

**TOWN OF MORAGA  
REGULAR MEETING**

**February 10, 2016  
MINUTES**

**7:00 P.M. Regular Meeting**

Council Chambers and Community Meeting Room  
335 Rheem Boulevard, Moraga, California 94556

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting was called to order at 7:01 P.M. by **Mayor Michael Metcalf**.

**ROLL CALL**

Councilmembers present: Mayor Michael Metcalf, Vice Mayor Dave Trotter,\* and Councilmembers Phil Arth, Teresa Onoda, and Roger Wykle  
\*Vice Mayor Trotter arrived at 10:07 P.M.

Councilmembers absent: None

**2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**Councilmember Arth** led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**3. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Mayor Metcalf** reported that a Closed Session had been held with no reportable action.

**4. PROCLAMATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**

**A.** Proclamation Honoring the 2015 Campolindo High School Football Team

**Mayor Metcalf** presented a proclamation honoring the 2015 Campolindo High School Football Team and declared February 10, 2016 as "2015 Campolindo Varsity Football Team Day" in honor of the team's outstanding accomplishments.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED**

Kevin Macy, Coach of the Campolindo High School Varsity Football Team, accepted the proclamation and commended the team's accomplishments.

Sterling Strother, a member of the Campolindo High School Varsity Football Team thanked the athletes, parents, coaches, and staff for the experience.

Dick Callahan, Moraga, spoke to his experience as an announcer for professional sports; announced Saint Mary's College (SMC) sports and Campolindo High School

Football games; and commended the Campolindo High School Varsity Football Team on its accomplishments and heart.

Shanette Westphal, Moraga, Team Mom for the Campolindo High School Varsity Football Team, thanked the Town Council and the community for its recognition of the team and its successful season.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

## 5. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

David Killam, Moraga, suggested the Town should consider raising revenue by levying a potential two percent tax on the profit from private home sales, which could allow the Town to raise funds for infrastructure repairs.

Graig Crossley, Moraga, recognized Interim Town Manager Robert Priebe at the dais.

Harold Friedman, Moraga, read into the record a letter which had appeared in the January 27, 2016 Lamorinda Weekly from a local resident regarding the current construction of homes on Camino Ricardo and the Town Center development, which had raised a number of concerns with both developments. He expressed concern with the scale of the homes under construction and stated there should have been a setback from Camino Ricardo; and asked that the remaining homes yet to be constructed be terraced in some manner with greater setbacks from all other developments in the Town.

**Mayor Metcalf** asked staff to look into the request in terms of the homes yet to be built along Camino Ricardo.

## 6. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

Consent Agenda Item 6.4 was removed from the Consent Agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

There were no comments from the public.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

<b>ACTION: It was M/S (Arth/Wykle) to adopt Consent Agenda Items 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3. Vote: 4-0-1. Absent: Trotter.</b>
---

- |     |   |          |
|-----|---|----------|
| 6.1 | Accounts Payable Claims for: 1/22/2016 (\$167,723.01);<br>1/22/2016 (\$575.00); 1/26/2016 (\$2,460.39);<br>1/28/2016 (\$5,888.62) | Approved |
| 6.2 | <u>Town Council Goals for 2016</u><br>Review and Accept Town Council and Community Goals<br>and Objectives for 2016               | Approved |

6.3 Commons Park ADA Pathway Project Approved  
Consider Acceptance of the Commons Park Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) Pathway Project (CIP No. 15-304) and Authorize the Interim Town Manager to File the Certificate of Completion with the County

6.4 Moraga Trails Map Removed  
Consider Resolution \_\_\_-2016 Appropriating an Amount Not to Exceed \$25,500 from the Fiscal Year 2015/16 General Fund Operating Surplus to Prepare a Trails Map and Geo-Rectified PDF of Trails in Moraga

B. Consideration of Consent Items Removed for Discussion

1. Moraga Trails Map  
Consider Resolution \_\_\_-2016 Appropriating an Amount Not to Exceed \$25,500 from the Fiscal Year 2015/16 General Fund Operating Surplus to Prepare a Trails Map and Geo-Rectified PDF of Trails in Moraga

**Councilmember Onoda** expressed concern with the request for a map when the Town had two existing maps, which appeared to work, along with a map available online. She opposed the expenditure of funds as requested.

Jay Ingram, Parks and Recreation Director, advised that the request was consistent with Town Council Goal 10; had been a goal of the Park and Recreation Commission in 2015; and the recommendation had been presented to the Town Council in January 2016. The Park Foundation had been asked to contribute \$8,000 to the project and agreed to do so if the Town Council funded the remaining \$17,500. The project would improve the interconnectivity of the trails in the Town, with a hard copy map to be used for existing and proposed trails and could be used as a planning document.

Responding to Council, Mr. Ingram affirmed there were no grants available for the project through the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD). The proposal was to use operating surplus funds to fund the project.

Melissa Erikson, Senior Associate, PlaceWorks, defined the term “interconnectivity;” stated the map was intended to clearly define the overall trail network and identify gaps; clarified how the trails would be identified and formatted on the maps through either a dotted line or a solid line; and explained that future development would then be aware of any proposed trail plans to allow for the connections to happen even if in slightly different locations to ensure connectivity.

Mr. Ingram identified eight trails in the 5-Year Capital Improvement Program (FY2015/16 to FY 2019/20) report on pages CIP-31 thru CIP-38 in addition to trails in the 2004 Trails Plan, and the EBRPD and East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) trails that already existed. As part of the project, PlaceWorks would interface with EBMUD and the EBRPD to address any issues, and would work with the Planning Department to include trails that were being considered and were part of planned or future projects.

## PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Joan Bruzzone, Moraga, expressed concern that the Town had plans for Bruzzone property of which the Bruzzone family was unaware until attending Town Council meetings. She questioned how the Town would have access to the planned private property trails; who would be responsible for building the trails; who would pay for the insurance involved; and questioned planning for private property absent the consent of the property owner. She referenced the update of the Moraga Center Specific Plan (MCSP) on Bruzzone property and the fact that three Councilmembers had voted in support of historic preservation, also absent property owner consent, which she found offensive.

Graig Crossley, Moraga, a member of the Park Foundation, supported the project and the expenditure of funds. He anticipated the work would allow an indication of what trails were accessible.

