



HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING
MINUTES July 25, 2019
City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 A.M.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Bower, Board Member Bernstein, Board Member Kohler, Board Member Wimmer

Absent: Vice Chair Corey, Board Member Makinen, Board Member Shepherd

Chair Bower: Okay, I see lights on. We have a quorum, so Robin, would you call roll.

Ms. Robin Ellner: Four present and we do have a quorum. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Thank you Robin.

Oral Communications

Chair Bower: It's nice to see faces in the audience this morning. Welcome to all of you. We'll do oral communications. Anyone that wants to speak on any topic not on our agenda, just three minutes. I don't have any cards, so we'll move right on to the next item.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Bower: Agenda Changes, Additions or Deletions. I don't think...

Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official: None.

City Official Reports

1. 2019 Historic Resources Board Meeting Schedule and Assignments.

Chair Bower: Okay, Official City Reports.

Ms. French: We do not have any today.

Chair Bower: Right. There's one correction on the meeting schedule. I had thought I would be out of town September 26th. I will not, I'll be here, so, that's another opportunity for us to have a meeting.

Study Session

Chair Bower: Okay, Study Session. It's three minutes per speaker and I don't think we'll have a problem letting everyone who wants to speak, speak.

Action Items

46 **2. Historic Resources Board Discussion and Comments on the Historic Resources**
47 **Evaluation of the Former Cannery Property Located at 340 Portage Avenue (Frys site),**
48 **within the North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan (NVCAP).**
49

50 Chair Bower: So, let's move on to the Action Items: Historic Resources Board Discussion and Comments on
51 the Historic Resources evaluation of the Former Cannery Property Located at 340 Portage Avenue
52 commonly known to us Palo Altons as Frys, which is within the North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan, which
53 you will see in the printed materials abbreviated as NVCAP. Okay, so I see that our consultant is here.
54 Please begin your presentation.
55

56 Ms. French: Amy French, Chief Planning Official. I'm introducing Elena Lee, who is the manager of the
57 project and is the long-range planning manager as well, and then, of course, we do have Christina Dikas,
58 Page & Turnbull.
59

60 Elena Lee, Manager of the Project and Long-Range Planning Manager: Thank you Amy. Good morning
61 Board Members. So, the purpose of today's meeting is to review and discuss the Historic Resources
62 Evaluation prepared as part of the North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan. The Plan is in its initial stages and
63 discussion on plan options have just begun; however, we anticipate three alternatives to be developed, but
64 those have not been proposed or developed quite yet. There will be multiple future meetings at the next
65 following stages to discuss those in detail, and the outcome of those meetings or the materials prepared
66 for those meetings will depend definitely on the discussion and the feedback from you today. There will
67 also be a second community meetings to actually also carefully review all of these options. So, we anticipate
68 that this project will require an environmental impact report or supplemental EIR because that has been
69 discovered through this process that the 340 Portage is eligible for the California Registry, and that will
70 require its own lengthy process and analysis. So, I'll provide a brief overview of the North Ventura
71 Coordinated Area Plan process and as Amy said, Christina is here to present an overview of the HRE. So,
72 the NVCAP is a direct outcome of the Comp Plan update that was adopted in 2017, and there's actually an
73 overview of the site. So, it's basically a 60-acre site around the, what's known as the Frys property, or 340
74 Portage. So, Comp Plan has Policy 1.7 which says that you should use coordinated area plans to help guide
75 development, especially in areas where there is potential change, and 340 Portage is one of the more open
76 sites available likely for development. So, especially Comp Plan Program L-4 10.1 states that "a coordinated
77 area plan shall be developed for the North Ventura Area and surrounding California Avenue area". So, in
78 terms of the brief overview of the process, so City Council adopted goals and objectives and initiated the
79 project with a schedule and boundaries. It also authorized the formation of a Working Group, and there
80 are several members of the Working Group here today, because there has been a lot of interest expressed
81 on this particular issue. So, there have been four Working Group meetings held between October 2018 and
82 April 2019. On February 5th the first community workshop was held where they kind of went over, where
83 we went over the site context and also identified issues developed through the Working Group meetings
84 as well as raised by the community members. March 11th was a joint meeting between the Working Group
85 and City Council, held as a town hall on Ventura topics in general, but specifically also discussing the
86 coordinated area plan process. And on August 19th we are proposing to go back to City Council as a follow
87 up from the March 11th town hall. And we are tentatively scheduled also to go back to the Working Group
88 probably around August 21st. We also do have a website that is dedicated to this project, paloaltonvcap.org,
89 and that provides an overview of the project as a whole, including all staff reports and will also include a
90 link to this particular hearing. So, the procedures for the NVCAP process are outlined in Chapter 19.10. Oh,
91 there, sorry about that. And it states that "the intent is to create enhanced opportunities for building a
92 sense of community through public involvement with meaningful opportunities to help shape the physical
93 components of their neighborhoods and community". And so primary statement that is really important for
94 this project is that it is, its intent is to create enhanced opportunities for public involvement. So, the general
95 process is that City Council initiates the CAP process and established goals and objectives. A working group
96 is appointed to advise the process, and then it includes regular public meetings, including a community
97 meeting. The Planning and Transportation Commission will hear about the, have an opportunity to hear
98 about the plan and also make their recommendations to City Council, as well as any environmental
99 documents. And then, finally, it will return to City Council, and throughout the process we will also be
100 providing updates to the various Boards and Commissions that have a role in this process, and especially,

101 since there is a historic resource involved, they will be coming back to the HRB eventually. So, Page and
102 Turnbull was hired to provide historic analysis, including evaluation of the entire site. So, they did a
103 Windshield Survey evaluating all the potential sites, and it was, the determination was that 340 Portage,
104 which is the subject of this HRE was the only identified potential historic resource. So, the HRE identified
105 the property, including the Frys building itself, and the associated office building as eligible for listing in the
106 California Register of Historic Places, and it also qualified as a historic resource per the California
107 Environmental Quality Act. And we did receive multiple comments from the public regarding this project,
108 ranging in diversity of opinions about what should be done with the site, so those were presented. Those
109 will also be made available to our Working Group members and on our project website as well. And in
110 particular, Staff also wanted to respond to some of the comments that were raised. So, again, as I stated
111 the purpose of this meeting is to discuss the HRE and to get feedback from the Board about this, and also
112 to emphasize the fact that options have not been developed or finalized yet, so the meeting, today's
113 meeting will go into feeding that, into that process to develop the options which obviously will, what we'll
114 do with 340 Portage will be an important component of that. And I think one of the things that was raised
115 in particular was the rail spur that's located behind 340 Portage, so that was abandoned a while ago and
116 the rail spur was actually removed in 1964 when it was abandoned. And I also want to mention that we
117 have the honor today of Gloria Hom in the audience today. She is actually the granddaughter of Thomas
118 Foon Chew, so she has agreed to speak to us about the project, but also is here today in the audience, so
119 I just wanted to mention that. And with that, I will turn this to Christina.

120

121 Chair Bower: Can I interrupt for just a moment? You mentioned that the NVCAP goals would be formed in
122 the form the development of this site. Could you very briefly just tell the Board and the audience what
123 those goals are?

