

AD-HOC AFFORDABLE HOUSING COMMITTEE MEETING, TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY, MARCH 5, 2013,
SCHOOLHOUSE, TOWN CENTER, 765 PORTOLA ROAD, PORTOLA VALLEY, CA 94028

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

Absent: Judith Murphy
Andrew Pierce

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

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

Steve Toben: He welcomed everyone to this historic first meeting of the Ad Hoc Affordable Housing Committee and explained that he'd be scoping the work of this Committee. On behalf of the Town, he expressed gratitude for everyone's interest in this topic and their willingness to invest intellectual capital and time in helping the Town move forward on affordable housing. It's been much in the news over the last year. The Committee has a clear assignment from the Town Council that we can deliver good value on. Having read the applications to serve on the Committee, he said it's a stellar group, with richness of experience in our Town and obvious interest in the well-being of our community.

This is a Brown Act governed process, and Mr. Pegueros will give a quick primer on the obligations of conducting our business in the public forum. Part of the Brown Act's requirements are that we provide time at the beginning of every meeting to give any member of the audience a chance to speak, preferably on a topic that's not on the agenda. So, I'd open up the meeting at this moment and invite anyone who is in the audience to comment on anything that may be on their minds.

No public comment was taken.

(2) Oral Communications

None.

(3) Opening Remarks [7:03 p.m.]

Mr. Toben: He said that after hearing from each Committee member's interest in this work and where they see it going, they would review the orientation memorandum with Mr. Pegueros, and then discuss the Committee's charter. The main objectives of that document are the mandate the Committee is expected to deliver on.

He introduced Mark Moulton, Executive Director of Housing Endowment and Regional Trust (HEART) and the Housing Leadership Council (HLC) of San Mateo County. He's one of the pillars of our County in terms of his advocacy for affordable housing, and will give the Committee a 30,000-foot overview of this topic. After that, we'll get to a finer examination of the issues as they pertain to Portola Valley.

Mr. Pegueros will report on the results of a Town survey conducted to try to assess the level of demand or interest in affordable housing in our community. At that point we'll talk about three

different subcommittees that will go forward after this meeting and undertake some assignments before our next meeting.

We'll certainly have some conversation about the March 19th agenda, when we'll focus on some of the programs currently in our Housing Element and think about what may lie ahead. That will be the point in the evening when I will invite people to raise what I call "bin issues." If you think particular issues need to be addressed and require additional research in between our meetings, that will be the time when we will put all those in the bin and dole out assignments to, for example, Ms. Kristiansson or Mr. Pegueros, who in turn will follow up. We'll talk about bin issues in Item 9 on the agenda. If there are questions that can be answered on the spot, we'll do that efficiently during the course of this meeting.

Now we'd like Committee members to tell us about your participation in this process, how long you've been in Portola Valley and anything you'd like to divulge about your household. We'd like to hear why you agreed to serve on this Committee – your personal interest in this Committee's work. And then, putting on your cap as a representative of the citizenry of Portola Valley, articulate one concern or one interest that you believe the residents in our community have, with respect to the domain of Portola Valley.

Many of you will instantly think of several concerns, several interests that might surround this issue, but I am confident that when we go around the circle, a lot of those will surface. Let's start with Carter here.

(4) Group introductions and sharing of concerns and interests on affordable housing [7:08 p.m.]

Carter Warr I'm Carter Warr, a local architect. This is my third month, after 21 years, of not being on the ASCC. My wife and my daughter and I have been here for 25 years. I'm on the Committee because (Mayor) John Richards arm-wrestled me into doing it. And I'm principally here because I care about the Town and one of the reasons we're all here; the rural character and visually what affordable housing means to the Town. Give the town the opportunity to understand the state mandates and what that means to us.

Onnolee Trapp: We moved to Portola Valley in 1968 and to The Sequoias about 12 years ago. I'm fairly active there. We raised our family in Portola Valley, attended the schools here, and over the years observed how the Town has changed, in different ways. The Sequoias cannot provide any more affordable housing, but it's important that we make provisions or somehow improve diversity, both in housing and ethnic backgrounds, of people in Portola Valley. When our kids were in school, there was still a shortage of diversity in my point of view. We moved here from Baltimore and our third grader came home from school one day and he said, "Mom, where are all the black kids?" It was a revelation to us that we had walked into something where diversity was not part of the equation. It's been a concern of mine for a long time.

Wanda Ginner: I'm a CPA, so with any issue, I start looking at the dollar signs involved. I think I volunteered to be on this Committee because I have a logical, concise and methodical mind that likes to look at all the parts of something and comes up with a solution that makes sense. I live in a part of Town where some people have been there for 50 or 60 years, but we also have \$4 and \$5 and \$6 and \$7 million houses nearby – in fact one of them abuts our property, one is a half a block away and another is two blocks away. And that's nice, but I don't think that's everything we need.

I'm a member of Alpine Hills, so I've heard much from people there, and from my neighbors. Everybody wants to know what side I'm on. I didn't know there were sides. Apparently I'm going to find out. I'm here to find out what kind of solutions people have to keep the wildlife, open space, greenery, people, and the houses all compatible and comfortable. It's not going to be any of my ideas, it's going to be mine and everyone else's.

Judith Hasko: My husband and I moved here in 2005 because we love the area. We're avid outdoor people and we felt that this was a place we could make a home. We have two dogs, three birds, and a couple of

horses that we keep in the area, because we're out all the time, keeping everybody happy. We imported my mother in law from England to The Sequoias, so we also have a view of the community from that perspective as well.

A couple of years ago I started to volunteer time to the community because I admire what we've built in Portola Valley. I joined the Trails and Paths Committee. I'm a lawyer by training and have a logical view, I look at balancing of interests. In terms of what we hope to draft, what Ms. Trapp said about diversity resonated with me. I think of it more as how we balance various interests. If we're too weighted in any one area, things won't seem right in the community. And I'm here to learn. I have a lot of learning to do. I just want to do what's right for the community and learn from the people here about what that might be.

Bud Eisberg: I've been in Portola Valley 43 years, since 1970, living in a rental for some years as a bachelor and got married in 1983. We've lived on Wyndham Drive for 30-plus years. Time freed up in my life when I finished some commitments about 20 years ago, and decided to put some of my free time into volunteering in the Town. I always followed what was going on through *The Almanac*. I've been on the Public Works Committee since about 1990, served on the ASCC for 12 or 14 years, the Sausal Creek Committee, and the General Plan Committee.