William Carman, Moraga, supported the project and suggested if the Town Council moved forward with the project it should include a plan for future development and consideration of in-lieu park fees. He emphasized the importance of a plan to show links and connections to be maintained whereby once a property was developed or a fee paid, the Town had ways to provide access, where possible, as part of the development negotiation process.

Jeanne Moreau, Moraga, supported a map of the trails, although given plans by the John Muir Land Trust to purchase the Carr Ranch property, she preferred more work by private citizens before the Town expended any funds on the effort.

Andy Scheck, Moraga, suggested the map could be used in two ways; to identify possible future trails, and to identify public trails which did not have access to private properties.

## PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

**Councilmember Onoda** reported that she had met with the Director of Parks and Recreation and had been shown two separate maps. Maps had also been viewed on the Town's homepage where all trails appeared to have been mapped. Given future developments such as Palos Colorados, Rancho Laguna II, and plans for the Carr Ranch with the John Muir Land Trust, future trails were possible and there would be a time when a new map was needed. She disagreed this was the time and suggested the requested project was premature.

**Councilmember Arth** agreed with Councilmember Onoda since the Town's current maps identified current trails, and suggested it would be speculative to discuss future trail locations. When a development was proposed and a trail was needed, it would be part of the negotiation process. He opposed the expenditure of funds at this time. He also commented that regardless of how the trail had been identified on the map, it could potentially encourage trespassing onto private property.

**Councilmember Wykle** clarified with Ms. Erikson the intent and purpose of the project; recognized the importance of improving the maps of existing trails; suggested the project could possibly be done in a phased approach; and agreed the Town should not spend too much money on the effort but should be aware of where the gaps were in the existing trail system.

**Mayor Metcalf** understood the Park Foundation had agreed to contribute \$8,000 for the project with the Town to expend the remaining funds. He suggested there could be a less expensive option and asked staff whether a Town expenditure of \$10,000 of General Fund monies would be sufficient to realize the project. He understood the map would be easy to update and could be a planning aid in addition to a hiker's aid.

Ms. Erikson explained that the PlaceWorks proposal had originally estimated \$17,000 with some minor clean up, preparation of a draft map, review and revision, with a print out of 500 copies. If that was how the Town wished to proceed, it would be a matter of addressing the accuracy of the existing data and how to supplement it.

When asked by Councilmember Onoda, Mr. Carman clarified he had not walked all of the trails but the green trails identified on the maps, and some of the potential trails. In terms of accuracy, he described the methods he had used based on the Town's records. He suggested the consultant would do a better job to ensure accuracy than what he could accomplish.

Mr. Ingram explained that if the Town Council considered a reduction in the scope of work, he would have to go back to the Park Foundation since it would contribute a portion of the Town's cost.

**Mayor Metcalf** offered a motion to reduce the scope of work and approve a project not to exceed \$17,000, with \$8,000 to be contributed by the Park Foundation.

Mr. Crossley advised that the \$8,000 the Park Foundation had approved on February 9, 2016 had been based on a project that had been quoted to the Park Foundation at \$25,500. If the Town Council reduced the scope of the project, in all fairness the matter should go back to the Park Foundation to inquire whether the Park Foundation would be willing to continue its commitment in the same amount.

The motion died due to a lack of second.

**Councilmember Wykle** agreed that staff should go back to the Park Foundation; consider the concerns of the property owners; refine the existing proposal without redoing it completely; and return to the Town Council with another scope of work.

**Councilmember Arth** made a motion to table the item; with the item to return to the Town Council at a future date when staff had the opportunity to look into the matter further, and develop exactly what needed to be done, and the different cost levels.

**Councilmember Wykle** seconded the motion.

**Mayor Metcalf** sought clearer direction to scope the project at \$17,000 and recommended that a Council representative work with staff and the Park Foundation to come up with a revised solution.

While staff sought additional direction, the Town Council offered no further direction on the matter at this time.

**ACTION: It was M/S (Arth/Wykle) to table the consideration of a Moraga Trails Map, a Resolution Appropriating an Amount Not to Exceed \$25,500 from the Fiscal Year 2015/16 General Fund Operating Surplus to Prepare a Trails Map and Geo-Rectified PDF of Trails in Moraga; with staff directed to look into the matter further, and develop exactly what needed to be done, and the different cost levels. Vote: 4-0-1. Absent: Trotter.**

## **7. ADOPTION OF MEETING AGENDA**

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED**

There were no comments from the public.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED**

**ACTION: It was M/S (Wykle/Onoda) to adopt the Meeting Agenda, as shown. Vote: 4-0-1. Absent: Trotter.**

## **8. REPORTS**

### **A. Mayor's and Councilmembers' Reports**

**Mayor Metcalf** – Reported that he had attended the opening for Natasha Grasso Jewelry in the Rheem Valley Shopping Center on February 4; and a meeting of the Southwest Area Transportation Committee (SWAT) with a continued review of the proposed Measure J reauthorization to be discussed during the Tri-City Meeting scheduled for Monday, February 29 in the City of Lafayette, with the meeting to be publicized on the Town's website and About Town Newsletter.

**Vice Mayor Trotter** – Absent.

**Councilmember Arth** – Reported that he had attended the Moraga Chamber of Commerce meeting on February 3; and the opening of Natasha Grasso Jewelry in the Rheem Valley Shopping Center on February 4, along with the Mayor and Councilmember Onoda.

**Councilmember Onoda** – Reported that she had attended the Mayors' Conference on February 4; Natasha Grasso Jewelry opening in the Rheem Valley Shopping Center on February 4; a Moraga Town Hall hosted by Catharine Baker and Steve Glazer on February 11; and announced the Saint Mary's College Museum would be hosting a new show on February 14; the SMC versus Gonzaga Basketball game had

been scheduled for February 14; and the Pure Muir Gala [John Muir Land Trust] scheduled for April 30, 2016 would raise money for the Carr Ranch land acquisition.