124

125 Ms. Lee: Sure. Let me locate that on our website.

126

127 Chair Bower: (inaudible)

128

129 Ms. Lee: Sure, but yeah, there were specific goals that, goals and objectives that the City Council adopted
130 earlier this year, and those are available on our... But basically, the goals are around housing, the creation
131 of additional housing opportunities and having a connected land use pattern. Making a basically a mixed-
132 use neighborhood, because it's proximate to the Caltrain Station, having good transit, pedestrian and
133 bicycle connections, having a connected street grid, having adequate community facilities and
134 infrastructure, balance of community interests, having strong urban design and design guidelines and a
135 neighborhood fabric and sustainability and the environment.

136

137 Chair Bower: Thank you.

138

139 Christina Dikas: Good morning members of the Board. I think a little bit of my presentation on the left side
140 might get cut off, but hopefully, nothing of vital importance. I'm here to present the work that Page and
141 Turnbull did. We were contracted to the City to do this work. As Elena prefaced, Page and Turnbull looked
142 at the entire plan area to understand whether there were historic resources, and then as a result of that,
143 we drilled into the largest property on the site at 340 Portage and wrote a separate historic resource
144 evaluation for that property. So, just to explain a little bit about the survey that we did, we called this a
145 Windshield Survey. We went out, we had property data with construction dates, so we looked at every
146 building that was at least 50 years old, which is the threshold for potential historic significance for the
147 California Register and for CEQA. We took a picture of each of those and we created a table with some
148 basic property information. We also put together a historic context for the Mayfield Area and this Ventura
149 Neighborhood Area of Palo Alto to understand the development patterns and the people who lived there
150 over time. And so, though we didn't do individual property research for all of these properties, we did have
151 a sense of their potential historic context and architecture based on the site visit that we did. Through that
152 process we found that none of the residences and commercial buildings in the area, aside from 340 Portage
153 appeared to be eligible for listing in the California Register. Most of the houses, particularly on Olive Avenue,
154 were built in 1946, after the War, so it appears that there was a lot of post-war housing construction which
155 was happening throughout Palo Alto and the Bay area, and that a lot of this neighborhood was really built

156 out in the mid to late 40's, though there were a smattering of earlier buildings before that time. We had
157 received a question quite a while ago that we responded to in an earlier draft of a report before we finalized
158 it asking whether these houses were associated with the canning company. We didn't uncover any historical
159 information that associated the construction of the houses with the canning company. Many of them, as I
160 just mentioned, were built in 1946, which was towards the end of the canning company's period, which
161 ended in 1949. So, if the residences were associated, they likely were not historically significant for that
162 association. And while the Ventura neighborhood had more African-American and Latino residents than
163 other areas of Palo Alto in the mid-twentieth century, which was another topic that we dove into a little
164 bit, preliminary research did not find that the area's history of accommodating under-represented
165 communities rises to a level of significance to warrant historic designation in the California Register. And
166 just to note, this aerial photo in the slide is from 1941, so you can see, you can kind of see the boundary
167 of the plan area, and that a large amount of the area was not yet developed until after 1941. All right,
168 actually, I'm going to go back to our first slide just for a moment. The large building that's shaded orange
169 in this picture is 340 Portage, and then there's a smaller building just to the right and bottom that's shaded
170 blue by Ash Street, and that is the office building that I'm going to discuss. So, this is 340 Portage, former
171 cannery building that was built in stages between 1918 and the 1940's, and this is the office building which
172 we, it was moved to its current location in 1940, and we believe that it may have been previously used as
173 a dormitory for the cannery and was built between, if that's the case, was built between 1918 and 1925,
174 1918 being the date that the cannery was originally constructed and 1925 is when this dormitory building
175 shows up in the first Sanborn Fire Insurance map. So, I'm going to just describe a Statement of Significance
176 for this property. Agricultural industries, including fruit and vegetable canning were once the dominant
177 industries in Santa Clara County. The oldest portions of the cannery building were constructed in 1918 for
178 the Bayside Canning Company, which was owned by Chinese immigrant and prominent canning
179 businessman, Thomas Foon Chew. Under Chew the Bayside Canning Company rose to become the third
180 largest fruit and vegetable cannery in the world in the 1920's behind only Libbey and Del Monte. After
181 Chew's death, the cannery was subsequently purchased and operated for more than 20 years by the Sutter
182 Packing Company, another fruit and vegetable cannery. The Sutter Packing Company significantly expanded
183 the cannery building and its operations throughout the 1930's and 40's, as it prepared for and raced to
184 meet the demands of World War II. For a time, the cannery was the largest employer in the mid-peninsula,
185 and when it closed in 1949 it was the largest employer in Palo Alto. My understanding is that Safeway had
186 bought the Sutter Packing Company in 1946 and though the company was still very profitable, it didn't fit
187 within their company profit scheme, so they closed it. The trajectory of canning operations at the plant,
188 which began in the early 20th Century, peaked in the 1920's, increased production to meet the demands of
189 World War II, and then quickly declined as residential development and new industries began to replace
190 agricultural industries in the post-war period. This corresponds closely to the broad pattern of the history
191 of the canning industry in Santa Clara County. The building is a rare surviving example of Palo Alto's and
192 Santa Clara County's agricultural past, so we identified this property to be significant under Criterion 1 for
193 events with a period of significance between 1918 to 1949, the full period in which it operated as a cannery.
194 Just to comment on the other couple of potential criteria for the California Register, one is Criterion 2,
195 which is association with significant people. For a property to be found eligible for the California Register
196 under Criterion 2, it must be associated with a person who has contributed significantly to local, state and
197 national history and the property must be the best representation of the reason for which the person is
198 significant. The building at 340 Portage Avenue was originally built by Thomas Foon Chew in 1918 as a
199 second canning plant for his Bayside Canning Company, and continued under his ownership until his death
200 in 1931. Although Chew's father had founded the cannery in Alviso, an earlier cannery as well in San
201 Francisco, Thomas Foon Chew is regarded as the primary driving force behind the Bayside Canning
202 Company's growth into the third largest fruit and vegetable cannery in the world by 1920. In spite of his
203 association with 340 Portage Avenue, the building was not the first canning plant constructed by Chew,
204 which is part of the National Register listed Alviso Historic District. In addition, and this is the most important
205 for this Criterion, the building was extensively expanded after Chew's death, primarily when it was owned
206 and operated by the Sutter Packing Company. The building, therefore, does not retain enough integrity to
207 Chew's period of association to be eligible under Criterion 2 for direct association with him, though his
208 contribution to the industry and this property is reflected during the early period of the Criterion 1 period
209 of significance, which I've already discussed, so it includes both the Bayside Cannery and the Sutter Packing
210 Company period. I'm happy to answer any questions, if that's a little confusing. To be eligible for the

211 California Register you need both significance and integrity, and so essentially what I'm saying is that there
212 wasn't enough integrity only to Thomas Foon Chew's period to be found eligible under that Criterion
213 because there were so many changes made after that. Yes. (crosstalk) I have a little bit more on my
214 presentation.

215
216 Board Member Bernstein: Okay, thank you Christine.

