



TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
Open Space Committee Meeting
February 5, 2026
5:30 P.M.

Betsy Morgenthaler, Chair
Nona Chiariello, Vice Chair
Jackie Magno, Secretary
Terry Lee, Member
Delle Maxwell, Member
Gary Nielsen, Member
Carter Warr, Member

AGENDA

HISTORIC SCHOOLHOUSE– 765 PORTOLA RD. – PORTOLA VALLEY, CA

REMOTE MEETING ADVISORY: On March 1, 2023, all committees in Portola Valley will return to conducting in-person meetings. A Zoom link will be provided for members of the public to participate remotely; however, the Town cannot guarantee there will be no technical issues with the software during the meeting. For best public participation results, attending the meeting in-person is advised.

ASSISTANCE FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Town Clerk at (650) 851-1700 or by email at towncenter@portolavalley.net. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the Town to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

VIRTUAL PARTICIPATION VIA ZOOM

To access the meeting by computer:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/89946271431?pwd=mlvaJpPjD76RQo3vrxQRadfYuVksl0.1>

Webinar ID: 899 4627 1431

Passcode: 052438

To access the meeting by phone:

1-669-900-6833 or 1-888-788-0099 (toll-free)

*Mute/Unmute – Press *6 / Raise Hand – Press *9*

- 1. CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL**
- 2. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**
Speakers' time is limited to three minutes.
- 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**
 - a. Minutes of November 6, 2025 (PDF)
- 4. COMMITTEE OFFICERS NOMINATION and ELECTIONS**
 - a. Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary
 - Invitation for nominations for Chair
 - Motion to approve nominations for Vice Chair and Secretary
 - Invitation for nominations for Vice Chair and Secretary
 - Motion to approve nominations for Vice-Chair and Secretary and vote
- 5. OLD BUSINESS:**
 - a. Update, Hawthorns Area Plan and Hawthorns Historic District
 - i. December 10th, Midpeninsula Regional OS Board meeting report
 - ii. Committee discussion, creation of an Open Space Subcommittee on Hawthorns and 2026 proposed members, Nona and Betsy
 - b. Brief update, proposed Ford Field Snack Shack Property
 - c. Brief update, Open Space Fund and Skyline Property
 - i. Property appraisal + legal expense approved by Committee on 3/6/25 to be expensed this fiscal year 25-26

6. NEW BUSINESS:

- a. Open Space Fund Committee discussion
 - i. If a situation arises where a prospective open space acquisition was not yet known to the Open Space Committee (i.e. Due to confidentiality reasons), and if advance funding were needed to establish value and viability, how would the Town best source the funds to proceed?
- b. Future agenda topic(s)

7. ADJOURNMENT

The next regular meeting is April 2, 2026 at 5:30 p.m.

Land Acknowledgement:

The Town of Portola Valley acknowledges the colonial history of this land we dwell upon—the unceded territory of the Ramaytush (rah-my-toosh) Ohlone, Tamien Nation, and Muwekma (mah-WEK-mah) Ohlone, who endured a human and cultural genocide that included removal from their lands and their sacred relationship to the land. Portola Valley recognizes that we profit from the commodification of land seized from indigenous peoples and now bear the ecological consequences. We seek to understand the impact of these legacies on all beings and to find ways to make repair.

Portola Valley Open Space Committee

Special Meeting Minutes – 11/06/2025

Historic School House – 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA

Recorded at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AEmCd56AcvA>

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order by Chair Betsy Morgenthaler at 5:30 PM.

Member	Attendance	Arrival Time
Delle Maxwell	Present	5:30 PM
Terry Lee	Present	5:30 PM
Gary Nielsen	Present	5:30 PM
Nona Chiariello	Present	5:30 PM
Jackie Magno	Present	5:30 PM
Carter Warr	Present	5:31 PM
Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair)	Present	5:30 PM

Staff Present: Darcy Smith (Town Manager).

Community members: In person – Patty Dewes and Karen Askey (Parks and Recreation Committee), and Catherine Magill. Online: Danna Breen, Karen Vahtra, and Peg Goodrich.

2. Oral Communications

No oral communications were offered for items not on the agenda.

3. Approval of Minutes

Chair Morgenthaler asked for any edits to the draft minutes.