**Councilmember Wykle** – No report.

- B.** Town Manager Update – Interim Town Manager Robert Priebe reported that Governor Brown had signed Assembly Bill (AB) 21 on February 3, which eliminated the March 1, 2016 deadline for medical marijuana cultivation ordinances imposed on local governments by last year's Medical Marijuana Safety Act. Staff would bring the Town's ordinance to the Town Council in the future for clean-ups and to ensure consistency with the new act. He had received a request from the League of California Cities on February 8 to e-mail U.S. Senators to oppose the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, which included a permanent extension of the Internet Tax Freedom Act, and had sent an e-mail substantially the same as one that had been sent on December 14, 2015 by former Town Manager Jill Keimach. The Northern California Chapter of the Public Works Association had selected the Town of Moraga's Three-Year Extensive Pavement Program as Project of the Year for Small Cities and Rural Communities in the category of Environment. He commended Public Works Director/Town Engineer Edric Kwan and his team and took the opportunity to thank the Public Works and Parks and Recreation Departments for placing walking lights along the sidewalk outside of the Council Chambers, which was a temporary measure until a permanent solution could be provided.

## 9. DISCUSSION ITEMS

There were no discussion items.

## 10. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A.** Lamorinda Development Mitigation Fee Program  
Consider Resolution 10-2016 Adopting the 2015 Nexus Study for the Lamorinda Fee and Financing Authority (LFFA) Development Mitigation Fee Program and Impact Fees; and Approving the First Amendment to the LFFA Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement (JPA)

Planning Director Ellen Clark presented the staff report and recommended the Town Council adopt a resolution adopting the 2015 Nexus Study for the Lamorinda Fee and Financing Authority (LFFA) Development Mitigation Fee Program and Impact Fees, and approve the first amendment to the LFFA Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement (JPA).

Responding to Council, Ms. Clark identified the requirements of AB1600 which had been well established; the purpose of the Nexus Study to make the findings of nexus between the fee being charged and the nature of the fee; the number of findings to be made, and the components of the Nexus Study which included a multi-step process; the methodology used to identify the fees; and clarified that the fees the Town was currently

receiving had been based on a series of assumptions about development occurring in certain amounts in each of the three cities of Lafayette, Moraga and Orinda. Because of the way the current allocation had been structured, for every dollar Moraga collected in fees, the Town kept 20 cents of that dollar while 80 cents went back to the regional pot. The Town received approximately 11 percent of the remainder. Given that the Town had seen little growth since 2008, with more growth in Lafayette and Orinda, those communities had received a larger percentage of the pot.

Ms. Clark explained that based on all the calculations that had been done by the consultants, the fees to the Town had been determined to be fair and proportionate to the impacts of new development. Moraga's local fee, which was approximately \$588 for a single-family unit, did not come close to the additional increment associated with the new fee structure. She suggested the new structure offered a more fair return, and given the overlap between the two fee structures it would be difficult for the Town to justify keeping its local fee without substantial changes to the rest of the LFFA Program.

#### PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Dave Killam, Moraga, inquired of the total amount in fees the Town had received to date and what types of projects would be funded by the monies received.

Ms. Clark explained she did not have that data at hand although it was likely a relatively small amount.

**Mayor Metcalf** explained that the Town had spent approximately \$100,000 of the fees since 2008, with the majority of the monies given to Lafayette and Orinda all those years. He explained that the project included an expenditure program, which staff affirmed was an attachment to the staff report, with local flexibility as to how the Town could spend the funds.

#### PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

**ACTION: It was M/S (Arth/Onoda) to adopt Resolution 10-2016, Adopting the 2015 Lamorinda Development Mitigation Fee Program Nexus Study and Impact Fees; and Approving the First Amendment to the 1998 Lamorinda Fee and Financing Authority Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement. Vote: 4-0-1. Absent: Trotter.**

#### **B. Master Fee Schedule Update**

Consider Resolution 11-2016 Amending Resolution No. 55-2015 Adopting the Town of Moraga Master Fee Schedule Effective July 27, 2015 to Include Town Council Chambers and Community Meeting Room Fees

Mr. Ingram presented the staff report and recommended the Town Council adopt a resolution amending Resolution No. 55-2015 adopting the Town of Moraga Master Fee Schedule effective July 27, 2015 to include Town Council Chambers and Community Meeting Room fees.

In response to the Council, Mr. Ingram defined the differences between private and commercial rentals of the Council Chambers and Community Meeting Room. In terms of the fees imposed on other governmental agencies, the Town typically charged a fee

for the use of its facilities, and given the Town's revenue problems it offered an opportunity to recoup the Town's costs, which was a policy question before the Town Council. He affirmed that staff verified non-profit status for requests. He also affirmed that the Master Fee Schedule would not apply to the Town's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Saint Mary's College (SMC), and if the Town had an MOU with the Moraga School District (MSD), the same could apply.

#### PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

There were no comments from the public.

#### PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

**Councilmember Onoda** found the rates to be reasonable and the Master Fee Schedule, as updated, to be well done.

**Councilmember Wykle** clarified with staff the development of the potential fees; found the fees to be comparable to those charged by the cities of Orinda, Lafayette, and Walnut Creek; and while he agreed the Town had a revenue problem, he did not wish to impose a fee on non-profits and governmental agencies.

Mr. Ingram advised that he had contacted all of the cities in Contra Costa County, and the information contained in the staff report on the fees imposed by other communities were from those cities that had responded to his inquiries.

**Councilmember Arth** suggested the imposition of a fee on non-profits would be acceptable if a service was being provided whereby a fee should be charged. He suggested non-profits like the Park Foundation, which donated monies back to the Town for Town projects, should not be charged a fee and suggested that those entities should be granted a waiver. He suggested that a fee should be charged to everyone, with waivers granted based on an exceptional basis.

**Councilmember Onoda** clarified with staff the fees imposed on non-profits for the use of other Town parks and facilities and suggested there were other components to consider, not just the amount of the fee.

**Mayor Metcalf** opposed a fee on another governmental agency while recognizing the MSD imposed a fee on the Town for the use of its facilities. He added that the Town had already approved an MOU with SMC, which stated the Town would not impose such fees on SMC. He also opposed a fee on the Moraga-Orinda Fire District (MOFD) although he supported fees imposed on private and commercial entities. As a general rule, he believed non-profits should be charged, although he agreed there should be a list of non-profit exceptions that could be considered.