217
218 Ms. Dikas: Just to mention Criterion 3, which is significant architecture. We did not find that the property
219 was significant under Criterion 3, 340 Portage Avenue consists of what were originally several connected
220 cannery facilities and associated warehouse buildings. It's primarily constructed of reinforced concrete with
221 utilitarian wood posts and beam construction and no ornamentation, consistent with its functional design.
222 The former office building at 3201 to 3225 Ash Street is a plain wood frame building built in a vernacular
223 style. Neither of the buildings appear to exhibit artistic value, nor are they particularly distinctive examples
224 of cannery building or industrial warehouse typology such that they would rise to a level of individual
225 significance for the California Register. So, for the purposes of CEQA, we found that 340 Portage was a
226 qualified historic resource and I will also mention, because it's come up in a couple of public comments
227 about the National Register, that the State Office of Historic Preservation generally provide guidance that
228 the California Register and National Register have an equal footing, essentially the same criteria and the
229 Office of Historic Preservation doesn't see any difference between levels of significance, so though we did
230 not specifically evaluate this property in our report for eligibility for the National Register, it's assumed that
231 it would also be eligible for the National Register. That concludes my presentation. Thank you.

232
233 Board Member Bernstein: Thank you Christine. You said something about, if you look on packet page 15,
234 please. And for members of the public, that's the entire 340 Portage building. You said something about,
235 one of your last sentences, you said... Is it the entire structure on the orange on packet page 15, that is
236 eligible, right, for...?

237
238 Ms. Dikas: Correct. Both the orange and the blue buildings together are what we have identified as
239 significant on this site.

240
241 Board Member Bernstein: Okay, great. Thank you.

242
243 Chair Bower: Any other Board comments at this time? Maybe we'll open it up to the public and hear what
244 our audience has to say about this. I have three, four cards. The first card is Laura. Please come up to the
245 podium and state your name and try to keep the microphone close to your mouth because it works better
246 and we're recording.

247
248 Laura Bajuk: And I promise no singing. My name is Laura Bajuk. I'm the Executive Director of the Palo Alto
249 Museum, and I'm a resident of Palo Alto since I fell in love with one of your native sons 20 years ago. I
250 love this community. I love exploring its history. The statement I wanted to make was that first of all, the
251 Museum stands by to assist the City and the community in the interpretation of the history of, well, the
252 history of the community in general. So, as you address these issues, if there are things relating to history
253 interpretation, we can help with that, and we stand by to assist. We feel that's part of our job. I think one
254 of our goals is to answer the questions behind the community, why does it look the way it does, why is the
255 railroad here? I think understanding the past layout of the community really answers those questions. One
256 of the things that ties into the cannery community for me is the economic impact of the railroad. The fact
257 that Southern Pacific comes to this area has to figure out how to get people to live here, and they decided
258 that orchards are going to be the most profitable opportunity. Profitable for small families who can support
259 their family, support themselves on a relatively small piece of land, grow the fruit, truck it down to the
260 railroad, which is where the canneries are located, and this is one of the biggest. Valley fruit fed the world.
261 Before tech, I'd say 180 years ago, or in the 1920's, we would have talked about orchards and fruit the
262 way we talk about tech today. It makes me wonder, you know, 100 years from now how we'll be talking
263 about our tech era that we're in the middle of, as I look at my screen where I have my notes. We were
264 just as big to the rest of world at that time with fruit. So, there's a tendency to be sentimental and think,
265 oh, it was so lovely when we had all those trees, but it was big business and it was a sticky business cutting

266 apricots. It employed teenagers, minorities, women had jobs. People could afford to support their families
267 by working in the canneries. And it was immensely profitable for the railroad, because it was one of the
268 most expensive things you could ship. Gravel could sit by the side of the railroad and wouldn't be harmed,
269 but fruit had to go quickly. And our fruit went all around the world thanks to Southern Pacific and their
270 global network, which predates those we have today. But the bottom of the market was reached after
271 World War II. During World War II you could sell all your fruit. Eighty per cent of the fruit in this area, I
272 believe, went to the military efforts to feed the troops. So, when the war ended, that was really the end of
273 this market, and at that same time we have people here who don't want to leave California, and for good
274 reason. My family was one of them. We wanted to stay. We needed housing, so there was a huge boom.
275 Tech is building up, again influenced by World War II. People have jobs, this is where the jobs are. So,
276 where we are today is directly connected to what happened really not so long ago. And again, we stand
277 by to help in any way you would like to interpret it. Thank you.

278

279 Chair Bower: Thank you for sharing that. Next card I have is Karen Holman. Welcome.

280

281 Karen Holman: Good morning, and thank you for bringing this to the HRB and thank you for answering
282 some of the questions I had submitted. I appreciate that very much. I think it's really important, several
283 things are important here. One of the things I think is important that, yes, clarifying that California National
284 Register, it's presumed that if you're California you're also eligible for National Register. I think in many
285 people's minds it makes a difference though, because National Register carries a lot more aplomb, if you
286 will, in people's minds, so if sometimes we're talking about this, California and by reference, National
287 Register, something like that. It also in the Staff presentation, I think it's going to lead to some confusion
288 if it's stated as one property has been identified as historic, when actually it is the cannery building and the
289 associated office. And I can understand that it might be one property, considered as one property, however,
290 it's two different addresses, and I think that can lead to confusion if it's only referred to as one history
291 building or property. I think there are many, many opportunities at this site. I've been following Ventura
292 very closely, because I care a great deal about it, as many people in the neighborhood do. Some people
293 are out of town because of vacations and such, that are committed to this project. And I think a lot of the
294 goals of the work of the plan can be accomplished in more creative ways than maybe are being considered
295 to this point in time. I did mention in my email yesterday this plan map. It's a working tool that was handed
296 out to the Working Group, and I do want you all to see it. I don't think you have been provided this. And
297 what's important about this is that this was provided by Staff, not the property, major property owner. It
298 shows as areas parcels that may be redeveloped within the plan horizon. It shows the office building under
299 that color overlay, and it shows all of the cannery building except for two sections that are being proposed
300 for retention as being redeveloped, and I think that's really important for you all to know, and I don't know
301 where this came from or where the basis could be in CEQA or the Secretary Standards. Those proposals,
302 especially around the cannery building, one is to provide a street, which is right directly in front of the
303 existing cannery building, and two pedestrian/bicycle paths that run through where the building is now.
304 People who are walking and biking can make turns. I'm going to hand this, through Staff I'll hand this to
305 you all. And I'd like to get that back if I could. And then the other thing is culturally. Thomas Foon Chew,
306 and I'm glad Gloria Hom is here today, Thomas Foon Chew accomplished not only what he did by this
307 cannery being the largest behind Del Monte and Heinz. Thank you to Page and Turnbull for discovering
308 that, but he was, this was one of the largest employers on the mid-peninsula under his ownership. Consider
309 that this was in a time when, this was not the most welcoming of environments, and he had, and photos
310 clarify this, he hired multi-cultural employees, and he accomplished that with an open, I'm kind of a little
311 bit interpreting here but not a lot. The photos demonstrate that he had multi-cultural employees, and I
312 think, you know, that kind of acceptance, that kind of model we could, especially at this time and place,
313 could really appreciate and benefit from that kind of model. And when it comes to the industrial buildings,
314 and then I'll wrap up with this, when it comes to the industrial buildings, adaptive reuse has not been
315 considered for any of these buildings as far as I can tell, and I have gone to every one of the Working
316 Group meetings, and stayed to all of the meetings except for one, when I had to leave early. Consider
317 things like in Sebastopol the Barlow. The Barlow is a retail and commercial area that is industrial buildings
318 that were there and some in-fill buildings that were developed in keeping with that style, and it's hopping
319 busy. It was flooded this last year in the rains, and I was there just recently again. Almost everyone has
320 come back and new companies have, new businesses have taken place there too. So, I think, we, you

321 know, no working group and no plan are going to be able to accomplish everything, but I think much can
322 be accomplished while retaining these buildings, and I think it's critical that we respect our cultural diversity
323 and the history that represented on this site, especially given its rarity, because most of the Valley of Heart's
324 Delight relics have disappeared. Thank you very much for your time.