My interest in being on this Committee stems from living on Wyndham Drive and reading the Town's intentions of buying the AI's Nursery property for affordable housing. Basically what I see as a citizen from this experience has been a lack of long-term planning regarding affordable housing. There have been areas where they have been successful, but I think we need a more comprehensive approach and maybe a little more creativity.

Jon Myers: I've been in the Town since 1996, about 17 years. I am currently Chair of the Parks and Recreation Committee, and am involved in the Co-Ed Soccer League. What I like most about Portola Valley is the community orientation. More than any other place I have known, this really feels like a community where you know everybody. It's just the right size. It's not a big city where you don't know your neighbors, and it's not so small that you don't have neighbors. Maybe it's also being involved; you get to know so many different people and feel more responsible for the welfare of the community. That's one of the reasons I'm here. I believe in volunteerism and a responsibility to it.

I actually grew up in an affordable housing community in Philadelphia – and there were plenty of black kids in the area, so that's not an issue. But my parents were teachers, and therefore low-income professionals. It was kind of a volunteer charity-like thing. There was a person who had bought a lot of the homes in the area and rented them out at sub-market prices to teachers and others. As I look into this, one of the big things for me is just understanding this situation and the government and community's role.

When we moved, we sold our little house in Philadelphia for \$2,000. And I found my way through to Portola Valley where I now have a house worth \$2 million. So it was an enabler for me.

Susan Dworak: I may well be one of Portola Valley's newest residents. My husband and I moved here two years ago with our 13- and 14-year-olds. Although new to Portola Valley, my husband is a Bay Area native. I grew up in New York City and just outside Washington DC with parents who worked for government. Every night at the dinner table I learned about the interplay of different government entities. I did my undergrad work in Los Angeles and came here for law school. I lived in downtown San Jose. While living in the area for 25 years, we directly experienced affordable housing in great ways and also in horrific ways.

After living in a beautiful historic district in downtown San Jose, where everybody knows everybody, we started seeing a lot of changes, many of which involved affordable housing. We move to Portola Valley and the first thing I see on the agenda is affordable housing and I think I should get involved, because it's absolutely needed. It's state-mandated, so it must be done, but it must be done in the right way.

I'm very interested in diversity and sustainability, sustained change – not just for right now. The entities we're working with now will change, the people in place in government will change. We are all going to change, so we need to put some structure in place that's sustainable going forward.

My main concern in finding the right balance is not making decisions that will result in irretrievable consequences, because those decisions can be made very easily. I have a lot to learn. I'm here to listen. I've read hundreds of pages in the past week or so and I look forward to learning more and to follow the right path.

Nick Pegueros: I joined the Town on May 1, 2012, following Town Manager Angie Howard. My primary role here is to support the Committee, serve as the committee Secretary, which is traditionally something Committee members would handle themselves. As for my background, I've been in public service for 12 years and enjoyed every single day of it. One thing I love about Portola Valley, unlike some other communities I'm very familiar with, is the undying commitment for participation on the policy level by members of the community, and for community members to get together and address the tough issues.

Affordable housing is a very tough issue. On a personal level, I think affordable housing is a very noble goal. It is a pressing issue in San Mateo County and I'm very proud to be associated with an organization that is stepping ahead of the curve in addressing the issue with a tough and meaningful voice.

Ms. Ginner: For the first 15 years of our 30-plus years in Portola Valley, my husband and I basically lived in a trailer – the fancy name was modular housing – that we pulled up onto our lot. So we might have been living in affordable housing too. Then we built a house which is definitely not affordable housing.

Mr. Toben: That was very rich, and I'm grateful to all for describing your interest in this process. We're going to move on now to the orientation memo, which will lay out some of the basics.

(5) Review of orientation memo

Mr. Pegueros: The first piece talks about the meeting schedule and works to identify topical areas for each meeting that hopefully moves us toward our end goal, delivering a proposal to the Town Council. Many of you have served on Town committees, but not everyone, and I want to reinforce that this Committee is subject to the Brown Act which governs basically how decisions are made.

Whenever five or more of us get together, we're required to send out notices that this is a public meeting and invite members of the public to make comments and listen to the decisions being made and conversations taking place. One of the many aspects of the Brown Act is that it applies also to telephone meetings and email communications. And it's very challenging sometimes for Committee members to get an email from the staff to push something out. It's very easy to hit "reply all" and say "I don't agree." That could violate of the Brown Act. With that in mind, if you need to get feedback to me, send it directly to me as a medium, and I will discuss it with the Chair and if appropriate, share it with the entire Committee.

Another nuance of the Brown Act is what's called a serial meeting. And that's a situation in which a body arrives at a decision through a series of meetings. You don't have five Committee members sitting in a room discussing an issue and reaching consensus, but you may have two members who agree on something, and then one of them goes to two more members and says, "This is what we're thinking, let's follow this path," and the three of you discuss the issue. You come to a new conclusion and go to a fifth member and say, "This is where we're heading, how do you feel about that?" You've made a decision among those five committee members, and that's something I just want to sensitize the Committee to, because the Brown Act prohibits that.

For staff support, we have the Town's Principal Planner Karen Kristiansson, who has 15 years' experience supporting the Town's planning process efforts, primarily in the area of long-range

planning, which includes affordable housing. She's our expert on the General Plan's Housing Element.

We will distribute agenda packets electronically no later than Friday before each meeting.

And then finally the memo has a committee roster. If any of that information changes, or you have a preferred number, please let me know.

Mr. Warr: The meeting schedule seems very aggressive.

Mr. Pegueros: We're getting ready to start working on the next Housing Element cycle in July, and the Council wanted this Committee to finalize recommendations via a report to the Council on May 22nd. June is primarily focused on preparing the budgets because it's the end of our fiscal year. That leads us into July, so we worked backwards from there.

Mr. Warr: It just seems very aggressive to have our information at one meeting and then report to the Council. It's hard to imagine making any progress without any subcommittee meetings and without any follow-up. I just think it's unrealistic and sets us up for failure.

Mr. Toben: I take that as a challenge. We don't know yet how fast we can move. The wheels may start a little slowly but will pick up momentum. Much remains to be done, obviously, but from my experience in past processes, I think we're going to get a lot of headway. Much will depend on the goodwill of this Committee and the intention to work outside of these meetings, in some subcommittee settings. My hope is that we can in fact deliver a useful product. It remains to be seen if we'll pull it off.