Mr. Ingram clarified that the Master Fee Schedule did include exceptions for the Park and Hacienda Foundations given that 100 percent of their activities benefitted the Town; the only non-profits where that was the case. The same model could be used for the use of the Council Chambers and Community Room. As to whether a list of non-profit exceptions could be brought back to the Town Council, he commented on the challenges given the dozens of service clubs in the Town where some money went

back to the Town or local schools, and the Town Council would have to decide when to grant an exception. He recommended that the Town Council leave the exceptions with the Park and Hacienda Foundations.

**Mayor Metcalf** disagreed with the staff recommendation on the discussion of non-profit exceptions.

**Councilmember Onoda** recognized many non-profits helped the Town in different ways; recognized the challenges in determining which non-profit to grant an exception, and recommended the Town Council follow the staff recommendation.

**Mayor Metcalf** was willing to charge non-profits, as proposed, although he disagreed with charges to any governmental agency.

**Councilmembers Onoda** and **Wykle** accepted the Mayor's recommendation, and clarified with staff that SMC would not pay for the use of the Council Chambers and Community Room given the existing MOU between the Town and SMC.

**Mayor Metcalf** made a motion, seconded by **Councilmember Onoda** to adopt Resolution 11-2016 Amending Resolution No. 55-2015 Adopting the Town of Moraga Master Fee Schedule Effective July 27, 2015 to Include Town Council Chambers and Community Meeting Room Fees, with no charges to any governmental agency.

On the motion, **Councilmember Arth** asked that the motion also exclude the Moraga Park Foundation and The Hacienda Foundation of Moraga from charges.

**Mayor Metcalf** accepted the amendment noting that everything the Moraga Park Foundation and The Hacienda Foundation of Moraga did went back to the community.

**Councilmember Onoda**, as the second to the motion, also accepted the amendment.

**ACTION: It was M/S (Metcalf/Onoda) to adopt Resolution 11-2016 Amending Resolution No. 55-2015 Adopting the Town of Moraga Master Fee Schedule Effective July 27, 2015 to Include Town Council Chambers and Community Meeting Room Fees, with no charges to any governmental agency or to the non-profits Moraga Park Foundation and The Hacienda Foundation of Moraga. Vote: 4-0-1. Absent: Trotter.**

**C. Development Impact Fees**

Consider Adopting Resolution \_\_\_-2016 to: Adopt the 2016 Comprehensive Development Impact Fee Update (2016 Nexus Study); Adopt Updated General Government, Public Safety, Storm Drainage, and Park Development Impact Fees; Adopt an Updated Fee In-Lieu of Parkland Dedication; and Consider Waiving the First Reading and Introducing an Ordinance Amending Moraga Municipal Code Chapter 8.140, Park Dedications, and Chapter 17.24, Park Development Impact Fee (**Staff recommended continuance to the Town Council Meeting of February 24, 2016**)

Ms. Clark advised of the staff recommendation to continue the item to the Town Council meeting of February 24, 2016, to allow staff time to resolve a few more details.

#### PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

There were no comments from the public.

#### PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

**ACTION: It was M/S (Metcalf/Arth) to continue consideration of a resolution to: Adopt the 2016 Comprehensive Development Impact Fee Update (2016 Nexus Study); Adopt Updated General Government, Public Safety, Storm Drainage, and Park Development Impact Fees; Adopt an Updated Fee In-Lieu of Parkland Dedication; and Consider Waiving the First Reading and Introducing an Ordinance Amending Moraga Municipal Code Chapter 8.140, Park Dedications, and Chapter 17.24, Park Development Impact Fee; to the Town Council Meeting of February 24, 2016. Vote: 4-0-1. Absent: Trotter.**

### 11. ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND REQUESTS FOR ACTION

#### A. Hacienda de las Flores Conceptual Plan

Consider a Draft Final Conceptual Plan for the Hacienda de las Flores as Directed from the July 8, 2015 Town Council Meeting and Provide Direction to Staff

Mr. Ingram presented the staff report and introduced Lauren Maass and Douglas Thornley with Gould Evans.

Lauren Maass, Gould Evans, Project Manager, presented a PowerPoint presentation offering a recap of the first initial phase of the project since it had last been presented to the Town Council in July 2015; with direction at that time to proceed with the development of Concept A: Community Conference Center and Inn. She detailed the site plan proposed in 2015 with a balance of public and private uses with six new guest rooms as part of the Hacienda renovation; the addition of a garden room/banquet facility to be supported by a restaurant that would use the existing kitchen, serving as a hub to the Hacienda and the possible private development; a banquet facility intended to be used for public use as well; and the Pavilion, to be the community portion of the project to be developed with meeting rooms, the Parks and Recreation Department, and possibly a pool and recreation area in future phases. The key would be a new entrance on Moraga Road to change the circulation pattern onsite.

Additional community meetings had been held along with a meeting with the business operator of home/made kitchen café and bakery; a developer think tank meeting in September 2015; along with meetings with the Public Works Department to discuss the Moraga Road entry and Livable Moraga Road Project in October 2015; and discussions with the MOFD in January 2016 on the continued use of the fire access route off Donald and Devin Drives, and the change in use of the Hacienda necessitating the installation of fire sprinklers throughout the facility including the new garden room and banquet facility.

Ms. Maass detailed the think tank discussions with regional and private developers to discuss the potential opportunities for the Hacienda. The think tank included a site tour, presentation of Concept A, and questions on the visioning tasked for the Hacienda facility. Feedback had been positive as it reflected on the improved visibility with the Moraga Road entry, and encouragement to limit the focus on a smaller business model and create synergy around the Hacienda itself for future development both public and private rather than the multiple casita idea. There was also support for six guest rooms, supported by a restaurant, bar and the banquet and special events facility to be used for both the community and private events. The rental of the Hacienda for special events had been recognized as part of the revenue collecting ability of the use and the need to increase the user-ship. There had also been discussions for a community pool/spa in the Pavilion although there were challenges that had been acknowledged by those attending the think tank discussions. It was also recommended that Gould Evans continue with a marketing study.

Ms. Maass identified the Town of Moraga's retention of the firm PKF Consulting to conduct a market study with a focus on lodging and how it would be supported by a restaurant and special event facility. The study had identified four areas of possible revenue; the creation of a new community room and meeting room rents, garden room rentals, a restaurant and bar, and guest rooms with projected revenue based on the analysis through the year 2020, which revenue projections she detailed for the Town Council. For the six-room concept, management and staff could be onsite at the facility and did not need to be present in the later evening hours. She offered a comparison to other lodging and event facilities with a similar business model.