ACTION: Approve the minutes.

- **Motion:** Carter Warr
- **Second:** Gary Nielsen
- **Vote:** Motion passed (All members present voted "Aye").

4. Old Business: Open Space Maintenance Subcommittee Recommendation

Chair Morgenthaler provided a brief history, noting the Open Space Maintenance Subcommittee was created on August 3, 2023, with members from Open Space (Nona and Gary) and Conservation (Judy Murphy and Nancy) to address maintenance needs.

Nona reported that the joint subcommittee members agreed it was time to disband the joint body and return to the previous structure. The rationale was to allow:

- The Conservation Subcommittee to focus specifically on town-owned open space maintenance needs (scope of work, contractors, timing).
- The Open Space Committee to form its own separate subcommittee focused on oversight of the Open Space Fund and guidelines.

ACTION: Disband the joint Open Space Maintenance Subcommittee.

- **Motion:** Carter Warr
- **Second:** Gary Nielsen
- **Vote:** Motion passed (All members present voted "Aye").

5. New Business: Dorothy Ford Park, Open Space, and Alpine Road Scenic Corridor Discussion

Chair Morgenthaler introduced the topic of the recent proposal to consider permanent bathrooms and a new, larger snack shack at Dorothy Ford Park and the possibility of locating them within the Scenic Corridor.

Chair Morgenthaler covered the structure of the meeting. Starting with an overview of what was presented at the Town Council on October 23rd and brief, high-level, six slide presentation. She thanked Karen, Patty and Darcy for attending. Next the committee will bring up any questions they have and following that, public comment. Then the meeting will come back to the committee for full discussion.

Chair Morgenthaler shared that the Planning Commission and the ASCC will meet Monday, November 10th at 6:00 PM to discuss this same topic.

Chair Morgenthaler shared the following background:

State Grants in the amount of \$180,000 are available to the Town for a new structure at Ford Field under the conditions that the Town provide matching funds of at least 20% and the building be completed by January 1, 2028. The Parks and Rec proposal calls for a 340 sq ft building under one roof, including 2 ADA compliant bathrooms (25 sq ft each x 2= ~ 50 sq ft) and a kitchen/concession area (290 sq ft remainder). For comparison, the existing grandfathered “Snack Shack” is 103 sq ft.

The Parks and Recreation Committee proposal at the 10/22 Town Council meeting, included these questions of building location and approval process:

- Should the Town move forward to a concept design phase with cost estimates to replace the portable restrooms and snack shack at DFP?
- Should the Town consider the current site as one alternative?
- Should the Town designate this a PV Fund activity?
- Shall a group consisting of members of the Planning Commission, ASCC and Parks and Rec be formed as we move forward to assess locations and costs?

The Open Space Committee will review the Parks & Recreation proposal from the standpoints of:

- Stewardship responsibility for Dorothy Ford Park Open Space.
- Principles of the General Plan.
- The parcel's significance within the Priority Conservation designation.

The slide presentation (Betsy & Nona):

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): Taken from the October 22nd presentation the images show the location of the portable potties (which are heavily used), they are meeting an important need. The garbage cans next to them don't make a friendly impression. There's room for improvement. Baseball season runs from March into June, but these receive heavy year-round use from members of the public. You can also see to the right, the existing snack shack of 103 square ft. It sits on no foundation, a fact established at the Town Council meeting, creating an ongoing issue with rats.

Nona: Next slide is essentially a map of the layout of Dorothy Ford Park. On the left is an aerial view. The brown band shading along Alpine Road is the 75-foot setback from the road right of way for the scenic corridor. The green shading is the 55-foot setback from the top of Los Trancos Creek bank. The right side shows the same features on a hill shade image, and on both images you can also see dashed or dotted lines representing Dwight Crowder path and the Alpine Trail. The setback lines, I included at the bottom the municipal code requirements for this scenic setback and also for the creek setback, so you know where those numbers came from. The yellow hashing is the deed restricted area for the baseball field. The deed restriction, as I understand it, expires in 2031.