325
326 Chair Bower: Thank you. The next person is Terry Holzemer.

327
328 Terry Holzemer: Good morning. I am a member of the NVCAP or what you want to call the North Ventura
329 Working Group; however, I'm not representing them here today. I'm representing myself, okay. I would
330 like to take a moment first of all to support my view that the Frys Bayside Cannery site is not only historical,
331 historically significant to Palo Alto's own history, but significant to this State's, and even of national
332 significance. As you may have read in the Page and Turnbull Historic Resource Evaluation Report, the site
333 does meet Criterion 1, but does not, apparently, does not meet Criterion 2 and 3. I personally have done
334 research on this site and have done significant research on the past history, and have interviewed and
335 talked to not only Mrs. Hom, but to other people who were involved. I disagree with the Criterion, the Page
336 and Turnbull of Criterion 2 and 3, as well, which was not even really mentioned. I believe Criterion 2, the
337 significance of Thomas Foon Chew cannot be overestimated at all. I think this gentleman, he created
338 something out of literally nothing. In many ways I believe that he could be called in Chinese-American
339 history, the first great entrepreneur, American entrepreneur in America. I think that he came to this country
340 with really nothing and he created a business that became, like other people have said, the third largest
341 cannery in the world. And the significance of that is kind of lost over history. We don't realize that before
342 there was high tech in this area, there was a growing business, the cannery and fruit business, which really
343 dominated this area. And also, was significant for the entire world, not only this country. I think Thomas
344 Foon Chew and his ability to not only cross barriers as other people have mentioned, but also to find
345 solutions to problems. He was one of the unique creators and inventors of the cannery industry. He created
346 a machine, for example, that automatically washed cannery wood boxes. This was something they had to
347 do every time they had new fruit, they had to wash the boxes. But he created a device that would do it
348 automatically. Probably the first invention of such a thing in the history of this area and maybe of the world,
349 actually. I think there is other significance of him as well. I think the idea that he created a business that
350 really made significance throughout the world. I would like to encourage you, if you have not seen this,
351 and I don't know if it's in your report or not, there is a story called, *The Story of our Local Bayside Cannery*,
352 that was published in 2010, and I would be glad to share that with you as well, and show you that. Finally,
353 I would just like to mention really quickly, if you've not seen this exhibit, it's a great exhibit to go see. It's
354 currently at the Los Altos History Museum, which I think you probably all have been there, but right now
355 it's called *Silicon Valley Eats*, and it tells a little bit about the history of how this area became known as the
356 Heart's Delight, you know, the Valley of Heart's Delight. But in that exhibit, there's a great exhibit on
357 Thomas Foon Chew, and I encourage you, if you have not seen it, to definitely go and observe and visit it
358 as well. Again, I'm also available if you would like to talk to me, since my research might be helpful to you
359 as well. Okay, thank you.

360
361 Chair Bower: Great. Thank you. If you could, if you're willing to share the article that you, 2010 article you
362 were referring to, if you could give it to Staff.

363
364 Mr. Holzemer: I think Staff already has it; they do.

365
366 Chair Bower: Okay, great. Thank you for your comments. I'm going to go a little bit out of order here and
367 Kirsten Flynn.

368
369 Kirsten Flynn: Hello, I'm Kirsten Flynn. I'm a life-long resident of Palo Alto and a member of the North
370 Ventura Community Area Plan Team. And I want to say something to this subject. I, when I'm working
371 with the group and I work with the NVCAP because I have lived here so long and I'm so ingrained into the
372 community, and even though it kind of stresses me out to work with in a political setting. But what I try to
373 do is I try to focus on the overall goals and shared values of what the group is trying to accomplish, and I
374 think that we can all agree that the goals of redevelopment effort is to create affordable housing, because
375 you cannot open a newspaper without realizing that California is in an affordable housing crisis. And I have

376 three young adult children who I would dearly love to live close to me, which they cannot presently do. We
377 enjoy the benefits of and enjoy being around the vibrant small office space environment were many startups
378 originate here in Palo Alto. And that's part of something I think we do not want to necessarily quash;
379 however, we have been hurt by it because of the jobs/housing imbalance. And we all want a high-quality
380 place to live and work. So those are the overarching goals, sort of, and stay focused on those and we'll
381 come out okay. And as far as that last point, I think that this building really has a huge effect on quality of
382 life. It really resonates for me as a Palo Alto, because I've seen that California is obsessed with the new,
383 we are obsessed with the new. We don't have a lot of history because we're a young state compared to
384 Europe or the East Coast. Perhaps we don't have the most significant architectural resources, but what we
385 have is what we have. That's what's left is what is left. What has not already been erased. And a plaque
386 does not bring history to life. I'm not sure if you've noticed that the way a building does. And so what I'd
387 like to say is, I believe, I'm a designer in my private life and I believe design thinking, good design thinking
388 can solve a lot of problems if we say with an open mind and a creative confrontation to achieving these
389 goals, I believe we can achieve all of these goals and also preserve this building. And I would hope that
390 we make the best, most creative effort we can to do so. Okay, that's all. Thank you.

391
392 Chair Bower: Thank you for those comments. And finally, I think we're honored to have Thomas Foon
393 Chew's granddaughter, Gloria Hom, here to speak. Welcome.

394
395 Gloria Hom: Thank you very much and thank you Elena for inviting me to the meeting. And I am Thomas
396 Foon Chew's granddaughter, and I also am a fifty-plus years resident of Palo Alto. And I'm here to just say
397 that I'd like to maintain and retain the historical value of, and highlight Bayside Cannery. In the 1920's
398 when it was in its heyday, it was the only large business in Palo Alto. I mean, Palo Alto was the University,
399 but in terms of a large business, Bayside Cannery was actually it. And I think it's really an important
400 historical contribution to the area and certainly I would like to see it highlighted in some fashion and
401 certainly maintained. It was, it canned primarily peaches, apricots, pears and the Alviso Cannery canned
402 primarily tomatoes, but this area was mainly the fruits and fruit salads and, you know, used the train
403 system to transport the cans to other areas of the world. So, thank you very much for your time and if you
404 wanted any more information on the cannery, I would be very happy to submit it to you.

405
406 Chair Bower: Great. Thank you and I particularly appreciate the fact that you've come today to talk to us.
407 So, I don't have any other cards. Maybe we'll move on to Staff report.

408
409 Ms. Lee: If I may, I can respond to some of the questions that were raised during the public comments.

410
411 Chair Bower: Certainly, go ahead.