But I appreciate your point. We certainly are on a very fast march, no question about it.

Unidentified Committee member: Will there be a staff person with us at the neighborhood meetings?

Mr. Toben: We'll want to talk about that a little later on, and the extent to which that will involve support. We have to figure that out.

(6) Review of charter and committee objectives

Mr. Toben: The Council has given us a pretty clear mandate. We essentially are asked to deliver two products. The first is a mission statement that embodies this Committee's sense of what Portola Valley aspires to accomplish in its affordable housing opportunities and obligations. My understanding is that this would essentially contain the aspiration of this Committee on behalf of the Town's residents with respect to addressing issues such as Ms. Trapp mentioned the idea of diversity of housing stock. Others might want to address preserving property value, preserving the essential rural character of our town, etc.. That can all be encapsulated in a mission statement that will get us moving forward with a clear understanding of the shared vision for affordable housing in Portola Valley. That's a pretty near-term assignment – we hope to have that done by the end of the third meeting.

Once we have that in place, the second task in our sequence is to come with criteria that define and prioritize programs and sites for affordable housing in our Town. It's very significant that the Council has refrained from having this Committee assess particular sites. That is not the assignment. The assignment is to come up with criteria that the Council and Town Staff would employ in deploying the Housing Element down the road.

This would be analogous to a process I was involved in 12 years ago over where to put the Town Center. We had to take down the old school campus because it was seismically unsafe. It was highly controversial and got very chaotic very fast. There was a lot of unhappiness about particular sites that seemed to be the preferred options of various factions. The Council took a step back, much as it has done here, and said, "We need to sit down and come up with a set of criteria by which we will evaluate any number of possible sites." I was a part of that process and it was very productive.

We were able to figure out, in a very rational and focused way, that to the extent possible, we wanted to preserve the functions of the Town Center that existed historically on this site. We wanted something affordable and accessible – simple stuff, but it helped coalesce the Town around a fairly narrow set of options for the selection of the Town Center site. This seems like ancient history now, but I assure you that at the front end, it was not at all clear that we'd be able to come up with a proper selection for this facility. It proved to be a very successful process.

So we're tasked with that assignment only. We're not here to pick out any site as the right place for whatever form of housing. We're here to try to determine what weighted criteria we ought to invite the Council to consider in moving forward. Is everyone reasonably clear on the scope of our assignment and the boundary conditions that frame it?

Mr. Warr: I understand. I just don't think they attend to the basic issue of numbers and what the numbers mean and how those numbers will be somehow allocated, and how to provide the housing, in what form, and how to arrange that. I'm not sure that you can arrive at some kind of criteria without also establishing sub-criteria within the varieties suggested. Right now it looks like three options, and the criteria associated with second units, multi-family housing and inclusionary housing would all be different.

And I think there should be a fourth option, some kind of trade-off – someplace where transportation and jobs would coalesce – is likely to be more closely related to the need. Whether that fits in the charter of duties, if you don't deal with it with in some level of specificity, I don't think it provides much value or guidance to the General Plan.

Mr. Toben: Those are thoughtful comments. Your remarks cause me to think that we may want to consider some method of weighting the programs, applying criteria that would yield some weighting in terms of the emphasis given to second units versus inclusionary and so forth. And then within each of those subcategories, there might be a separate subset of value criteria that you might apply to determine how you deploy a set of policies related to second units.

Mr. Warr: Exactly, and to me, this is part of looking at topography, geology, existing and future patterns of development, so you can see where those things happen. Some of the greatest conflicts in Town involve the two arterials in Town are also our scenic corridors. There's a giant problem associated with that, because where increased density makes most sense (near arterials), in this Town is our most important scenic resource.

It's very complex and I don't think it can be dealt with in words. I do think some diagrams, developed with Ms. Kristiansson's help, where we can look at and see where the conflicts likely are, would be valuable. I look at the words here as being simplistic and the problem as being very complex.

Mr. Toben: Fair point. We're going to get good help from Ms. Kristiansson as we go forward and graphic support will be important. The Housing Element does delve into certain assigned numbers for each of the programs, so we're not bereft of numbers. Whether they are sufficient to provide guidance for going forward is a good question. But I take your point that we face a lot of complexity and may not get to the finish line, but we're going to move in that direction.

Let me finish quickly with a couple of other comments about how we hope to conduct this process. The aim is to arrive at a consensus at the end of this process through the good intentions and give-and-take of this Committee. Consensus is a slippery concept. It doesn't mean everybody is equally thrilled about something, but basically we can all live with it. That's the essential aim of this multi-meeting process. To get there, I think it's my obligation to comment about protocols.

This has been a lively conversation in our Town over the last year, and at times the basics of courtesy have not always been observed. I don't suspect that to be a problem within this Committee or with those who come to our meetings, but it's worth reminding ourselves that in order to improve the chances of success, it's important to observe certain basics of decorum. That includes refraining from interrupting one another as we speak. Certainly if I'm doing my job properly, everyone will get a

chance to talk, and some people may be less talkative than me. Secondly, as some of you have said quite eloquently, we're all here to learn. That necessitates listening more than it does talking, especially when it comes to listening very carefully to diverse points of view. We will make sure that members of the audience who attend our meetings also have the opportunity to speak; however, most of the conversation will need to be carried on if we have any hope of getting to a result. That's all for the preliminaries.

(7) Discussion of the need for affordable housing

- (a) Need for affordable housing in San Mateo County
Mark Moulton, Executive Director of Housing Endowment and Regional Trust (HEART)
and the Housing Leadership Council of San Mateo County

Mr. Toben: Now it's time for substance, and we're going to start by opening up the lens and inviting Mark Moulton from HEART to give some context at the countywide level.

Mark Moulton: This conversation for me goes back to the late 1960s, when San Mateo County had a population of less than 700,000. We'd all spent a fair amount of time watching the country come apart. John Gardner – a Republican who was the Director of Health, Education and Welfare in the Johnson Administration – came here and told community leaders there were some hard issues we needed to look at – what we'd call classism and racism now.

We had gotten separated to the extent that we weren't necessarily sharing neighborhoods or raising children who were hopeful, and that manifested itself in a number of ways. A lot of us went off and thought about healthcare, some of us thought about education and some of us thought about housing. That's when we got deeply involved in the issue of affordable housing, and it's been my full-time occupation for more than 20 years. In addition to HEART, I'm also Executive Director of the Housing Leadership Council, founded in 1999 by a group of us in the business of delivering housing-related services. Basically the Housing Leadership Council is an advocacy group and HEART balances its mission to be partly about education and advocacy, but also to raise money and find permanent sources of funds for affordable housing.