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): Moving to our third slide. This is a possible future that you're looking at here. The picture shows two ADA compliant bathrooms on the left side, on the far right side, the proposed new kitchen that is approximately the same size as the two ADA compliant bathrooms, and between the two of them, a fairly large closet and water heater area. The overall dimension of the two ADA compliant bathrooms pictured on the left would be similar to that drawn just those two bathrooms, and those that would amount to about 115-ish square feet, whereas the entirety of the plan on the right measures approximately 340 square feet. To give you a sense of relative scale.

Comment by Karen Askey (Parks & Rec): The overall dimensions of the pre-cast building to the exterior, including the whole exterior walls and such, is 17 by 20, so that's a total of 340 sq ft. With the exterior walls, with all the stuff you have to put in they're about 127.5 square feet, and the um this concession stand with the little window is the same. The area in the middle that has the water heater and that would have janitorial supplies and things like that is about 85 square feet. I just wanted to clarify that.

Nona: The next slide, zooming in on the area where the snack shack and the portable toilets are right now, and asking the question: is there is there a way that new facilities could fit between the two setbacks that we've talked about? So not within the 75-foot setback, and not within the 55-foot creek setback. To clarify, this is not a proposal, this is not a plan, this is a **thought exercise** to address that question. What is shown on the right is just to the east of the scenic corridor setback is two ADA bathrooms, so it's basically the dimensions that Karen has already stated. It shows sinks within the bathrooms which wouldn't necessarily be the case. And as a thought exercise again, "Could the snack shack be replaced by a food truck?" and that would give you an opportunity to put it within the scenic setback because that's part of the parking a lot. The goal of the exercise is to address the question from an open space perspective: Can we honor the 75-foot setback and still provide food and flush toilets?

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): This is a very powerful moment in the town's process where a thought experiments is a valuable addition to the conversation. We are entertaining the possibilities in order to choose the one that fits us best.

Nona: There are other ways to approach this too. If you do not build the snack shack or maintain it, there are savings, but that is not why we proposed this thought experiment.

For the next slide, Delle Maxwell came up with an intriguing idea she shared with the Town Council.

Delle Maxwell: I found a company The Portland Loo, making a customizable unit that was invented in Portland. It can be hooked up to the sewer, or it can be stand-alone without a sewer, and it's a simple design and elegant. The base unit costs about \$185,000, and if you install it with existing plumbing, that adds about another \$30,000. If you need sewer and water hookups, of course, the cost will be higher, though that's something we're going to have to deal with no matter what. They are easy to clean and graffiti proof.

The units are longer but narrower, accommodating baby strollers and encompasses a janitorial closet on the back, less than the 85 square foot janitorial example shown earlier. It's definitely ADA compliant.

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): Lets go to the next slide showing the Municipal Code.

Planning Chapter 18.58.020 **Special Setback Lines (Scenic)** A.D. 2. Alpine Road: No structure shall be located closer than 75 feet to the right-of-way of Alpine Road in that section of Alpine Road lying between the northerly Town limits and Portola Road.

Item 18.59.020 “The following creeks are subject to the creek setback provisions in this chapter; Los Trancos Creek is the first named.”

A.3. Parcels of 2.5 acres or more are 55 feet from top of bank or 60 feet from the ordinary high water mark.

General Plan, Scenic Roads and Highways (Last Amended March 11, 2025)

Objectives

3302 2. To provide guidance regarding the maintenance of the scenic qualities of our major roads. Because Portola Valley is a place of unusual natural beauty, all roads in Portola Valley can be considered “scenic.” However, it is possible that the pressure of increasing development and the resultant traffic could lead to the erosion of the aesthetic quality of our roadsides if care is not taken.

Local Scenic Roads

3309 The two roads designated in this plan as local scenic roads are Alpine Road and Portola Road.

3310 Alpine Road is now a route of great natural beauty and variety. The creeks that follows through the foothills are lined with tall trees, and the countryside has kept much of its rural tranquility. The mountain canyon is still wide and new views open up at each turn of the road. A superb scenic route already exists. It is threatened by change. The challenge is to find and pursue the ways that can protect and preserve this route through the mountains for our present enjoyment and the delight of future generations.

3311 The town has, since its incorporation, endeavored to protect the scenic quality of the Alpine corridor. From a policy statement adopted in July 1969.