Ms. Maass advised that Gould Evans was now proposing a phased approach to Concept A. Phase 1: Community Conference Center and Inn by creating five guest rooms upstairs in the Hacienda; building a structure (Garden Room) for indoor event seating of 200 people; relocating the main entry/exit to Moraga Road, to be widened and made more accessible for through traffic for public and private uses; the Mosaic Room could be made into a meeting room; no changes had been proposed to the existing kitchen facility other than creating more refrigeration units and more storage; retaining the Fireside Room, with the bar and lounge area to spill off of that and connect directly to the Garden Room.

Ms. Maass explained that the removal of the northern side of the Hacienda where the current Park and Recreation offices were located to open the entry with more future plaza area was part of a future phase along with integrating a better lobby entrance sequence into the Hacienda; keeping the Donald Rheem Suite on the second level with four additional rooms to be created; installing an elevator to be strategically accessed from both the front and back connecting all four levels of the Hacienda ensuring full accessibility; and creating a lounge area near the elevator could also be part of the inn amenities. An economical renovation to the Casita building into community room space and economical renovation of the La Sala Building to accommodate the Parks and Recreation office had also been proposed. The costs for Concept A and Concept A: Phase One were detailed. The costs included road improvements.

Ms. Maass identified Phase Two, to consider removing the La Sala Building to create a courtyard/drop off area adjacent to the Hacienda; constructing a wine cave with private funding; adding community building space to the Pavilion's southernmost patio wall; and

considering the construction of more guest rooms adding hillside cottages adjacent to the Waxman Trail and along Devin Drive. Phase Three would replace the Pavilion pool, create a day spa amenity; consider a custom crush facility with private funding to support the local wine industry; and consider building more guestrooms on the property if the market existed.

Ms. Maass advised that Gould Evans planned to return to the Town Council with more fully developed concept plans, programming, and visual renderings. She sought input from the Town Council on the phased approach.

Responding to the Council, Ms. Maass identified the cost for the road widening for the entry at Moraga Road, with almost half of the amount dedicated to the development of the road and infrastructure, and an expansion of a parking area to provide additional parking at the Moraga Road entry. The parking had been identified as being needed for special events. An entry off of Devin Drive where there was an opening in the gate identifying a trail entrance had not been explored as an entrance/exit to the Hacienda, as opposed to what had been recommended, although it could be explored if that was the Town Council's direction.

Douglas Thornley, Principal, Gould Evans, affirmed that the other entry point, (off Devin Drive) the original entry to the estate, had been discussed although there had been concerns with an entrance that close to an intersection, and to investigate that option would require a traffic study. The cost to widen the road to 22 feet from Moraga Road had been estimated at \$77,000, with some additional replacement of asphalt requiring an additional \$18,000.

Mr. Ingram clarified as part of Phase One that the Town's programs would go to the Casita, La Sala Buildings, and Garden Room, and the rooms would be available for public and private use.

As to the possibility of private funds for Phase One, Ms. Maass affirmed there had been some interest although she could not speak for anyone who attended the developer think tank. There had also been some interest in developing a Request for Proposal (RFP) for developers who might be interested in the project.

In response to the Mayor's concerns regarding the unlikelihood of the Hacienda to capture significant lodging demand from traditional business and leisure sources, Mr. Ingram explained that the study prepared by PKF Consulting had addressed average occupancy between 70 and 80 percent over the last couple of years, increasing closer to the 80 percentile occupancy rate. The PFK study had shown a 25 percent occupancy at the Hacienda while still being able to generate the amount of revenue shown in the report.

**Mayor Metcalf** suggested that the report prepared by PKF Consulting had used flawed assumptions. He disagreed that SMC alone would not likely fill the Hacienda year round. If there was a 50 percent load, it would be a better picture, and he did not want to see such a report presented out to potential investors. He was also aware there was opposition in the community to the concept that had been proposed. He asked whether the Hacienda Foundation had commented on the staff report.

Mr. Thornley affirmed that Gould Evans had met with SMC, which had suggested the facility would be used if improved as proposed, although SMC was not willing to commit. While the report offered a conservative approach, he was confident SMC would still be interested in the property.

Mr. Ingram added that SMC had expressed interest in the Hacienda property although a commitment from SMC at this time would be premature. The Hacienda Foundation and the public had been provided a copy of the staff report at the same time as the Town Council.

## PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Wendy Scheck, President, Moraga Chamber of Commerce, was pleased to see the drafts of the concept for the Hacienda, and the potential to increase the use of the Hacienda for the community. Having attended the community workshops, she was intrigued with Concept A, although she was confused with the report from PKF Consulting, which lacked analysis of current event centers and restaurants in the Lamorinda area, market demand for lodging for corporate or wedding parties, and limited data on the current event rentals for the Hacienda. She suggested it appeared as if the conclusions had been based on data crunching software rather than an analysis of the true situation in Moraga. She detailed a list of local event centers that could be used as a comparison to the Hacienda for events and dining, and suggested that only six hotel rooms was shortsighted given a demand potential for hotel rooms and weddings that occurred annually around SMC's Chapel.

Ms. Scheck added the possibility of an intimate corporate retreat center had not been analyzed as a potential revenue source. She suggested the market conditions should be more thoroughly investigated, and suggested the Chamber of Commerce could work with the Town on a local think tank in order to gather and clarify the data for potential business drivers to allow the Town Council to make a more informed decision.

Bob Reynolds, Moraga, former member of the Hacienda Foundation and a current member of the Park Foundation, questioned whether the revenue projections, which had suggested the community facility would generate \$1.2 million; \$12,000 per use for 200 people at \$60 a head, were accurate. He otherwise liked the professional approaches proposed for the use of the property.

Joan Bruzzone, Moraga, asked whether the Hacienda Foundation supported the proposal.