I've been meeting with people about affordable housing in Portola Valley for at least 15 years. You carry the wisdom of the community. I'm here as a resource. I don't have an agenda or any recommendations for you. What I'm going to give you is information.

[Slide presentation.] The affordable housing industry itself is a real contributor to the residential construction industry. Affordable housing has typically accounted for 20 to 55% of all multi-family new construction. It went up to 55% when 2008 hit. People couldn't borrow from banks to develop multi-family housing, but many of our projects were already in the pipeline. I worked 12 years for Habitat for Humanity, domestically and internationally. I've been in all the major cities. I went to Cabrera Greens in Chicago. I know about the failures that have been produced in the name of creating housing for folks who couldn't meet their own housing needs in the market. It's not always perfect, but we learn from it.

People in this business are asked, "What's the case for affordable housing? Do we really need it in California? Do we need it in the Bay Area? Do we need it in Portola Valley?" Consider the cost of housing in the context of income to get an idea of what kinds of money you must make to be able to afford a typical two-bedroom apartment and what you get if you are paid in certain professions. Sometimes there's a single breadwinner in the family, and that's the money the family has to work with. Sometimes two people in the household make these amounts.

[Slides showing the increasing discrepancy between income and cost of housing and illustrating the economics of how difficult it is to live in this area]

In 1970 we decided that we needed immediately 100,000 units of housing that were available at below-market prices. We've been able to produce 50,000 units, so we've made some progress, but the deficit in terms of the need has grown.

[Slides showing some of Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition projects integrated into neighborhoods in Bay Area counties]

The affordable housing industry is in a funding crisis. It stems partly from the Palmer Decision in Los Angeles that says multi-family rental housing can't demonstrably help solve the affordable housing problem simply by ordinances requiring inclusionary housing of for-profit developers.

We're going back to the mat on that kind of thing in Sacramento. [A slide listed other funding sources.] We're going after a follow-on SB1220, so there will be an approach to getting a stream of income that will help replace what we lost when we lost the redevelopment agencies. So one spotlight would be interim housing, an outgrowth of the work that John Gardner brought to us. The Urban Coalition became Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition, which has now been modified by the new CEO to Mid-Pen Housing. They've done 6,000 units. I have been to many of these developments, one of which was named after my father. I know families that live here. I know the management. The management company has grown to 300-plus employees and a billion dollar company. We are very serious about doing this business and doing it right.

If we've basically decided that we like the way our communities are, we don't want any growth, we're willing to visit our grandchildren in Arizona and see our seniors in the Sierra Foothills, we're not going to address the problem that we have, which is we have four-generation families now. If we're lucky and get really old, we'll get to see our descendants. If we are going to integrate those folks and folks who have the kinds of jobs and make the kinds of incomes on the graph that I showed you, we need a new pattern of development.

What we're thinking about in the Grand Boulevard Initiative and other Bay Area-wide planning processes, is something that looks like this. This is in San Mateo, right by the railroad tracks. This is part of the Grand Boulevard – up in South City, right by the high school – which ramps back into lower density because it goes back into single-family-home neighborhoods. This is one- and two-bedroom apartments at about \$1,000 below median, and I'm working on getting financing for another piece the same size next to it. That's by the fairgrounds in San Mateo, off Hillsdale Boulevard. My wife and I couldn't rent an A-class two-bedroom apartment for the same amount we pay for our three-bedroom home that I designed and built 25 years ago, because we're in a time warp in the economy and many of us experienced that privilege and pleasure.

This is on Main Street in Half Moon Bay, 27 units per acre, which is pretty high density, in the two-story, shared-wall construction. It does provide seniors a place that they can live, with common rooms and other amenities, and it's a good-quality building.

The parking ratio is usually defined in terms of either the number of spaces per unit, and sometimes by bedrooms, in which case it's .9 per unit, because you've got small units for seniors who statistically don't drive as many cars as much. The parking ratios for what you'd think of as a family development would often be set by somewhere between 2 and 2.2 parking places per unit.

Mr. Eisberg: Are these developments designed to take into account the fact that they're near public transportation?

Mr. Moulton: Yes.

Mr. Eisberg: Are parking and car ownership discouraged in any way? Or do these units just add more cars to the traffic?

Moulton: You're bringing up two things. For the development on El Camino Real, we make agreements with SamTrans to get free bus passes for residents there, particularly for their children. We're trying to cut

down on driving children to school, plus workers getting to their jobs. In addition, the families with two cars because they have two relatively modest incomes put together might be on the road next to you having left their home in San Mateo 15 minutes ago or having been on the road for over an hour. The Bay Area has 60,000 "super commuters" – people who travel 90 minutes or more and 50 miles or more each way to and from work. We have 170,000 in-commuters and 170,000 out-commuters. About 60% of them make \$80,000 or more, but the ones we're trying to arrange housing for are not choosing to commute those distances.

Mr. Warr: What is the relationship between the cost of land and building and the rent cost to make housing affordable? And what has to happen that's different from market rates that would create rents of \$1,500 to \$2,000 versus \$500 to \$1,500?

Mr. Moulton: I brought a book for you that was written in 1995 by an architect about doing affordable housing in a community. Three things – the community's intention, the co-creation of an industry, and long-term, very low- or no-interest financing – make the difference between the affordability of housing to the customer versus a private developer. When I began to show successful for-profit developers how they were subsidizing housing as taxpayers, through the laws, and what that meant in terms of predevelopment costs (which included getting the land costs right and the ratio of land cost to the building cost right) some of the worry lines on their foreheads eased off. They realized that the laws of economic physics didn't work anymore when you asserted that you were going to help reach for availability of housing for families who couldn't get added in the marketplace by creating whole programs that were locally financed, nationally financed, state financed – that would be put together in pro formas and complicated stacks of financing.

Mr. Warr: I guess the thing that becomes complicated in a rural community is about dense projects, and that scene scares them.

Mr. Moulton: 27 units an acre is more than you will ever see in a rural setting. Think about a building mass that looks like some of the newer buildings in Woodside, where the post office is. You have to think about shared-wall construction and two stories, that kind of thing.