3312 The policy of the Town of Portola Valley has always been to maintain a tranquil, rural atmosphere, and to preserve a maximum of green open space. The Alpine Scenic corridor should be developed in accordance with policy. The natural look and feeling of the land between the road and the creek should be maintained. Trees and natural growth should be preserved and increased. Recreational uses should be in keeping with a peaceful and rural atmosphere.

3313 In May 1971, the town adopted the Alpine Parkway Plan, subsequently named the Alpine Scenic Corridor Plan, as a part of the town General Plan which includes detailed description of the road and of related design policies (see part 6). Special provisions to implement the plan and to protect the corridor include:

1. Open space zoning for sections of the corridor.
2. Special setback lines along a major portion of Alpine Road.

3. An open space program which does and should include recommendations for land acquisition and regulations pertaining to the corridor.

4. The recreation element and the trails and paths element which include proposals for trails and paths in the corridor.

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): Let's move to questions from committee members.

Carter Warr: For complete disclosure, I'm on the ASCC, and we'll be seeing this again on Monday, as part of a study session with the planning commission. The town is spending an extraordinary amount of money monthly on the maintenance, service and rental of the unsightly portables. The baseball league needs the town's support and a concession stand. I'm not a fan of the food truck concept though it avoids issues here.

A couple questions: the parking lot is being used by parking lot renters including employee parking for Rosati's, and there is more use than ever before. I have a couple of questions about how the rental agreement is working now. I think that my recommendations would be to have the use comply with the setbacks, and that other funds be located and used as it relates to the increase in parking use associated with that rental.

Delle Maxwell: *The question I was looking at was should the town designate this as a Portola Valley Fund activity? Do you mean by that as this is something we're going to start fundraising for, or do we already have pledges and commitments?*

Patty (Parks & Rec): PV Fund does not do any fundraising. The PV fund is the engine as would be a GoFundMe. They provide the tools, the background bank information, the donation capability, the form that you get to say you just donated, non-profit is deductible. They are the engine. The fundraising will be the responsibility of Little League, Parks and Rec and others.

Terry: *I'm grateful to be considering this now given the availability of the state grant, a timely opportunity we should take seriously. Putting in place a more permanent infrastructure something we should take seriously.*

Gary: I have a question. The notion of moving this [Snack Shack] into the parking lot, can we afford to invade the regularly full parking lot? *What are the impacts of [the building footprint] invading the parking area [and diminishing parking places]?*

Jackie: This is a really good idea and an important issue. We should keep in mind not only the setbacks based on what the regulations call for, but also if we have to enlarge Alpine Road, that this structure, which is intended to be a longstanding structure, allow that to happen and not have to be moved. *I think the setbacks are absolutely critical.*

Betsy: *My question is about balancing costs and understanding and distinguishing short-term costs from long-term costs. One question, how much more expensive it would be to build in the parking lot, conforming to our General Plan and municipal code, and not within the scenic corridor. I would like more information about the cost trade-offs of the two locations. We also need to balance the*

experience of the public - those walking, cycling, horseback riding, and driving by - with the experience of those who use the parking lot to park or play baseball.

Nona: I want to begin by congratulating Parks and Rec on a great proposal and on raising a bunch of money already. I also want to thank Karen and other members of that committee for talking with me, explaining how they feel about things and why they feel so strongly about things. Coming from a huge amount of research at Ford Field, I want to raise hard questions worth addressing that have not yet been raised yet.

Can the new facilities fit between the two setbacks and should it go there or should we consider putting something within the scenic setback?

The General Plan and Municipal Code make it really clear that it should not be in the scenic corridor setback. I can see why the current location is really nice. I can think about it more clearly if I separate the bathrooms from the snack shack which maybe can be done. The bathrooms will serve more people if the bathrooms are in the scenic corridor, closer to the heavily trafficked Dwight Crowder path, making them more accessible to all users. If the bathrooms are located in the scenic corridor, then it doesn't have to be on the current side of the baseball field, it could be on the other side of the baseball field where the Dwight Crowder path comes inside the fence line. You could put the bathroom adjacent to the paved path and make it equally accessible to everyone there. I'm not advocating but really trying to raise all kinds of questions.