Graig Crossley, Moraga, stated he was not authorized by the Hacienda Foundation to speak on its behalf, and was speaking as an individual. He reported the Hacienda Foundation had learned of the agenda item on Monday, February 8 but had not reached a consensus on the project. He was comfortable with Phase One, as proposed, with five or six rooms on the second floor. The suggestion for a community room could have been placed differently although he liked the capacity and the proposed use, and agreed with the expansions planned for the Casita and La Sala Buildings. He suggested the use of Moraga Road as the primary access to the Hacienda and widening it must take into consideration an existing wide swale, raising accessibility questions given the steepness of the road. He asked what remediation would be done

for the slope, and suggested a pedestrian pathway down Moraga Road through the swale and to the Hacienda should be considered.

Mr. Crossley also suggested if the main entrance was off Moraga Road, trash cans should not be allowed to be placed where they were now. He questioned whether the large structure to accommodate a 200-capacity design would be in keeping with the Spanish architectural style and design, and emphasized the need for consistency with the main Hacienda structure. In addition, he found the revenue projections to be optimistic with no cost estimates other than the numbers identified during the presentation. If Phases Two or Three were considered with a potential hotel, he recommended that a private business not be on the Hacienda grounds.

Judy Dinkle, Moraga, a former member of the Hacienda Foundation speaking as a resident, was thrilled to see the phased approach. She hoped the compromise from a 30 to a five- or six-room plan would not preclude some of the interested investors. She agreed that SMC was a potential source for filling all of the rooms and keeping the restaurant and meeting spaces rented and was a market that should not be ignored; found the report from PKF Consulting had not addressed those issues or specifics to the marketplace that should be included; emphasized the importance of the report to be as accurate as possible to ensure feasibility; and was encouraged that the Town would have an opportunity to do something significant the residents could enjoy and use. She encouraged the Town Council to move forward with the effort.

Edy Schwartz, Moraga, was excited about the plan and appreciated the comments offered by the Chamber of Commerce. She referenced the recent Business Symposium hosted by the Chamber at SMC, at which time the new property owner of the Rheem Valley Shopping Center had offered some ideas. She suggested the Town had potential it could not yet imagine, and with the right design and thinking the Hacienda could become something great. She also suggested the potential for a restaurant was tremendous based on the former home/made kitchen café and bakery.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

Ms. Maass again identified the next steps of the process where Gould Evans would come back to the Town Council with fully developed concept plans, programming and visual renderings; to include a more elaborate and robust programming analysis; further development of the site plan and floor plans; and potential three dimensional renderings. Although Gould Evans would not write a RFP, it had the resources available to assist the Town in that effort.

Mr. Ingram advised that the scope of work for PKF Consulting had been limited to what had been presented, with staff focused on keeping the costs limited given the conceptual stage.

Ms. Maass noted that PKF Consulting had looked at the lodging aspect and another consultant might have to review the events and other potential uses that had been referenced.

**Councilmember Wykle** liked the concept and the idea the Hacienda would remain open for community events. He also liked the potential contract with an operator and

the location of the existing main entrance, but found the site development estimates to be conservative given that ADA improvements and pedestrian accessibility would be required.

**Councilmember Onoda** was excited with the project; the fact the upper level would be accessible with an elevator; the idea of five, not six rooms; but did not want to see the larger community room divided. She expressed concern with the location of the main driveway given the proximity of the Pavilion and the existing bridge, with possible traffic and pedestrian conflicts. She would rather see the main driveway be located on the flat pathway which was wider and safer. She also expressed concern with a potential restaurant use and recommended the restaurant use be open at all times, with wedding events held in the Pavilion. She suggested the design of the Garden Room did not fit the glamor of the Hacienda or the Pavilion and should repeat the existing architecture of the Hacienda. Further, given the close proximity of the Park Hotel in the City of Lafayette, she suggested a partnership with that business should be considered.

**Councilmember Arth** commented that the projected revenue had reasonable numbers, and clarified with Mr. Ingram how the numbers had come about for the banquet facility.

**Mayor Metcalf** clarified with staff that the Town, not Gould Evans, had retained PKF Consulting. He was disappointed with the report from PKF Consulting. He questioned a discussion of the specific design issues at this time given that they were not at that level of detail. He wanted to see more work on the potential entrance at Moraga Road and how it would handle the existing grades and potential safety hazards. Since the original entrance to the Hacienda estate had been on Devin Drive, and the pavement remained, he questioned why that alternative had not been analyzed in more detail. He wanted to see those alternatives be researched more to allow a better discussion of the best alternative to consider.

**Mayor Metcalf** recommended the phased approach be detailed in more depth to be more attractive to potential investors and allow more detail between the private and public uses. While he commended Gould Evans' efforts, he did not support the continued use of PKF Consulting.

Mr. Ingram affirmed the direction from the Town Council.

Mr. Thornley explained that Gould Evans would begin working with the Moraga Chamber of Commerce on its suggestions; continue conversations with SMC; reconsider the entrance; and prepare some imagery to entice people to invest in the project.

As to whether Gould Evans would be able to respond to the direction from the Town Council and still hold a proposed February 23 Open House meeting, Mr. Ingram advised for the benefit of the audience that he would verify with the consultant whether that date could still be met. From the audience, he was informed that February 23 was also the date of the Business Person of the Year event sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce.

**Vice Mayor Trotter** arrived at 10:07 P.M.

**Mayor Metcalf** declared a recess at 10:07 P.M. The Town Council meeting reconvened at 10:15 P.M. with all Councilmembers present.

**B. Palos Colorados Processing Agreement**

Consider Resolution 12-2016 Approving an Agreement for Processing Future Grading Authorizations with Richfield Real Estate Corporation and Bigbury Company Regarding Palos Colorados

Assistant Town Attorney Karen Murphy presented the staff report and recommended Town Council approval of the item subject to revisions to Attachment B, Proposed Agreement for Processing Future Grading Authorizations with Richfield Real Estate Corporation and Bigbury Company Regarding Palos Colorados to Section 3, Conditions Related to Grading Permit Milestones; Section 4, Post Final Map and Grading Permit Conditions as related to C.3 requirements and bus shelters, to be separately recorded against the property; and confirmed in the Agreement that future owners were responsible for the ongoing payment obligations under the Agreement.