412
413 Ms. Lee: First of all, what I wanted to bring your attention to is that the project goals are up here. I can
414 send the link separately and post it up, but, so they do list what the goals are on housing and land use,
415 transit, pedestrian and bicycle connections, connected street grid, community facility, infrastructure,
416 balance of community interests, urban design and guidelines, sustainability and the environment. And just
417 quickly back to the top, there it goes. So, we have a section about the project engagement, which is where
418 you will find links to all of the reports and materials, resources and contact information. This is where we
419 list all upcoming meetings. And the article that Mr. Holzemer referenced is also included under the
420 engagement sections under the April 17th Working Group Meeting. and I can provide the link afterwards.
421 And then there were a few other items that I wanted to mention. And there was a plan that was shared
422 today that was shown at one of our Working Group meetings in the past. Just to clarify, yes, exactly that
423 one. That is also available at our website. But I wanted to clarify that the purpose of that plan was to start
424 a conversation about what the potential options are. It's not a proposed option. We have not developed
425 one, but the purpose is to show what the potential pattern could be. We will be again going back to the
426 Working Group with more on that, but you know, it's still early in the process. We're still, we're just about
427 finishing the data gathering stage right now. But the plan options are going to depend on a number of
428 factors, including the historic discussion, so, that discussion we're having now. So, we need to have that
429 done before we can actually develop options. The other option, the other item is also looking at the creek.
430 One of the things that City Council mentioned was they wanted to look at naturalizing the creek, and that's

431 also an item that has to be done and analyzed in order for us to actually come up with options for discussion.
432 So, that is good information to have in the plans, that plan set, but it's just one piece of the background.
433 And again, as I have mentioned, adaptive reuse hasn't been discussed because we actually haven't come
434 to discussion. But, certainly, that's something we will be considering when we come back with more on the
435 options. Thanks.

436
437 Chief Bower: Great. Thank you for pulling that page of goals up. I was sorry that we didn't see on that list
438 of goals, historic preservation as part of it, considering that the cannery building is such an integral part of
439 this redevelopment process. I wanted to ask a couple of questions of Christina, if I could. I was interested
440 in the evaluation of the railroad siding. If you could pull up the aerial view of the site so we could look at
441 it? I'm wondering what, when you evaluate the significance of a siding, what's the cutoff level of
442 significance? In the aerial view you can clearly see where it was and it hasn't had railroad tracks there for
443 years, but the Highline Park in New York City, which is a former rail, elevated railway has some rails in
444 some portions and doesn't, and yet it's one of the most successful sort of rehabilitated uses to create a
445 park in New York City. So, could you comment on that a little bit?

446
447 Ms. Dikas: Sure. We didn't find the rail spur specifically to be historically significant, but it contributes to
448 the history of the site overall and the building as part of its cannery function. As Elena mentioned and it's
449 in our report, the tracks themselves were removed by Southern Pacific in 1964, so what remains is kind of
450 a pattern that's reflected in the parking area currently. So, we mentioned that pattern as a character to
451 finding future of the site along with just a few landscape site features that contribute to the significance of
452 the cannery property. But we didn't call out the track specifically. Does that answer your question?

453
454 Chair Bower: Yeah. I'm just concerned that just because we don't have track there, that that particular
455 space loses significance and then becomes, it just basically disappears. By the way, that spur, I think, that's
456 the spur that went, continued all the way down to Los Gatos and that the current Foothill Expressway
457 space, at least near Gunn High School used that abandoned spur, the County used that spur to develop
458 Foothill Expressway. So, it was, I remember as a child watching the trains come to Arastradero Road where
459 Gunn High School is now located every day in the afternoon, dropping off commuters to San Francisco.
460 Okay, another question. You had mentioned a, that the cannery buildings didn't, I don't want to
461 mischaracterize what you said, but maybe you could talk about how the architecture of the cannery building
462 was not significant, or am I remembering that correctly?

463
464 Ms. Dikas: That's correct. We found that the buildings were, in their nature quite utilitarian and functional
465 and that there wasn't anything that was specifically unique compared to other types of industrial buildings
466 to rise to an individual level of significance for the California Register under that Criterion.

467
468 Chair Bower: So, I guess I'm puzzled by that conclusion, because it seems to me that what that suggests
469 is that the only way a building, in this case a cannery building could be considered significant is if it was
470 unique or almost one of a kind, and the fact that this building has the characteristics of multiple canning
471 buildings, I mean, even ones down in Sunnyvale look similar to this one, or they are similar. I'm just now
472 sure why that wouldn't be, rise to a level of significance that would add to support for a greater level of
473 importance.

474
475 Ms. Dikas: The building, the physical building is important in that it represents the reason for significance
476 which we've identified as the cannery operation under Criterion 1. So, that's not do discount that the
477 physical building is not important. It must physically represent its reason for significance in its period of
478 significance, which we identified as 1918 to 1949. But we just didn't find it to be individually significant for
479 its architecture itself, its design. It was a conglomeration of a series of additions over time that were really
480 made for the purpose of the cannery function and its development and growth, which reflects the Criterion
481 related to events and use that we identified more than like an architectural style or period typology. Things
482 of that nature that usually fall under the Criterion 3 discussion.

483
484 Chair Bower: Okay, so I'm thinking about Pier 70 in San Francisco, which is the oldest West Coast shipping
485 facility. It still operates today as a repair place. It is a huge conglomeration of buildings that occurred and

486 were built over a long period of time in the early 1900's. It's being repurposed, all the old buildings that
487 are still standing, I think, are going to be repurposed and then there's going to be infill. So, again, I'm
488 thinking in the case of this entire building at 340 Portage, it is an initial cannery building that is added on
489 to over a period of years, and each of those building additions become significant because the latest on is
490 only 79 years old, and the earliest one, 1918, now it's 101 years old. So, again, I would think that this
491 would be significant, the entire building is significant and one of the things that troubled me most about
492 this initial proposal to get the conversation started is that it was going to cut the building up, and create
493 certain sort of preserved parts, and then basically destroy the rest. And I'm just wondering if you can...
494 Well, that's okay. I think we've had enough conversation about this because I think it's going to come back.
495 I don't want to, I want to give my colleagues an opportunity to weigh in. I wonder if Staff could talk about
496 the Matadero Creek changes and how that might affect, you know, the historic buildings that we're
497 considering.

498
499 Ms. Lee: Sure. So, right now we are in process of trying to select a consultant for the analysis of the creek.
500 So, the consultant's analysis will let us know what is actually feasible to be improved. Some of the items
501 that were discussed would be fully naturalizing the creek, because right now it's completely channelized in
502 that portion of it. However, it gets complicated because of the right-of-way issues and it's, you know, and
503 impact on drainage further down the creek watershed. We've started conversations with Santa Clara Valley
504 Water District, but we'll have to involve multiple other jurisdictions in terms of what's feasible. So, once we
505 understand the feasibility of what we can do, then it can range from partial naturalization, no naturalization
506 where we would leave the creek alone, but we would improve on either side, so providing more of a
507 connectivity through the site, especially as it leads down south to the park. Or it could be partial
508 naturalization or it can be fully improving and naturalizing the site. So, as we look over the, as we develop
509 the plans for the site, it could be a range of things. It could be just by itself or we could try to help create
510 some sort of connection to whatever we propose for the other buildings within the plan site.

511
512 Chair Bower: So, if I understand correctly, the idea of naturalizing the creek channel would only occur
513 within this, the boundaries of this particular study are?

514
515 Ms. Lee: At this point, because that's what this, we're limited to the 60-acre site of this project. So, it would,
516 the creek runs through only the southern portion of the site.

517
518 Chair Bower: Okay. Colleagues, comments, questions? Martin.

519
520 Board Member Bernstein: Thank you Chair Bower. I was very interested in Laura Bajuk's comments today
521 about what was significant when this building was first put into business, and that being the connection
522 between how famous this business was and our current Silicon Valley businesses. You know, the company
523 SPRINT, that stands for Southern Pacific Railroad Interconnection, so very interesting connection there.
524 Laura Bajuk was saying what was considered old then is now, we're using the same words, Southern Pacific
525 Railroad, the internet SPRINT. Also, let's see, when I was probably about 13 years old, I was a farm worker
526 and I picked green beans. It is now the property called Oakmead Industrial Park, so certainly one industry
527 down from farming to high tech. So, it certainly is part of the regional history. Did I hear Chair Bower say
528 something about historic preservation was not a goal for this area?