My question is will the architect, or whoever considers location, think outside the box as much as we're trying to? Our goal is to ask can we meet multiple objectives at once, and what kind of thinking does it take to find those solutions?

Another fundamental question about the snack shack, will a wide range of location possibilities be considered, and what will their trade-offs be?

Regarding the Shack, the town policy on rental and use of town-owned recreational facilities states that "food sales are only allowed at the Snack Shack at Ford Field". I wondered why. Does it relate to the deed restriction and if so why? I have never seen the deed restriction so do not know what it entails and how that may change when the deed restriction changes in 2031.

There's a basic question of who the snack shack serves. If it is really only being used by Little League, then I have the question whether there is precedent or town policy to support a structure, especially one to be located in the scenic corridor, that has one organized user, or is the idea that the Shack would actually be available to other groups so any other non-commercial group, a club in town, a student group, a church could use the facility? I think it is a question of basic fairness.

I read the Agenda Materials and great letters from Alpine Little League, though nowhere in the proposal could I find the words "Little League". I do not honestly know if the Shack is a Little League facility or intended for broader use.

Those are the questions I have been grappling with; I do not have a position yet. I've spoken with many people, coaches [including] coaches of other sports, and parents, and I understand *this is about culture and tradition specific to baseball. We know that is really important; I do not know how we weigh that in today's context.* Those are my questions about the Snack Shack.

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): Thank you very much Nona and committee and with that we are going to go to comments, questions from Darcy Smith and those present and then anyone online.

Darcy Smith (Town Manager): I apologize Mayor Judith Hasko, your liaison, couldn't be here tonight, so I'm here in her absence. Our town has a very constrained budget. There is a \$180,000 in state grant. The grant was awarded to the town in 2020 and 2021. The state has clarified that it is a use it or lose it in the next two years and two months, and it will not be extended.

A similar bond measure was used to renovate Ford Field back in the 2010s. We are approved for the full \$180,000 for the bathrooms. We're scoping the first phase of work, which is definitely hiring a landscape architect and a civil engineer for a preliminary analysis of building sightings with locations and estimated costs, because *a big issue here is whether the \$180k plus donations are going to be enough*. The team is working on an RFP that will go out in a few weeks to bring on a qualified landscape architect and a civil engineering team.

We'll start with a survey, the topo survey with all the utilities, the top of the creek bank, the property line, so we can actually measure both the creek and the view corridor setback with absolute engineering precision. Then site reconnaissance, so the architects and their team will walk the field, look at trees, look at any other existing conditions in the field, make an existing condition plan, and then dive deeper into these three different locations. We will definitely be looking at breaking the buildings up, potentially moving them apart, trying to look at through the lens of how much that might increase cost.

The most important thing to come out of that is an estimate of probable construction costs for three options, and including bringing the buildings together, maybe the Portland Loo option, and a prefab option. I think the cost here could be \$400,000 up to \$1.5 million. The big issue here is sewer connection costs, a very complicated thing. The plan is to get your feedback, get the feedback from the Planning Commission, ASCC. The most important thing to do is get the RFP out there and get a qualified landscape architect, an engineer, and surveyor under contract doing preliminary work to return to council and publicly release estimated cost. We want to be very thoughtful about how we get to the ninth inning in the game, and we are in a tight time frame.

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): Is there anything else that you would like to share with us?

Darcy Smith (Town Manager): The council did meet in closed session about the Fogerty property, and I don't have an update on that. The town continues to look at our priorities and also at our fund balance for open space. As we go into 2026, you'll be working on your budget. Your work on that is much appreciated. You're not a very big high spend in this committee, but we will look at your budget.

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): Thank you Darcy, next we have Karen, then Patty.

Karen (Parks & Rec): How many of you watched the Town Council presentation? How many of you or your kids played Little League? There are nuances to baseball games, such as foul balls get hit, where home run hit, as well as the fact that the games are about 2-1/2 hours long, so that need to be considered in choosing placement. Little League games are really long. It's great that you are all in favor of bathrooms and flush toilets. *Three words that we're aspiring to: economical, expedient,*

and efficient. Those are our goals. In the town meeting we had a study session not a proposal where concepts were presented.