Responding to the Council, Ms. Murphy affirmed the intent of Section 2.3, Refund of Deposit, as written, with Section 1.1, Amount of Deposit stating that it would be a non-refundable deposit with the one exception shown in Section 2.3.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED**

Alicia Guerra, Buchalter Nemer, on behalf of Richfield and Bigbury, reiterated the commitment to move forward with the Palos Colorados project. She stated her client was aware of Town Counsel's request for the two revisions to the Agreement and was in agreement with those revisions.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED**

**ACTION: It was M/S (Trotter/Arth) to adopt Resolution 12-2016 Approving an Agreement for Processing Future Grading Authorizations with Richfield Real Estate Corporation and Bigbury Company Regarding Palos Colorados, subject to the following revisions to Attachment B, Proposed Agreement for Processing Future Grading Authorizations with Richfield Real Estate Corporation and Bigbury Company Regarding Palos Colorados to Section 3, Conditions Related to Grading Permit Milestones; Section 4, Post Final Map and Grading Permit Conditions, as related to C.3 requirements and bus shelters, to be separately recorded against the property; and confirmed in the Agreement that future owners were responsible for the ongoing payment obligations under the Agreement. Vote: 5-0.**

**C. Moraga Center Specific Plan Implementation Project**

Review Moraga Center Specific Plan Implementation Project – Vision Concept and Provide Direction to Staff

Senior Planner Holly Pearson presented the staff report and provided the background to the Moraga Center Specific Plan (MCSP) Implementation Project, and introduced Stefan Pellegrini with Opticos Design.

Stefan Pellegrini, Principal, Opticos Design, presented an overview and PowerPoint presentation of the MCSP Implementation Project – Vision Concept; also identifying the background of the project, the formation and discussions of the MCSP Implementation Project Steering Committee, development of the vision concept, guiding design principles for the site, a set of site plan alternatives for key parts of the MCSP Area, a mixed-use and residential zoning framework, a proposed street network, proposed zoning map, and illustrative drawings and renderings to demonstrate potential development scenarios that could result from application of the new zoning.

Mr. Pellegrini explained that underlying the MCSP implementation strategy was the integration of “form-based” zoning standards into the code amendments that could promote high-quality, mixed-use, walkable, people-oriented places. Form-based zoning focused on the physical form of development rather than the separation of land uses, as was the case with conventional zoning, and the approach could ensure a more predictable outcome for the MCSP in terms of the type, scale, and form of new development.

In the process leading up to the crafting of the Vision Concept, the consultant team, Town staff, and the Steering Committee had reviewed examples of form-based coding applications that had been enacted in other jurisdictions, both locally and around the country. He identified the following design principles that formed the basis of the Vision Concept for the MCSP:

1. Create a connected street network through the entire Specific Plan area;
2. Support new public spaces through active block frontages (i.e. requiring building fronts and entries to face streets and public spaces); and
3. Create fine-grained pedestrian and bicycle routes through the site.

The Implementation Strategies included a series of site plan alternatives based on the above principles, which were divided into two different timeframes for implementation. Short- to mid-term site development strategies included:

- Develop School Street as a “complete street” that serves as a new main street for the area;
- Create a central public square, which should be the initial focal point for new commercial and mixed-use development;
- Create an active public space along the creek with good pedestrian access;
- Establish an inviting, human-scale neighborhood environment through appropriately-designed building frontages along School Street and along the creek;
- Provide a bridge connection from School Street’s public square to new and existing residential neighborhoods across Laguna Creek;

- Establish a new street network through the existing shopping center area, with an emphasis on the streets as public spaces. Provide on-street parking and improve access and facilities for pedestrian and bicyclists;
- Improve building frontages along the primary streets in the area, Moraga Road and Moraga Way (i.e. requiring building fronts and entries to have a primary orientation to the street that relates to an improved design scenic corridor design);
- Enhance and improve the Lafayette-Moraga Regional Trail through the site, either or both through developing a multi-use trail along the creek and/or with on-street bike lanes and an improved pedestrian path;
- Revitalize and improve connectivity through the existing shopping center by adding new streets that provide the structure for development of smaller scale, neighborhood-serving retail and services. Convert small portions of existing underutilized parking into new public spaces;
- As the site develops, accommodate parking in lots that are internal to blocks (i.e. not fronting on the street); and
- Improve the design of the scenic corridors through the site (Moraga Way and Moraga Road) through one of two design options, "Frontage Road" or "Attached Green."

Longer-term implementation strategies for the site included:

- Build out the new street network over time with a variety of new residential unit types that can accommodate different household types, such as families, seniors and students. Examples of unit types include townhouses on the internal streets near the central square, live/work units around the shopping center, and apartments or flats along the scenic green on Moraga Road; and
- Provide a pedestrian path along the scenic corridor frontage to improve access to the shopping center and new housing.

The Vision Concept articulated a series of eight new zoning districts for the MCSP Area, accommodating a range of land uses and intensities of built form, following the policy direction established in the MCSP. Medium and higher intensity "core" zones would be located at the center of the site, with progressively lower intensity zones ("general" and "edge") providing a transition between the village center and the existing residential neighborhoods adjacent to the MCSP site. The zone districts were applied to the MCSP Area to implement the land use designations described in the specific plan, and to generally provide land use mix, density, and intensity that was in keeping with the MCSP vision. In some cases, the district boundaries had been refined from the MCSP land use map in order to better relate to existing topography and/or site constraints and to ensure compatibility between zones.

Mr. Pellegrini reported that a public Open House and Joint Meeting of the Design Review Board (DRB) and Planning Commission had been held on January 25; the

consultant was in the process of drafting the zoning amendments to be brought to staff in late February, with Steering Committee meetings to discuss the public review of the draft code in March and April. The project would then be brought back to the Planning Commission and the Town Council for further discussion.

Responding to Council, Mr. Pellegrini affirmed that the affordable housing component of the MCSP was in the 20 dwelling units to the acre (DUA) range, to occur in Area 5 of the MCSP, although the MCSP allowed the use to appear in other land use districts as well. He identified the building types for Area 5 with a mix of apartment buildings, two to three stories in height, to be supplemented with townhomes, row homes, or other multifamily buildings. Standards would be applied to ensure the building types were compatible with the environment and with existing standards in the Zoning Ordinance for the R-20 zoning district.

Ms. Clark noted the density range would allow for different building types that would accommodate seniors at various stages of their lives.