529
530 Ms. Lee: Um, it's not, oh, sorry.

531
532 Chair Bower: Actually, what I said was I was unhappy not to see historic preservation as part of the listed
533 goals in that, but it might have been there because (crosstalk).

534
535 Board Member Bernstein: So, just a clarification, is historic preservation a listed goal?

536
537 Ms. Lee: It's not listed by itself, but it is, you know, it is part of the neighborhood fabric and it also goes to
538 sustainability, so there is, it has been identified as something important by Council, but it isn't listed
539 separately as a goal.

540

541 Board Member Bernstein: Okay. For future meetings with the Working Group, would Staff consider including
542 that as a goal?

543
544 Ms. Lee: We can certainly bring that up. We are going back to Council in August and the Council does have
545 the ability, the prerogative to make changes to the goals and objectives.

546
547 Board Member Bernstein: Thanks. I'm going back to the railroad spur. There are a lot of communities on
548 the peninsula that still have actually the tracks themselves. For example, in San Carlos there are a lot of
549 metal fabrication companies all through that area, Corey Road for example, where the railroad tracks are
550 still in the parking lots, and they're really fantastic. In Danville, I think it's called the Iron Horse Trail, I
551 believe, and that used to be a railroad. The tracks have been removed but now it became actually a
552 parkway. So, there is still, the right-of-way is gone but it's, but the use is still there. So, there would be
553 opportunities to have that railroad spur somehow recognized physically. I think that would be a nice
554 character-defining element to retain. The map that Ms. Holman presented to us, it did show it looks like
555 two cut throughs on the 340 Portage Street, but I assume that's not the plan to do that, right?

556
557 Ms. Lee: It's just brought up as a discussion point, so it hasn't been actually proposed or selected. But it's
558 just one of the items that we wanted the Working Group to consider, because connectivity was one of the
559 goals that City Council raised.

560
561 Board Member Bernstein: Right, yeah. So that's obviously with removal of historic fabric, of course.

562
563 Ms. Lee: Yes.

564
565 Board Member Bernstein: Because once, hopefully historic preservation becomes a stated goal.

566
567 Ms. Lee: Right. Well, you know, so basically the goals and objectives really span a range of items. There's
568 no way that we, as mentioned before, there's no way that we can meet all of the goals, but it's going to
569 be a balance of meeting some of the goals and then making other goals more important. So, it will be an
570 interesting discussion.

571
572 Board Member Bernstein: Sure, yeah. I'm looking at the photos on packet page 29. I don't know if members
573 of the public can see. It's a very small drawing. I'll let Staff get to packet page 29. And looking at the upper
574 right-hand photograph of all the steel trusses there, I'm reminded when the project of the Creamery on
575 the 800 block of High Street came to the Historic Resources Board. Similar kind of structure, and the Board
576 discussed is there any way to get adaptive reuse of the structure so that that magnificent architectural
577 features can be retained. It was determined by enough of the different working groups and committees,
578 that the structure could not be saved physically because of deterioration. So, that was sadly torn down.
579 So, here's an opportunity where the building is not deteriorating to the point where it is demolition by
580 neglect. So, that would support, I think, the idea that perhaps the structure itself is historically significant,
581 combined with the other significant aspects of integrity. That's my comments for now. Thanks.

582
583 Chair Bower: Thank you Martin. Margret.

584
585 Board Member Wimmer: Yes. Thank you for all this great information because I always thought of the, I
586 mean, obviously Frys being a consumer in this area, going to Frys to shop, that was my sort of, the extent
587 of my experience there, so having a little bit more insight into the history of the site has been really
588 educational for me. I am just thinking about, for me I just think that there are three options for the
589 redevelopment of this site. Either to completely see it as a historic resource and preserve it. Or to completely
590 neglect the historic significance of the site or the buildings and just develop it as any developer would
591 probably go forth and do. Or find a common ground somewhere in between. I think to preserve this and
592 readapt it into something that is, community resource is a great idea, and I know that a lot of people have
593 said this could be a great artist colony. It could have open studios. I was reading some of the public
594 comments. But I think that just given the fact that we've already established that the building itself is not,
595 doesn't have a historic quality, that I think to be able to remodel it in a way that it would be of use to the

596 public, with public safety, fire issues. Obviously, there's ADA issues because a lot of those buildings are
597 highly elevated because there were loading docks. I think that for a building to go through that process,
598 it's basically going to be so drastically redesigned that I think a lot of the original aspects of the building
599 would just simply be lost. So, I think that Chair Bower and Martin's comments about, let's inject the fact
600 that we want to preserve this site in some way. I think that should be part of the criteria for the
601 redevelopment. I think, I don't really see that we can preserve these buildings as they are now and make
602 them useful, but we don't want to see everything lost and everyone just ignore the fact that the site does
603 exist. I think we need to find a common ground, and I think that there's a creative way to do that, either
604 by keeping the footprint of the building, keeping some of the architectural features that are existing in the
605 building. Maybe the interior trusses or maybe this, I don't know what we call this roofline, the monitor
606 roofs. I think that's, I mean that's sort of an iconic... You had some really great photos of it. Like this photo.
607 I mean, maybe just the, we take images of the existing site and have them, and have that as a design
608 element, part of the design criteria, and incorporate some of these historic elements. Maybe they're not
609 the original historic elements, but maybe we can creatively adapt so we don't lose this, I mean, it is a
610 resource because of the events that happened there. So, I think we should make a huge effort to retain it
611 in some way to honor it, pay homage to it. That's what I would like to see.

612

613 Chair Bower: Thank you Margaret. Roger, comment?

614

615 Board Member Kohler: Yeah. I'm having a little trouble here, but in my old days, younger days I worked
616 for a company that used to blow stuff up into the air and we tried to figure out where the wind was blowing
617 and this kind of thing. And we were one block over, just right next to there, I think it's Olive. I'm not sure
618 it that's the corner. I'm just disclosing that as, that's my notice there. And I just want to declare that I
619 know that property. I don't know if I have... My question is, where do we go from here? What happens
620 from our discussion today? Does this go before the Council or how far a process, where are we in the
621 process?

622

623 Ms. Lee: So, basically we are going back to Council, you know, as part of the background we'll let them
624 know that we've taken the HRE to the Historic Resources Board, but what we're going to do is we're going
625 to present a summary of what was discussed here to our Working Group. Staff will also take this information
626 as we prepare for the meeting, so, the Working Group will have your input as they consider different, the
627 plan alternatives that they're going to be developing with Staff.

628

629 Board Member Kohler: I guess.

630

631 Chair Bower: Great. I wanted to, before we leave this topic, since we don't have any Board Motions to
632 share with all the people here, this book that Amy French shared with me. And it's titled *Historic Bay Area*
633 *Visionaries* and it described in the book, it actually has an entire chapter about the cannery and six other
634 people who are significant to the local history of Palo Alto and the peninsula. It was fascinating reading.
635 Juana Briones is in here and several other people, including Charlie Chaplin. Anyway, it has a very good
636 chapter about this building.