As you think about this, you say it's important to get the proper balance between what the state wants to happen and doing your planning. With the deed restrictions in Blue Oaks, you've created a pool of money over a period of time – an opportunity. You are a bunch of sincere people who have come out to do some work on behalf of and at the behest of the Council, to think about this issue. All I'm here to tell you is that we've been working on this more for than 40 years. It's deeply satisfying work. When we dedicated the 50 units to my father, just before his death, he asked me to write a speech for him. One of the things he said to the people who were there, many of whom financed affordable housing or were project managers, was, "If this isn't your career already, I hope you'll consider becoming more interested in this. When you go into an apartment and a five-year-old runs by you and says, 'This is my room,' you really get what this is about."

Inside those multi-family apartments we now are able to invest in after-school programs between 2:30 and 6:00 p.m., where children are supervised and doing their homework while their parents are still at work. Those same people are there in the morning for the children. It's hard to describe exactly how it pencils, but it's a parallel universe to the universe of for-profit development. It's an excellent product.

Mr. Warr: Are there economic models you can share with us? Because part of this is understanding the economics. I think the problem the Council has run into is the economics.

Moulton: Absolutely. And I think there's also a reservoir of goodwill. We'd try to find you partners if that's what you wanted, but I think it's more important what you decide you want to do with this. And I have no foregone conclusions at all.

Mr. Warr: So HLC is a private foundation?

Mr. Moulton: HLC is a non-profit private 501(c)(3). I was the Executive Director of Habitat for Humanity at the time, working with volunteers and families to build homes they could afford to buy with zero cash down and zero interest payments. When we were trying to get entitlements, people who voted for the council or planning commission that had to approve those entitlements would say, "We don't want those people here" or "We don't want that amount of construction here," or whatever it was. So eight or nine of us got together and created Housing Leadership Council as a voice to try to make the case for what it is we do.

Member of the Audience: Everything just looks hunky-dory, but from my own individual experience, that's not true. Where's the other side? The problems with affordable housing? And how can you make a 100- or 200-unit housing project in a major urban area affordable to the community that has horses, one bus stop, limited facilities, and try to superimpose that on a small community. It makes no sense to me.

So where is the other side which talks about the issues that come up, and how these issues are exacerbated when you're trying to control a state-mandated program on a very small community with minimal resources. This is not San Jose, this is not Los Angeles, this is not San Mateo. This is a community of 5,000 people. So when do we hear from the other side.

Mr. Toben: I don't think Mr. Moulton is advocating that anything resembling what you've seen in the slides would be suitable for this community. In fact, he's said repeatedly that he's here as a resource. He's here simply to provide some information about how these kinds of models have worked in other cities and offer broader context for the need for affordable housing at various levels of income. That's his sole assignment tonight.

What this Committee will do is take up the question precisely that you're asking. The whole function of this Committee is to wrestle with this problem of whether there is any compatibility at all in the concept of affordable housing in a community with horses. So you're asking the right question, and I can assure you that we're going to get to the answers in the course of the next several weeks.

Member of the Audience: What are the actual costs, in general, for building a standard two-bedroom unit of affordable housing? All the hard costs and the overhead that goes into this unit, for a standard unit.

Mr. Moulton: On the building I pointed out and said I'm working on the other half, for a two-bedroom, they're roughly about \$300,000. That's a project in the City of San Mateo, but the city feels so strongly about it that they're making a 99-year lease at \$1 a year on the land. Otherwise the land cost would be significant – probably at least a third of the \$300,000.

Member of the Audience: You said you've worked on this full-time for over 25 years, and you clearly showed that the need for affordable housing has increased over the last 25 years. To me that's an indication that the current tools we have to solve the problems don't do it. Can you give us a brief idea what tools the government or the communities would need to provide to make this problem go away?

Mr. Moulton: Let me speak to the financial aspect. I have 21 members on my Board, from the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors, councilmembers from nine communities, and 10 representatives of the business community. I'm proposing to them that we raise enough money locally, to make up for the money we're losing because the federal government is cutting back on those kinds of social programs year in and year out, more and more. The State of California can no longer bond. I think the satisfaction and the political will can only come from people getting more involved. I have probably involved 10,000 people in affordable housing by spending 10 years as Executive Director of Habitat for Humanity. I hammered a lot of nails. A lot of people came out from their churches and their corporations – thousands and thousands of hours and days of volunteering. You can put the community will together and reach people in your community, whether they work at The Sequoias or whether they're your teachers.

Ms. Dworak: Can you tell us a little bit more about the funds? You mentioned federal, state and local fundraising that you're doing. Is it public, private, what percentage?

Mr. Moulton: The state, up until now, has supplied some of the funding for affordable housing. Private banks supply some of it. The federal government, through the tax credit programs, supplies some. Some is administered through community development block grants and various local agencies. What's gone away is billions of dollars in bond money that we voted away – Proposition 46 and Prop 1C – and they're not likely to come back. So basically what I have to fill in is 25% of the pro forma that's been lost through the attrition of federal funds and the loss of state redevelopment funds. That's what I'm going after with my Board, because those local funds leverage the ability for corporate investment and tax credits. At the point when three-quarters of it is filled in, the private sector comes in with loans at market- interest or below-market interest.

Ms. Dworak: So you're not looking at government money. Your fundraising efforts are private funds, correct?

Mr. Moulton: I would say so. And we feel that HEART has some influence on the political process, so we're working with the state legislature to try and get that recording fee done, which would be some replacement for the loss of the redevelopment agency funds.

Mr. Toben: We can also put your question in the bin for offline analysis.

Ms. Dworak: My next two questions shouldn't be answered tonight. I'll just put them out there so everyone knows the direction I'm going with this. With federal, state and local involvement, you have a lot of cooks in the kitchen, if you will, a number of different governmental agencies, and cross-jurisdictional issues and interplay going on, not only in project development, but afterward in the control and the management of the project. So I have questions about how these projects are managed after they're developed.

Second question: How do you take into account the jobs? We know more jobs are coming. We know we need more housing. But at the same time, companies are leaving California in droves. They're going to Texas, Arizona, Nevada. We all remember the 1980s and 1990s when we couldn't give apartments away. Vacancies are not good for communities. They can be worse than overcrowding. So I'm wondering where those numbers are factored into the equation.

Mr. Toben: Mark is available as a resource as we go forward, so we'll call on him again.

Ms. Dworak: Are we allowed to talk to him individually?

Mr. Toben: Yes, but he's very busy, and we can't have all of you calling him with questions. It would be ideal if you have an individual question to transmit it via Mr. Pegueros, and he can be the point person. But to clarify, there is no Brown Act forbidding posing those individual questions.