What the Town Council agreed to on October 22nd is it's a town capital improvement project meant for public use. They said, "Yes, we should start activities to facilitate a new restroom and snack shack." "Yes, we should explore as one of our options looking at building in the setback." The other two options that are on the table are the parking lot, the question is exactly where it would have to go, and the other one is the open space area on the other side past where foul balls may hit. Nobody's made any decisions about anything. And the third thing that they did say is, "Yes, we should utilize the Portola Valley Fund as one arm of our fundraising." The council made it very clear that the Planning Commission and the ASCC are really valuable to this town. The first step is to go to the Planning Commission and ASCC to present to them and hear if they know of any red flags, if there's any concept ideas.

The second step, as Darcy mentioned, is once we get that input is to hire the landscape architect, the right professionals to figure out these concepts and actual costs. Then that information will get shared with the appropriate committees, the Conservation Committee, the Open Space Committee, the Trails Committee, and we'll hear the feedback, but we will have actual design and costs.

In terms of the evacuation planning: the expansion of Alpine Road in that area from Westridge down to, I think it's Ladera, is to add a 5-foot buffer to Alpine Road. It's not widening it to a third lane, so that's important to understand. The other thing that is really important is we don't know what is required in terms of ADA accessibility. I also wanted to clarify that baseball season goes from late February usually into July, like the July 4th weekend, and then there's fall ball, which is September through November, so it is used by baseball a fair amount of the year.

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): Thank you, Karen.

Patty (Parks & Rec): Thank you Committee for taking this on and thinking about it. Even though it's early in the process it is good to give visibility to it, to get people thinking about it. I would caution us all that ideas are great and input is fantastic. I think we should step back and let the professionals, you know, look at the situation and come back and tell us what they think would be the best solution. Darcy mentioned the grant; we do have a time frame that we have to deal with. We're going to be doing a lot of things in parallel: design, fundraising. We're actually going to start to think about what we need to do to get the funds that we need.

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): Thank you, Patty. It's much better to help you out and offer you what we can at an early stage, particularly on location, because that will be one of the early decisions to be made.

Do we have anyone online that would like to make a comment? If so, please raise your hand or unmute yourself. If not, we can bring it back to committee for committee discussion and any particular questions or comments that you would like to hand down to the Planning Commission.

Delle Maxwell: I have a question. Given the potential grant money, what is the timeline for that, and what do we have to do in order to secure that?

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): Well, that I will answer the first part of it, but I would like the answer to the second part of this. The first part of it is that the \$180,000 Darcy said at the Town Council meeting that it is committed. The issue is that the construction needs to be complete by January 1st of 2028, after which time the state has six months to say, "Yes, here's your money". The question that I had is the town must come up with 20% matching fees, and from what I read in the materials, that it was 20% of 180,000. It looks like it might be a higher number than 20% of the 180,000.

The other question is something else that I read, and here there's a document out there from 2012 that undoubtedly had to do with the last fundraising for the field itself, but at that time the town was asked to come up with their 20% at the front end, and that that money was the first money to be spent.

Darcy Smith (Town Manager): There is a 20% required match of the total cost but that can be donations. As an example: if the project was \$300,000, then the state would pay \$180K, and we have to make up the rest anyways, so that's \$120K. The match was only 20%, it could be donations, they've confirmed that in writing.

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): The plan is to pay the bills with fundraised money, allowing for no burden on the town. The town is operating at deficit levels right now.

Darcy Smith (Town Manager): I think that is a risk. We have done campaigns in the past. The money would need to essentially be in the bank before we sign a construction contract to build it. So, the way the town builds projects is that we go through an elaborate public bidding project. You go out to contractors, you get a few bids, and then what we are required to do as a public agency is just ensure we can pay all the bills. The real deadline is that we need to know the cost, put it out to bid, and then lock in a contract. That is awarded by the council at a public meeting, and that is when we would need the money. That's probably nine to 12 months out. The good thing with a prefab is that they bring it in on a flatbed truck. The utilities are going to be the hard work with trenching and getting all the things in. The installation of this relatively small structure could be very fast. When we award the construction contract and execute it is when we would need the money in the bank. Until then, pledges would also be something that we can show the council to show that we're making progress.