637

638 Ms. Lee: Thanks. I just wanted to kind of go back to that earlier topic. So, basically in terms of process, so
639 the process would be we would take all this input, we would present it to the Working Group. The Working
640 Group will work together with Staff to come up with the options, the different alternatives. We'll take that
641 to the community at a community meeting sometime early next year. Then all of that goes to the City
642 Council for their review. City Council will come up with a preferred alternative. That preferred alternative
643 would then become the basis of the plan itself, and once a preferred alternative is chosen, then that will
644 go, that will help us start the work on the EIR for the project. So, at that point, it's at that point when we
645 actually have project alternatives that will work with our environmental consultants as well as Page and
646 Turnbull to evaluate the impact, the historic impact of the proposed project. And then that will then go
647 through the process and up to Council for final adoption.

648

649 Chair Bower: Great. Thank you. I think that the Board, I hope all of the members that are not here today
650 can participate in the EIR review which will come when this project moves forward. I think our comments

651 today would suggest that we feel that this project needs to take into consideration the historic character
652 of the cannery building and the office, and how that is expressed in the project development would be, of
653 course subject to all of the Working Group input, lots of other input, but our input, I think, is that somehow
654 these buildings need to be preserved and incorporated into a new project. I think that my colleagues here
655 today share that. So, Martin?

656
657 Board Member Bernstein: Yes. Thank you, Chair Bower. I have a question for Staff. Is this considered a, in
658 terms of historic preservation ordinances, is this considered a Group A or Group B? And so, Group A requires
659 it to be located in some historical category, which right now it's not a historic category, correct? So, it's not
660 a Group A, right?

661
662 Ms. French: So, that's a handy document that needs updating, that is very helpful for the single-family
663 residential projects that we see coming through. In this case, you know, this is a non-residential project
664 that is subject to architectural review. So, there's going to be a discretionary project on this site which then
665 kicks it into the CEQA review. This document you're holding, the bulletin is really helpful for Staff to
666 understand, you know, single-family residential which often is not subject to discretionary reviews.
667 (crosstalk)

668
669 Board Member Bernstein: So, Group A and Group B only refers to residential properties, not, is that correct?
670

671 Ms. French: Well, that's the focus of that bulletin. Yeah. So, it's been identified now as an eligible resource,
672 so we consider it a CEQA resource for the purpose of review.

673
674 Board Member Bernstein: Okay, all right. Just following up my thoughts about this, so it says under Group
675 B Historic Resource, it's listed in the National. So, right now it's not listed, correct? Okay.

676
677 Ms. French: Correct. And only the property owner can petition the State to have their property listed
678 actually. So, the eligibility is the thing that kicks it into CEQA review. But the listing itself is up to the
679 property owner.

680
681 Board Member Bernstein: Okay, all right. So, thank you for clarifying that. I did not know that this only
682 refers to, am I correct, this only refers to residential properties, Group A and Group B? Is that correct?

683
684 Ms. French: I think we should schedule a separate meeting for this bulletin, if you don't mind. So, have
685 further discussion. I'm not prepared to discuss that.

686
687 Board Member Bernstein: I see, okay. I do see that on today's agenda that this is actually not listed as a
688 study session. This is an action item, according to this agenda, right? This is an action item meeting, not a
689 study session.

690
691 Ms. French: I mean, to the extent that your comments will be considered in the next steps in this process,
692 I think it's an action item. There's no project under CEQA currently to make a recommendation to Council,
693 for instance, but I guess it's kind of a study session, but you know, because... I don't think we need a vote,
694 straw poll or anything.

695
696 Ms. Lee: No, I don't think we need a formal vote, but we'll definitely be forwarding on your comments and
697 recommendations to the Working Group.

698
699 Chair Bower: So, it's an action item that doesn't require any action.

700
701 Ms. French: Yeah.

702
703 Board Member Bernstein: Can Staff assure the Board that, again, it is because of potential eligibility... It's
704 potential eligibility correct?

705

706 Ms. French: It's no long potentially eligible, it is eligible.
707
708 Board Member Bernstein: Okay.
709
710 Ms. French: Because this study has been done. Once a study has been done to find it eligible, I mean, I
711 would from your comments surmise that you are concurring that it's eligible and as you've read through
712 the report this is, one of your functions is to review an important document such as this and weigh in, I
713 guess, if you'd like.
714
715 Board Member Bernstein: Okay, so we're guaranteed that this is tied into CEQA then?
716
717 Ms. French: Correct.
718
719 Board Member Bernstein. And that ties into the Secretary of Interior Standards for any alterations to historic
720 resource, correct?
721
722 Ms. French: Well, I think again, that's got a more... Lower-level projects, yes, but because environmental
723 impact report would be prepared, that would weigh the, you know, retention versus demolition, let's say,
724 of the existing buildings on this site, that go up to Council. Then Council makes a decision. You know, if
725 the Council decision is to retain the buildings, then, you know, then modifications there too would be
726 mitigated or what have you.
727
728 Board Member Bernstein: Okay. Well, thanks for clarifying that. When I was the words 'potentially eligible'
729 I thought, okay, so that doesn't mean it's eligible, but you're saying it is eligible, therefore, CEQA is
730 guaranteed, it would have to respond to CEQA requirements. Okay, thank you.
731
732 Ms. French: Yes.
733
734 Chair Bower: So, just... One second Margaret. Just so it's clear, I think I'd like to take a pole of Board
735 Members and just to verify that we do feel that this is eligible, it meets the criteria for listing, so that there's
736 no ambiguity about that in the record. Anybody disagree with that, that this is an eligible building? The
737 criteria qualifies it?
738
739 Board Member Bernstein: I agree that it is, yeah.
740
741 Chair Bower: Margaret?
742
743 Board Member Wimmer: Yeah. Just a quick question. So, if Page and Turnbull has reviewed the, all the
744 findings and they've clearly stated that it's, the building itself is not... I mean, I think the site and the event
745 of the site is, makes it eligible, but if we have a professional that has found, has done this report, how does
746 that weigh in?
747
748 Ms. Dikas: It was not found to be significant for its architecture or design, but that doesn't mean that the
749 building is not significant. The building itself represents the significance associated with the use and events
750 of the cannery function, and so we did still call out character-defining features of the building as well as
751 the site. So, there is still a physical representation that, when it comes down to it there isn't really a
752 difference when you're evaluating a project, which Criterion was found to be the significant one.
753
754 Board Member Wimmer: Thank you. That makes it more clear. Yeah, I agree.
755
756 Chair Bower: Roger, you concur?
757
758 Board Member Kohler: Yeah.
759

760 Chair Bower: Yeah, all right. So, all of us concur that this building is significant and should, could be listed,
761 so that that's clearly transmitted to the Council. Okay.

762
763 Board Member Wimmer: I have one quick question. Is this project going to circle back to us as the plans
764 develop, or is this the last time we'll review this project?

765
766 Ms. Lee: No, this will come back. So, once we've developed plan alternatives and we'll be doing the CEQA
767 analysis, so that will come back to you for your recommendation.

768
769 Chair Bower: All right.

770
771 Ms. French: Ideally, we would come back during the public comment period, like we're doing with the
772 Castilleja Project, for instance. So, you would have a public meeting during the comment period, if we can
773 swing that to have a coordinated discussion.

774
775 Board Member Bernstein: Chair Bower, I see there's, since the public hearing is still open, I see a member
776 of the public who would like to make a comment please.

777
778 Chair Bower: Oh, please.