In terms of addressing concerns with large out-of-scale homes adjacent to the street and given the Town's topography, Mr. Pellegrini explained that the process would allow a comprehensive review of the site as a whole. Large homes would likely happen in those zoning districts, but they might have to re-think the lot sizes and setbacks to ensure the homes were in keeping with the homes in the neighborhood. The intent was to make the standards clear enough to de-incentivize the use of Planned Developments (PDs).

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

<b>ACTION: It was M/S (Trotter/Onoda) to extend the Town Council Meeting to 11:30 P.M. Vote: 5-0.</b>
---

Dave Bruzzone, Moraga, reported a field trip had recently been held with some of the Steering Committee members and a couple of members of the Planning Commission to tour the site, an exercise he found to be productive, although he remained concerned the new regulations would be applied exclusively to Bruzzone property. He spoke to market constraints, economic conditions, phasing, and engineering considerations, which were all involved in creating a viable and successful product. He expressed concern with any standards that would impact his existing tenants and sought additional working sessions with staff and the consultant to ensure a successful project.

Ms. Clark affirmed that she had recently spoken with Mr. Bruzzone and Opticos Design, and agreed it would be productive to meet with the major property owner to ensure a successful project and learn what ideas the Bruzzones had for their property.

Jim Parsons, PA Design Resources, Land Planners and Engineers, Walnut Creek, spoke to his experience working with the Bruzzone family through a large number of projects. He had also participated in the tour of the property. He stated the Vision Concept had some good ideas, although the plan contained specificity that would have to be converted into reality, raising concerns setting aside areas to meet stormwater detention requirements. Grading and circulation were also issues for the area designated for Residential on the west side of the creek. He wanted to see those

issues resolved prior to locking in the plan to ensure that an acceptable grading plan could be achieved. He agreed that any opportunity to work with Opticos Design and staff would be very productive.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

**Councilmember Onoda** reported that she had also participated in the tour of the property, and suggested Opticos Design and the entire Town Council consider touring the site. She agreed with the importance of C.3 requirements and detention while recognizing the process was only in the conceptual stage. She thanked the Bruzzone family for allowing a tour of their property.

**Vice Mayor Trotter** asked staff to speak with Mr. Parsons when moving forward with the Vision Concept given the importance of the practical considerations. He referenced the materials presented, such as the trail network on both sides of the creek, which had been shown on Page 20 of the PowerPoint presentation although a previous document [Page 8] had not shown the same trail network. He emphasized the graphics needed to be consistent and clear, which was the direction requested by the Steering Committee. While the zoning implementation included appropriate locations for civic space and took advantage of terrain, he was uncertain of the mechanism to be used to preserve the ideas for civic space within the MCSP Area.

Mr. Pellegrini anticipated that in addition to the Zoning Map, there could be at least two other regulating plans; one would regulate the types and locations of the civic space and the other would regulate the types and locations of streets or thoroughfares. Both would build in a certain degree of flexibility.

**Vice Mayor Trotter** suggested the civic spaces were mostly in the right locations, and had been based on a considerable amount of effort and insight, with Mr. Pellegrini advising that the regulating plan would tie down the locations and the actual shapes subject to performance standards.

**Vice Mayor Trotter** spoke to the zoning implementation for the east end of Moraga Way. He clarified with Mr. Pellegrini for Area 2 that the cross hatch lines had designated an "open" designation, meaning Residential uses were allowed in addition to Commercial uses, and clarified the Mixed Use General Open Zoning Designation along Country Club Drive. He stated that the zoning suggested Residential should be encouraged as opposed to other development in that area. However a very dense and inappropriate residential use had been proposed for that space which had received a great deal of criticism from the Planning Commission.

**Vice Mayor Trotter** noted when the MCSP had been approved in 2010, it had not focused on that small piece of land and, based on the Planning Commission concerns should be considered for a different treatment. As to the conceptual pictures for the scenic corridor, as shown in the presentation, Picture 15 had shown new retail along Moraga Way with a reduction in parking, raising concerns that too much existing parking was being removed and if in fact that stretch of Moraga Way should have additional retail given the scenic corridor guidelines.

Mr. Pellegrini affirmed that the property owner would not be required to place buildings at that location if it would interfere with the needs of existing tenants.

**Councilmember Onoda** agreed with the comments from the Vice Mayor and urged the consultant and the Steering Committee to address the concerns with the walkability of the streets on the west side on the hill. She noted that she had recently provided Ms. Clark some comments that should be considered.

**Councilmember Wykle** again clarified the next steps for the project, thanked the Bruzzone family for hosting the field trip of the MCSP Area, and agreed with the need to see a continued effort to work with the property owner.

Ms. Clark confirmed that a meeting with the property owner would occur in the next few weeks.

**Councilmember Arth** stated he had frequently spoken with the Bruzzone family and had been pleased that the early discussions had expanded with a positive cooperation between the Town and the property owners.

**Mayor Metcalf** spoke to the seven-year effort to create the MCSP and its history once approved in 2010, where the Town desired to start with implementation and a Development Agreement (DA) to address the infrastructure that needed to be built, although there had been nothing from the Bruzzone family at that time to allow the effort to move forward. Now that the effort was moving forward, he asked Town staff to ensure that momentum continued.

**Vice Mayor Trotter** acknowledged the desire to move the effort forward and have a dialogue with the Bruzzone family, which was important, but he did not necessarily see the need for that dialogue to drag on indefinitely to allow choices to be made. He pointed out it had been a Town Council goal to complete this task in 2016, and he wanted to see it done.

Ms. Clark summarized the comments from the Town Council that the general direction was helpful and that staff should continue to expediently move forward with this process and engage with the property owner to obtain input as needed.

## **12. COUNCIL REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

**Vice Mayor Trotter** reiterated a past request for a future agenda item related to the Town Council giving direction on the use of a \$10,000 payment for the removal of trees by SummerHill Homes, and his recommendation that the funds be spent on the future acquisition of the Carr Ranch property.

Ms. Murphy reported that the request had been scheduled for Town Council consideration at its meeting scheduled for March 23, 2016.

## **13. COMMUNICATIONS**

There were no communications.

14. ADJOURNMENT

**ACTION: It was M/S (Wykle/Arth) to adjourn the meeting at 11:27 P.M. Vote: 5-0.**

Respectfully submitted by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Marty G. McInturf, Town Clerk

Approved by the Town Council:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Metcalf, Mayor