Mr. Myers: I have another kind of question. Even after reading all of this, I actually can't figure out what the problem is we're trying to solve from the standpoint of this being just a zoning issue? You're talking about government funding. Would we own the housing or support people to be able to buy the housing? Are we just talking about how to fit in that? Or are we actually going to be paying to build those houses?

Mr. Pegueros: As it's stated in the charter, the challenge that the state imposes on local agencies in order to obtain a certified Housing Element is to plan for the construction of affordable housing and to the extent possible help that affordable housing come to fruition. With respect to the Committee, the Council has asked for the mission statement to take that into consideration – not necessarily speak to the specifics of actually building affordable housing.

Mr. Myers: I understand what affordable housing is, and that zoning says what you're allowed to do and what you can't do. But when somebody else owns the land and someone else pays for the building and

then somebody else buys it, I can't figure that out. When you say invest, and talk about what we can do to support affordable housing, it gets confusing. Does supporting it mean funding it?

Mr. Pegueros: Every community approaches it differently. Some communities streamline the application process. Some communities actually financially contribute. The example that Mr. Moulton gave was a ground lease in San Mateo for \$1 a year for 99 years. That helps the bottom line and it helps bring the affordable housing to fruition.

Mr. Myers: What exactly do you have to do to satisfy the state mandate and get the Housing Element certified?

Ms. Kristiansson: The state policy is exactly what Mr. Pegueros said, to plan for and encourage housing for people at all income levels. In terms of what that means we have to do, we don't have to build it. There isn't any one particular action we have to take. What we have to do is convince the California Department of Housing and Community Development, which certifies Housing Elements, that we are planning for and encouraging housing that will meet the housing need that has been assigned to the Town. There are some numbers assigned to the Town, but we have the freedom to figure out how to do that within the parameters of state law. It isn't simple cut and dried actions that state you have to do this and this and this.

Mr. Myers: The key words you said are plan and encourage.

Ms. Kristiansson: But we also have to convince them that what we are putting forth in our Housing Element will result in the right number of units being built. That is the end goal.

Ms. Dworak: So the ABAG (Association of Bay Area Governments) number is 64. They told us we need to come up with 64 affordable housing units. Without complicating it with the various income levels, we have to come up with 64 units. But what if we determine that by way of seismology, geology, slope, drainage, if for whatever reason we just can't – I'm just saying hypothetically, we physically cannot produce or build or somehow come up with 64 units? Maybe we come up with 30 of them, or –

The fear I have is what if we can't build the 64? What if it's just not going to work? What kind of trouble are we going to get into? We just have to show them that we tried?

Ms. Kristiansson: (we should state clearly that the total housing unit number is 64 – affordable units are a percentage of that number) We'd have to plan for the 64. If we don't, the Housing Element won't be certified. We have to make it possible for it to happen. In the current Housing Element, we have done certain things to encourage second units. Second unit numbers can go up and down. When we take it to the state with our next Housing Element, I think we're going to be short by about six units. That's not something that would result in a penalty assessed on the Town, but they'd say for the next time, if we're counting on six units or more, we have to do more.

Mr. Warr: When the Mayor appointed me, I said part of what I need to see is the enabling language of the state law that actually requires the Town to do this stuff. I've heard and I've read a lot of policy and there's a lot of saber-rattling statements about our Housing Element and withholding our opportunity to issue more building permits, but I've never actually read the law and I spent a lot of time looking for it. What actually is the law that says that we have to do this?

Mr. Toben: So we've got to deliver the statutory language and the policy language to you. That's a very fair request.

Mr. Warr: It's part of the charge. I guarantee you that within it, there are opportunities for the community to see how our situation fits versus a federal or state employee reviewing our stuff. I think some of what we need to do will be to take a leadership role in the way rural communities respond, because the rural community obligation needs to be proportionate to what we can actually do and what our actual needs are.

Ms. Hasko: I want to know what the downside is, the penalty, the bad thing that would happen, the loss if we're noncompliant. It's not because we plan on noncompliance, it's just very important to be disciplined and understand what we're doing.

Mr. Toben: If you go back in the archives of *The Almanac's* coverage of this issue for the last six months, there was a very fine distillation of the state sanctions that can be imposed for failure to comply.

Unidentified Committee member: The distillation did indicate things that could potentially happen, but to me it wasn't clear enough.

Ms. Ginner: At some point, when the law came out, somebody in Portola Valley was responsible for reading it, interpreting it, and deciding what had to be done in what I gather was our first Housing Element. I would be interested in seeing not just the law (because I'm not going to interpret it), but what Portola Valley did in response to it. Somebody had to read it and understand it and respond to it. Can we find that out?

Mr. Warr: From what I've heard, I think one of the problems is that the law has been revised multiple times and that it's always a moving target.

Mr. Toben: So we want to see the mandate language, what puts this obligation in place for the Town, and the sanctions language. We want to understand the consequences.

Ms. Ginner: I want to see the connections, too. The mandate language, how did we think we had to respond, and the sanctions.

Mr. Toben: Right. And we should probably be clear about the snapshot in time. Maybe the 2009 update to the Housing Element, the last one, would be the right moment in time. Next year we have to do it again, because language in state law obligates us to update its Housing Element. Those wheels start turning in July, and that's what's driving this process.

Mr. Eisberg: One addition to the request. How many times have these state sanctions been applied? Where, when and who?

Mr. Toben: We know about the lawsuit just settled in Menlo Park.

Mr. Eisberg: That wasn't the state. That was an affordable housing advocacy group.

Mr. Toben: State law allows individual developers and private citizens to take action against municipalities alleging noncompliance.

Unidentified Member of the Audience: The state gives legal options. Somebody has to follow up with those legal options and a court will issue sanction.

Mr. Toben: Which are in turn the potential menu of sanctions provided for in state law. And the judge can decide which of those sanctions to impose for noncompliance.

(7) Discussion of the need for affordable housing

(b) Need for affordable housing in Portola Valley

Mr. Toben: Let's talk about what the local survey shows, Mr. Pegueros.

Mr. Pegueros: In an effort to quantify in a very efficient way what the actual need for affordable housing in Portola Valley may be, Town staff engaged in a survey during December 2012. We know we have an estimated 1,250 to 1,500 jobs in the Town, and based on our review of our business license database, we identified 75 employers. We asked them to circulate a Survey Monkey survey to their

employees. We had 104 responses, including 91 of from people who worked in the Town. We believe that the delta between 91 and 104 was the result of people who work for organizations with multiple places of business, for example the Woodside Fire Protection District and The Sequoias. We did not consider those responses in the analysis.