And can I just correct one thing about my prior budget comment? My comment about the budget wasn't your committee budget, but you pointed out to me that last year there was a recommendation by this committee to use a specific amount of open space funds on open space properties.

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): Yes, open space properties, and so that is the distinction. We enumerated, it was Spring Down, Frog Pond.

Darcy Smith (Town Manager): If you look in our budget, which is posted on the Town Council website, that was not approved in the budget. We can revisit that later if you want.

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): Let's do revisit that, so we can prepare for that meeting. Thank you very much, Darcy. Danna, if you want to unmute yourself and you have a question before we go to committee discussion, please speak now.

Danna Breen: I'm going to hear this on Monday night, but I found Nona's comments tonight pretty compelling. I support the project, so I'm excited about it. I'll hear it Monday. Thank you.

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): Carter, would you like to begin Committee discussion?

Carter Warr: I think our issues should not be around what the solution is but on what we would hope for from the Open Space Committee's point of view. I think we should opine about the need, the use, and what the rules of engagement from the Open Space standpoint should be.

Delle Maxwell: I'm all in favor of looking at these multiple sites to see which one would be the most appropriate to put something down. I'm sort of agnostic right now as to what the right solution is, and open to hearing what everybody has to say. I don't want to weigh in on that until I've heard more about the possibilities. I'm pretty confident that we're going to be able to raise the money for this project. It's something that we really need in town, and I think it's something that everybody can get behind that's going to be a positive asset for everyone. It's going to be more expensive than we think, I've never seen a construction project that wasn't.

Terry Lee: I appreciate everyone's comments, but particularly Nona's and Darcy's comments, and thinking about the bathroom and the snack shack as two things, not just one thing. I'm super glad that Darcy reminded us about the potential cost, and wonder how flexible we might be about siting, if the cost - because of the proximity to sewer and whatnot - might be influenced by the siting, not just by the environment. Lastly, I wonder if the town would be open or willing to lend money from the Fund to help support the timing of this project and access to state grant funds so that we could be successful even if the fundraising part lagged behind.

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): Terry, thank you.

Gary: I'm in favor of the project like the rest of you, and let's try to get it done, so I can see it! If the current location is the best place, I would have said go for it, until I got this piece of paper from you with the general plan guidelines. I was very pleased that Nona was wrestling with the concept of putting it in the right place. I would modify my initial feeling of "if that's the best place, put it there" to "let's put it in the right place, but let's find a place to put it soon and not several years soon". I just hope the town doesn't have to wrestle with that location. I guess what I'm saying, if it invades the 75-foot set back and if the final decision was to put it within the 75-foot that would be ok with me.

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): Jackie, I'm going to go in the same order.

Jackie: I am in favor of the project. It is beneficial to everyone in the community. I liked the comment you brought up, "Let's make sure we think about the general public," the people who are using that purely for parking as well as the people who are using the park for recreation as well as the little leaguers, and make sure everyone's needs are taken into consideration. Nona, your question of do we really need to keep the two things together or can we think of them separately is brilliant. The flush toilets are an imperative need in that place. I don't think there's anyone that's objecting to that. Regarding the 75-foot setback, ideally I would love to, as you mentioned during the Town Council meeting, adhere to what all of our residents have to adhere to, and I think that's only fair, but if there is no possible way to do it in a cost-effective manner, then we need to consider the alternative.

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): Thank you, Jackie.

Carter Warr: I have one more comment. *As an architect that deals with the Americans with Disabilities Act and accessibility throughout the State, I think the committees and the commissions should be cognizant of how much more the accessibility requirement is likely to cost than the actual toilets. It's quite a large site and you're talking about accessibility to and from the stands, the dugouts, the batting cage, the trails.* I could see an enormous amount of urbanization that I don't think this committee or the other committees have envisioned for Portola Valley. What is required by the state building code and the Americans with Disabilities Act would be a lot more than what the public and the citizens of the town would be expecting.

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): You're talking about both design intensity and price.

Carter Warr: Yes.

Delle Maxwell: I'd like to agree with you on that. I've been involved with *the San Francisco Botanical Garden for a long time, and we've done a lot of renovation in the park, and we've had to comply with ADA issues such as providing pathways. We built a new nursery, and we didn't find out until late in the process that we had to provide all of these accessible paths all the way from the front entrance. That wasn't disclosed to us when we were doing our fundraising, and that added a lot of money to the process.* I think Carter's right; here are some unknown issues and costs at this point about what we would actually need to do once you open the door to building something ADA compliant.