779
780 (inaudible, no mic)

781
782 Ms. Bajuk: So, as I mentioned earlier, housing was a pressing concern at the end of the war. It's still a
783 pressing concern. It's amazing how things don't really change too much. But as a suggestion, orchards
784 were replaced by housing at that time period, but we've retained a few throughout the County. Los Alto is
785 still fighting to protect its trees around that civic center and the museum I used to manage. Thank you,
786 Martin, for mentioning it, to go to that exhibit. So, a few have been kept as living monuments. I think
787 there's an opportunity here to keep a portion of the real facility. I'm going to back up a minute and say I
788 was very disappointed when we went to Europe to learn that castles didn't look like what Disney had taught
789 me they looked like. And so, there's a sentimentalization that can happen or sort of a fauxness that can
790 come with trying to emulate our past. But we can't preserve all of it. We need this space to be used for the
791 betterment of the community. But, perhaps a corner, maybe the corner that talks the most about Thomas
792 Foon Chew and his contributions to our community. You know, the cannery was expended after his death.
793 It was expanded by later owners, but what's the piece that most attaches to him, and is there some section
794 of that that could speak to that history. And also, the railroad history. I'm actually active because my
795 husband is, with railroad museums and I know we could do something interesting about the interpretation
796 of the fruit industry. For example, Southern Pacific employed the Stanford swim team, I think in the 40's
797 or so, for publicity shots where they were stoking ice into the top of the refrigerator units that would carry
798 the fruit. They weren't wearing much. It was sort of the beefcake of the day. This was their promotion's
799 department thinking this was wise. These are the sorts of stories that are attached here that people aren't
800 familiar with and bring a smile to our faces too, when we think how things haven't changed. Industrial
801 buildings aren't sexy. They're not meant to be. They're functional and even the Eiffel Tower was considered
802 too industrial, too commercial, too boring. It didn't reflect the aesthetic of the day. Perhaps, as time passes,
803 that would change with an industrial building like this. But perhaps a small corner can be kept. Again, real
804 places are the ones that teach history, not the recreated ones. So, even, not matter how fabulous our
805 museum is, and it's going to be fabulous, it is going to an historic site that gives the greatest impression
806 to people when they're thinking about history, and it is the most trusted source of history. History museums
807 come second. And third on that list, from a survey from Indiana is someone who was actually at an historic
808 site or in an historic occurrence, like a World War II veteran. So, try to keep a piece of the authentic history.
809 A small corner would be my hope. Thank you.

810
811 Chair Bower: Thank you Laura, and I'm not sure I can pronounce your last name. Bajuk. Anyway, you are
812 our first and our last commentator. Do you want to make a comment?

813

814 Board Member Kohler: I just wanted to make one quick comment. I forgot to mention that I can remember
815 seeing the train come off and go up and then you'd go up to Los Altos. You know, the main drag is up
816 there. The train used to run along that area as well. I guess I'm old enough to remember some of that.
817

818 Chair Bower: Okay, I'd like to point the public or anyone who is going to read the transcript of this meeting
819 to page eight and nine in our packets where the Staff has very cogently summarized the significance of
820 this building in terms of Criterion 1, which is events. And then second, aspects of integrity, there are seven
821 of them that define integrity, location, setting, design setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and
822 association, and this set of buildings retains six of the seven. I think that's one of the strongest statements
823 about any building that's come before this Board since I've been on here, and that's rather, I think that's
824 significant, not to overuse the term. So, I want to thank all of you who are here. We're going to go into
825 basic Board business after this. And in particular, I thank Gloria Hom for coming to the meeting. It is
826 particularly, to me, meaningful to have somebody who is related to people who we're talking about in an
827 historic sense. Thank you, Christina and Page and Turnbull and Staff, for your help in this, and I do think
828 we all look forward to having it come back. And thank everyone who has commented. It's the first time
829 we've had a meeting with anybody in the audience in several meetings.
830

831 **Approval of Minutes**

832 **3. Approval of Historic Resources Board Draft Minutes of June 13, 2019.**

833 Chair Bower: So, we're going to move on to housekeeping, approval of minutes. Once again, I slogged
834 through the minutes. They're getting better, but... Any Board Members that have any...
835
836

837 Board Member Bernstein: So, I can't vote on it. I was not here.
838

839 Chair Bower: No, you can abstain, which is what I do. So, do I have a motion to approve?
840

841 Board Member Wimmer: I'd like to make a motion to approve what we discussed today.
842

843 Chair Bower: Yeah. Roger second?
844

845 Board Member Kohler: Sure.
846

847 Chair Bower: All right, all in favor of approving the minutes from June 13, 2019 say aye. Roger?
848

849 Board Member Kohler: Yeah, aye.
850

851 Board Member Bernstein: I abstain. I was not participating in that meeting.
852

853 Chair Bower: Okay, so we have three.
854

855 (off mic)
856

857 Chair Bower: Well, so, Martin wants to abstain from the minutes, does that mean...
858

859 (off mic)
860

861 Chair Bower: Yeah, so we have a quorum. He doesn't have to vote for or against or, yeah, okay. So, it's
862 three yes and one abstention.
863

864 **MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 3-0, BOARD MEMBER BERNSTEIN ABSTAINED, VICE CHAIR**
865 **COREY, BOARD MEMBERS MAKINEN AND SHEPHERD ABSENT**
866

867

868 Board Member Wimmer: Actually, David, it says that I was absent during that meeting, and I came late
869 because I was in traffic, but I did come. Should, can I change that? Can we change that in the minutes?

870
871 Chair Bower: Oh yeah.

872
873 Board Member Wimmer: I was actually, it says that I was absent for the meeting on June 13th.

874
875 Chair Bower: She came late.

876
877 Board Member Wimmer: When, in fact, I...

878
879 Ms. French: Are you speaking about packet page four?

880
881 Board Member Wimmer: We're just looking at the minutes, so page 92. It says that I was absent for that
882 meeting, but I was actually present, a little tardy.

883
884 Ms. French: Okay, we'll make that correction. Thank you.

885
886 **Subcommittee Items**

887
888 Chair Bower: Okay, subcommittee items. After this meeting Roger and I will meet with Amy to discuss the
889 520, is it 527 Waverley? Is that the right address?

890
891 Ms. French: 526.

892
893 Chair Bower: 526 Waverly, right. The tile and entry. There are no other subcommittee reports that I'm
894 aware of.

895
896 **Board Member Questions, Comments and Announcements**

897
898 Chair Bower: So, Board Member questions, comments, announcements?

899
900 Board Member Kohler: I guess I forgot to let people know you could look at, I happened to grab these on
901 my way in. These are things I put together over the years and so...

902
903 Chair Bower: Right, so Roger is referring to the photographs that he has laid out on the dais behind Amy
904 that have pictures of, historic pictures of Palo Alto. I have a question. What's the deadline for our in-service
905 training for this year? You know, we have to go to, we have certain requirements.

906
907 Ms. French: I don't know the deadline offhand. I mean, you know, we want to make sure we keep going
908 to trainings.

909
910 Chair Bower: Well, I think that the report (crosstalk) October first. I mean, we file it in February, but I
911 think, but it's a look back period and I want to be sure. I haven't been able to get to one.

912
913 Ms. French: Whatever you attend between now and February, or whatever, January when I bring it to you,
914 I'll put it on the list.

915
916 **Adjournment**

917
918 Chair Bower: Okay, if we have no other comments or questions, then we'll adjourn the meeting at 10
919 o'clock. Thank you all.

920
921