When we looked at the 91 respondents who work in town, 59 of them reported household incomes that would classify as moderate or lower and would therefore make them eligible for an affordable-housing program under current income caps. Some interesting conclusions – I've already mentioned the 51 households that would qualify as moderate income level or below and would be interested in living in Portola Valley if they could afford to purchase a townhouse in the Town. Most respondents were from small households. More than one-fourth of those at the moderate income level or below have four or more people. Of those, 60% were from low, very low, to extremely low-income households and live more than 15 miles away from Town. I think that speaks more to the commute issue that was mentioned.

Just a quick review of the charts. As for the distribution of the respondents by category as it currently exists (page 2), 26% fall in the moderate-income category and 20% in the low-income category. In household size, 35 respondents reported having households of no more than two individuals. The remaining 16 (27%) have households of four or more. The next chart is about the distance from Portola Valley, and the final two charts about the interest in participating in an affordable-housing program in Portola Valley if it were available. 24 respondents stated that they were almost certain or highly likely to participate. Another 27 stated they were possibly or quite possibly interested in participating. Combined, that's about 86% of the households.

We asked survey participants to identify their profession. 81% reported a profession in healthcare services, education, local government and office professionals. One of the subcommittees will be looking at some of this data more carefully, and one thing that's important to consider in reviewing and considering the data, is that it focused on employees and did not look at other populations in the Town who may need affordable housing. Those would include seniors or disabled individuals who are on fixed incomes as well as young adults starting their career and wanting to live in their home town. They grew up here, but can't necessarily afford to live here. It would also include families who suffered the loss of a loved one or went through a divorce. Maybe they lost half of their income and can no longer afford to live in Portola Valley. We also have renters who live here but spend an exorbitant percentage of their income on rent.

One thing that's clear is that we've been able to determine, just in an unscientific survey, that 59 people who already work in the community and serve the Town residents would qualify for an affordable housing program. If we were to expand the survey to include those other specific populations, the number would likely grow. The purpose of this is to underscore, and to put into real numbers as best we can, Portola Valley's need for affordable housing.

Ms. Ginner: Did affordable housing get defined by a dollar amount as a percent of income or just called affordable and leave it up their imaginations?

Mr. Pegueros: The respondents were asked their household income and then based on the income they reported, we determined whether they would be qualified. And then we asked them whether they would want to participate in an affordable-housing program if one were available, but there wasn't a definition of what they would pay for affordable housing.

Ms. Ginner: Who wouldn't say yes?

Unidentified Committee member: To live in a really nice neighborhood and you wouldn't have to drive very far to get to work.

Ms. Dworak: I have two questions specifically on that. In reading these materials and other materials related to affordable housing in the state and Bay Area, I've seen a number of different figures defining affordable. Some say if you're paying 30% of your income, some say more than 35%, and even 50%,

which is just outrageous. That's off the charts. If you're spending 50% of your income on housing, that would be crippling. So what number are we using? Are we using ABAG's number?

Ms. Kristiansson: For the Housing Element, we use the state requirement, which is 30%.

Mr. Myers: You used the term "qualify" for affordable housing. Who decides who can rent and who can buy? I mean why isn't this an open market where people can buy and rent, wherever they can? Is the state coming in or is the Town going to control this somehow?

Ms. Kristiansson: I think the first table in the memo shows the state income limits for the different income categories. For example, the maximum income for a four-person household to qualify for moderate-income housing would be \$123,600. The monthly rent would be backed out from that – 30% of \$123,600 divided by 12. It's just math.

Mr. Myers: So you take a survey of the area and so now you know how many people make so much and they pay so much and therefore fit within the ranges that they want to see in communities, but it's all free market? Or is somebody saying you can't live in that housing because you make too much money?

Ms. Kristiansson: Yes. Generally speaking, there's an application process if a community subsidizes housing and it is provided specifically for affordable housing. So it's not a free market; it is controlled by whoever subsidizes it. So if the Town wanted to do it, we'd probably arrange for someone to manage that for us, but effectively different households that were interested would apply. They'd provide us information on their income that would be checked and then there would probably be a lottery in play.

Mr. Myers: So it's not a commitment that we would be doing this. As a Committee, we would be making a recommendation to the Council to say we're going to have to control housing?

Mr. Toben: There's a lot of mechanics involved, verifying the income of applicants for housing. I'm not sure we need to get to that level of detail at this moment, but we certainly want to be clear going forward what the real details are when it comes to implementing an affordable housing program, and that's certainly another issue for our bin.

(8) Formation of subcommittees

Mr. Toben: Let's move forward with the assignments in between our meetings. Mr. Pegueros will describe three subcommittees that we are going to ask volunteers to populate and those two committee members who aren't here tonight get the short end of the straw. Andrew Pierce and Judith Murphy are the other two members of our committee and they were unavailable tonight. And it's going to be first come first served, so whoever pops their hand in the air quickest gets it.

Mr. Pegueros: As Steve had mentioned earlier I think there was a question about the neighborhood community meetings. As Mr. Warr stated, there are a lot of issues, and as we learned tonight, a lot of legwork that needs to be done behind the scenes to help the Committee move forward. The reality is that we don't have in-house staff resources to focus on all of those issues, so – which would be consistent with other Town committees, as you're aware – we rely on the committees to do a fair amount of that work. I've identified three areas where subcommittees could focus their efforts.

- The first would be helping identify efficient ways to solicit feedback from the broader community. As you recall, there was a discussion that each member would be asked to host a neighborhood meeting. We would like this subcommittee work on identifying ways to make those meetings happen and what resources may be necessary.
- Another subcommittee would look at and assess the programs we have in place in the Housing Element. This would include a discussion of how to define and identify success? What data would the Committee need to evaluate those programs?

- And the third subcommittee would look at short-, medium- and long-term policy opportunities to help address the need for affordable housing in Portola Valley.

All three subcommittees would report back to the Ad Hoc Committee at its March 19 meeting, so you'd have reports that would build on each other. With nine members on this Committee and three subcommittees, it would be great to have three members for each subcommittee.

Mr. Myers: Number 3.

Ms. Ginner: Number 3. I can't possibly do on April 16. I'd like to do Number 2, but I can't do an April 16 deadline. So Number 3.