Carter Warr: A segment of the RFP should identify what can be severable from a disability requirement standpoint. The Americans with Disabilities Act has numeric limits on what can be required for private property vs. public property as they may not have the same limits.

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): The General Plan in my mind is something that we are going to honor. I don't want to say to the ends of the Earth, there is a limit, but I think the minute we start to open [the setbacks] up, we're going to look back at this moment some day and have regrets. I think we all have imagination of what kind of developments are coming our way, what other opportunities coming our way, to make such concessions. I hope you the deciders at the ASCC, Planning Commission, and Town Council take this extremely seriously and do the deep reading of our General Plan while keeping in mind how beautiful Portola Valley is because we have honored it. The two building idea is highly worth pursuing for one reason: it allows us to take risks a bite at a time rather than taking it all on at once. We could face some wild financial swings that could leave us wanting and we already are razor thin on this year's budget. Next year's budget is going to be more so. I would not take any [financial] risk. I think splitting them into two buildings allows for that, particularly with something like the Portland Loo, which allows a drop in and affords time for us to have the money in hand before it arrives and put in place. I also happen to think it's aesthetically going to be less of an eyesore than a very large bulky building will be. In addition, anything that we take on, we need to factor in and offload the maintenance cost or it will fall on the town's coffers. We have to keep the maintenance issues in mind as we are looking at our relative designs.

Nona: I want to thank Karen and Patty and Darcy again for the information that they provided tonight, and for all the work they've done so far, especially Karen and Patty. Secondly, I'm hearing

from everyone here that we are strongly and unanimously in favor of flush toilets, which I'm also really glad to hear because I think that that is imperative. There's also support for a concession stand, a snack shack of some kind, and that there are still some questions about that and about the location of where one or two structures would go. I really want to say that I appreciate the spirit with which questions have been asked. I am deeply interested in this problem. I went through every aerial photograph I could find to see how old that shack is, and I can tell you it's been there since before 1980. The best aerial that I have goes back to 1968, no shack, but by 1980, though it's there, and it has definitely seen better days.

On the issue of separate structures, there is another benefit to that for fundraising. The people who really want the snack shack will really respond to fundraising for that and the general public, the sustainability advocates might respond even more to prefab toilets, especially if they're really sustainably designed which would be a breakthrough for Portola Valley. I know that there could be greater cost associated with the two structure design, but I still think we shouldn't view that as a net increase in cost because it could yield more successful fundraising.

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): I do hope that as the town shares a list of background information that's provided, and one of the background pieces of information that Nona called out, that I too am quite curious is to read, is the deed restriction, particularly as it expires in 2031 when [the new structure] will barely be open for business. I hope we as a community can look at that together. Secondly, you know, there's the swing for the fences approach, and that I know was one of your by lines of the presentation, Patty and Karen, and then there's the what if we can only get a man or woman on second? As I think about a fallback, there's the phasing way to approach this, which would allow us to do remedial work at the existing snack shack. The existing snack shack is grandfathered. I realize it has a problem with rats. There are a variety of things that immediately quell those problems, such as rat slabs, and it may not last our lifetime, but will last a bunch of years. In a time of uncertainty, so that would be an intermediate solution worth investigating -- flushable toilets and excellent remedial work on the existing snack shack.

Carter Warr: Yes. The 2025 threshold at which a public project would necessitate full ADA compliance is \$203,611. If the project cost exceeds that, then 100% compliance is required.

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): Thank you, Carter. I see it's after 7:00, and we do strive to end by 7:00. But thank you for your extra attention as we gear up.

When we do meet again, I just want to give you a heads up that we recently posted our new Committee Charter to the town website. There is an opportunity to do extra website improvements, so any of you who are willing to work on that, please give me a call, I would favor working on it with you.

Motion to adjourn?

Carter Warr: So moved.

Betsy Morgenthaler (Chair): Thank you, Carter. Good evening, everybody. Thanks so much, Patty. Thanks, everybody.