission statement. Provide draft criteria as an option. There is a ton of work there. My question is to do that instead of just three of us coming working with the Town staff, eventually taking on some of that workload and then come back with a first pass at the criteria.

Ms. Hasko said the draft work program modification includes something to encourage second-unit production. We've talked a little bit about that, so certainly that's something you might be able to work with rather than asking you to write on a blank page. If that helps, I'd be happy to do it.

Ms. Kristiansson said she doesn't think we're starting from zero on any of these. The goals in the current Housing Element can really be a basis for a draft mission statement. In terms of the criteria, a lot of comments at the community meetings would be criteria. Ms. Dvorak said she would take a stab at pulling together a summary of points. With that, with the information from the subcommittee on the programs and with the goals in the current Housing Element, we have a good start toward what we were looking for April 30.

Chair Toben summarized. Subcommittee 2 plus Ms. Dvorak plus staff ought to be able to make a pretty good advance on this. We may not be able to get every one of these elements done, but since we've kicked back the April 30 discussion of Blue Oaks funds, we may have a little more breathing space.

(6) Questions/Concerns on Affordable Housing Submitted to Staff (the "Bin List") [8:51 p.m.]

Chair Toben, commending Mr. Pegueros for his work, asked for reactions to the Bin List.

Ms. Murphy said the FAQ puts more information out in the community, and the more information we get out to the community the better. I

Ms. Dvorak said that perhaps in response to Mr. Bayuk's comment about publicizing or publishing everything in the *Almanac*, would it perhaps be appropriate to put a big bold line somewhere in the *Almanac* informing people that detailed answers to questions about affordable housing, continuous updates, or however we want to articulate that, are available, with direct links to the website. Folks who don't use computers or don't use the website could rely on a friend to print it out, read it, or whatever. Rather than put it in physical print, why don't we just put these –

Chair Toben asked the outreach subcommittee to think more about the communication piece along the lines of Mr. Bayuk's suggestion. Certainly the *Almanac* isn't going to publish everything we've been talking about, and purchasing a link could be quite expensive. There could certainly be a modest purchase of advertising in the *Almanac*, but we have to be mindful about the budget issue.

However, there are plenty of ways to get the messages across. It can be highly refined versions. At one point, we talked about one quick message every several days on the PV Forum – kind of "greatest hits from the Ad Hoc Affordable Housing Committee." That might be one possibility.

Mr. Pierce asked whether the Committee minutes are posted on the Town website.

Chair Toben said yes.

Mr. Eisberg said a lot of the questions we heard in the meetings have been answered on the website. The question now is how to get people to read them.

Chair Toben asked, "What's the hook?" That's a question I'd certainly like the outreach committee, which is now the seasoned veteran, to follow up on.

(7) Urgency Item: PV Post Article [8:54 p.m.]

Chair Toben invited a motion delegating to the neighborhood outreach subcommittee the task of writing a short update on Committee activities for the online version of the *PV Post*, 200 words or less.

Ms. Murphy said they can do that – short, bullet points and a link.

Ms. Dworak said she'd certainly like to help, but needs to focus on summarizing the summaries and she has a short deadline for that, too.

Ms. Dworak moved to delegate writing the PV Post article to Judy Murphy and Onnolee Trapp. Seconded by Mr. Myers, the motion carried 9 to 0.

(8) Adjournment [8:57 p.m.]