Mr. Eisberg: Number 2.

Ms. Hasko: Number 1.

Unidentified Committee member: There's an opening on 2.

Unidentified Committee member: Number 1.

Mr. Toben: All right, so we'll take care of the assignments for Ms. Murphy and Mr. Pierce.

Mr. Toben: Let's move to wrap up now. As I indicated at the front end, this is your moment to let us know specific technical questions, substantive issues that you think need attention between now and the March 19 meeting. We've surfaced and logged a number of those tonight. We'll send around what we understand to be your bin list so far.

Remember don't hit "reply all" when you get the email. You can reply separately back to Mr. Pegueros. "I'm sorry, you misarticulated my concerns on X and I want to elaborate a little bit more on that." Mr. Warr, I particularly appreciate your input on that, because you've raised some very serious questions about the scope of what we're trying to do and whether we can get it done, and what information will at least increase the possibility.

Mr. Warr: Another bin item concerns how communities of similar size, in transportation, density and geology are responding. I don't think that we should be doing this in a bubble.

Unidentified Committee member: There might be a comparison in Hillsborough.

Unidentified Committee member: Saratoga is dealing with this issue right now.

Mr. Warr: We should join forces rather than divide and conquer. Basically we're all dealing with the same issues, kind of all at the same time and some joint efforts would make sense.

Unidentified Committee member: Does anyone know what Assemblymember Rich Gordon is doing? He's got some kind of committee together and there should be representatives from the Town on it.

Mr. Pegueros: At the next Town Council meeting on March 13, Council will be designated someone to attend those meetings. Assemblymember Gordon has invited members from all of the communities in his district to serve on a roundtable to discuss Housing Element issues, which are similar to what we're talking about here, but I think more to a policy level.

Mr. Warr: I think that's a very important area to get into. I'm sure we all wonder how realistic the numbers are, and the assumptions behind the numbers.

Unidentified Committee member: Who actually reviews and approves the Housing Element at the state level?

Ms. Kristiansson: Staff of HCD.

Unidentified Committee member: And which elected official supervises it?

Ms. Kristiansson: I don't think there is one – I think the Governor is the formal elected official.

Mr. Toben: Briefly, just to put a point of emphasis, any thoughts that occur to you that we can get into the mix on our bin list, please email Mr. Pegueros, so that we know what's on your minds and what technical questions we can answer.

Unidentified Committee member: Do you know of any opportunities that the community can trade off and provide funding to other jurisdictions or agencies in lieu of the kinds of things that are currently in the housing law?

Ms. Kristiansson: There is a provision in state law that allows for that. It needs to be done only during a certain window, between the time that the draft numbers come out and the time that they're finalized. We probably wouldn't be able to do it for the 2014 Housing Element, but if the community wanted to do it going forward, we could try with the next Housing Element in 2022. You'd obviously need to find another community to trade with and have something that they want.

Ms. Dworak: Do we have money to build or give to another community? If so how much? In other words, Blue Oaks was sold. I've heard \$3 million. Is that what is currently available, or what number?

Mr. Pegueros: The Town has effectively a restricted fund for affordable housing. It's called the Inclusionary Housing Fund, and the balance is around \$2.9 million. Almost all of it is part of the proceeds from the sale of Blue Oaks.

Ms. Dworak: Some of it is from permit fees.

Ms. Pegueros: In lieu fees – rather than building the inclusionary housing, you pay the fee. Blue Oaks has a long past, and what the money can or should be used for is something that we need to look at.

Mr. Toben: I just want to give you one last word on what's ahead. On March 19, the agenda will feature a discussion on the state mandate for affordable housing, so I think we already anticipated Mr. Warr's question about exactly what the Town's obligations are, and I hope we'll get some clarity on that.

Another major element of that meeting will be a discussion of the Town's three primary programs for the provision of affordable housing. Second units, multi-family affordable housing and the inclusionary housing provision. We will also hear the report from the neighborhood subcommittee on the design and execution of our community needs. Any last words from anyone tonight?

Mr. Myers: What I'm trying to keep focused on is the outcome of this group, how it relates to all of this. There's the mission statement and there's criteria. And I'm having trouble connecting them to, for instance what that third group – what are the two things, but the words are different on what that subcommittee, that group is going to be coming back with. It's a list of opportunities and I would think that we would need to come back with criteria and a mission statement and nothing else, so I don't know how to relate those to those three different groups and what we're trying to do here.

Mr. Toben: I appreciate your rigor of your comments. I agree with you that we should always have our deliverables in mind, always be clear on what we're delivering to the Council. My expectation is to have a mission statement as the product of this conversation and work that goes on in between the meetings. There will be some grappings going on.

On March 19 there will be some provision made for essentially looking at potentially a first draft mission statement. I know that's very fast, but we're going to try to take it from here and begin to do some wordsmithing March 19. If not that meeting then the following meeting on the April 16. But I

take your point that we don't want to be wandering around in the wilderness. We have a target. The target is a mission statement and criteria

Mr. Myers: Given the back dates, these look like they say different things. Like this one says Mission Statement and Deliverables and this says report to the committee on April 30, the same day, "Identify short-, middle- and policy opportunities." Whatever that means.

Mr. Toben: This is good. We haven't refined this to the perfect extent. And it's perfectly fine for your subcommittee to engage with Mr. Pegueros and me. I'm actually not a member of the Committee so I'm sort of outside the Brown Act, but I'm not going to fudge that. So we can do further revisions to this to make it clear to all concerned to report back on March 19 that we sharpened the focus. I think it's entirely appropriate.

Unidentified Committee member: Are the individuals on the same subcommittees allowed to meet in person?

Mr. Toben: Absolutely, because you're only three. Anything under five is good.

Unidentified Member of the Audience: Is the audience allowed to submit bin items in email?

Mr. Toben: Absolutely. We welcome your contribution. Thank you all very much for your participation.

Mr. Pegueros: So for Committee Number 1 we have Ms. Trapp and Ms. Dvorak. And then for Number 2 we have Mr. Eisberg and Ms. Hasko. Number 3 Mr. Myers, Ms. Ginner, and Mr. Warr. I will reach out to the two absent members to ask them who wants to serve on which committee.

Ms. Kristiansson: Ms. Trapp had mentioned that the figures from the Housing Element were not included in the version emailed to you, so I have copies of the full document.

(10) Adjournment [9:02 p.m.]