



HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING
MINUTES: September 12, 2019
City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 A.M.

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Bower, Vice Chair Corey, Board Member Bernstein, Board Member Makinen, Board Member Shepherd, Board Member Wimmer

Absent: Board Member Kohler

Chair Bower: Okay, all of us Board Members that are going to be present are here, so let's call the meeting to order and Robin, can you take roll?

Ms. Robin Ellner: Six present.

Chair Bower: Thank you Robin.

Oral Communications

Chair Bower: We'll move to oral communications. Anyone who wants to speak about anything other than the topic at hand is welcome to come up and speak, three minutes max. I'm not seeing any cards, nor any takers.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Bower: Let's move on to Agenda, Changes, Deletions, Additions. I don't know of any.

Ms. Amy French: Good morning. There are no changes.

Chair Bower: Good morning. Thank you.

City Official Reports

1. Historic Resources Board Schedule of Meetings and Assignments

Chair Bower: So, why don't we skip City Official Reports, put that at the end of our meeting, because that's not relevant to our current topic today. I'd like to welcome Vinh Nguyen, who is our new Board Liaison. Vinh, thank you for joining us. We'll miss Robin. Robin, this is your last meeting with us.

Ms. Ellner: It is, and I have to say it's been a real pleasure of the past two years, being the secretary to the HRB, and I will miss all of you. So, thank you.

Chair Bower: Well, we'll miss you too. Thank you.

[The Board moved to Study Session]

Chair Bower: Okay, if we want to get the meeting back on track. We have just housekeeping issues. We just to do housekeeping here, I think. I'm trying to get to page five of our packet. Our September 26th meeting has been cancelled.

Ms. French: Yes.

Chair Bower: We will have an October 10th meeting, presumably?

Ms. French: We can, if there are agenda items, which...

Chair Bower: Hang on a second. Guys in the back...

(off mic)

Chair Bower: Okay. Amy, October 10th looks like a real meeting day?

Ms. French: It's a, well all meetings are potential meeting dates, kind of like all 50-year-old and older homes are potential historic home, but if we don't have a meeting item, which you know, is generated by projects that come in, or a need to have a training session or some kind of thing that somebody has identified that we have time to put together.

Chair Bower: Okay. In our recent communication, though, you mentioned that there may be a project coming?

Ms. French: I was looking at the potential for that, but I don't have an answer at the moment.

Chair Bower: All right, so we have the possibility of five more, one, two, three, four, five, five more meetings. Debbie and I will not be at two of those. What's really important is to always tell Vinh, our new aide if you're not going to be here, so that we know that we have a quorum.

(off mic)

Chair Bower: The 26th of September is cancelled. Yeah. Vinh sent an email yesterday.

Ms. French: (off mic) four potential meetings because the November 28th meeting, I think, is Thanksgiving. So, that's cancelled.

Chair Bower: Yeah, okay.

Ms. French: Unless you want to bring the turkey.

Chair Bower: Yeah, right. No, I don't think the Council Chambers will be open. All right.

[The Board moved to Approval of Minutes]

Study Session

Chair Bower: Our Study Session, we have lots of people here and we want to get to the discussion of the main topic of conversation.

Action Items

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING. 1310 Bryant Street, 1235 and 1263 Emerson Street: Historic Resources Board Review of and Receipt of Public Comments on a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Prepared for the Castilleja School Project. The Draft EIR was**

Published on July 17, 2019 for a 60-day Initial Public Comment Period Ending September 16, 2019. File #s: 16PLN-00234, 17PLN-00238, and 19PLN-00116. For more information contact Amy French, Chief Planning Official at amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Bower: Okay, let's move on to our Action Item. It's a public hearing about the project at 1310 Bryant Street, 1235, 1263 Emerson Street. It's an HRB review of the Draft Environmental, the EIR, which is prepared for Castilleja. I guess, Amy, we have a Staff Report to start.

Ms. Amy French: Yes, good morning. Amy French, Chief Planning Official. Today the focus is the Environmental Impact report for the project. I need to run over here and get the mouse. Oh shoot, security alert, great. Okay, end of pause. Amy French still. Starting my presentation. This is the second opportunity for the public, in a public hearing setting to provide comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report. Here is the outline for today. I'm going to provide a bit of campus history. Talk about today's campus a bit and the adjacent school property. We have an Historic Resource on site, the Gunn Building. We have the adjacent Emerson Street. Two properties are within the project site, another is not and separately owned. And then we have our next steps for the HRB and your purview. Then we have our consultant, Kathy Layendecker of Dudek who will be presenting with her associate here on the Environmental Impact Report itself, with the focus on the Cultural Resources Chapter in particular. So, just for fun, I have an old slide here from 1894 when Palo Alto's first school was already built. Back in 1892 there was a building at 319 Kingsley. It was the first girls' prep school in Palo Alto. That school closed in 1901 and the building itself was moved from 319 Kingsley, three doors down to 1121 Bryant. The building is still there today. It's called Castilleja Hall and it became Harker's Elementary and then it served for three years as Castilleja School for Girls. We moved to this site, which is the current campus of Castilleja School. As you can see, 1910, there were about four buildings, a three-story dormitory, a chapel, a science building and a gymnasium. You can see here, the Recitation Hall, which later became – it still exists today as the administration building. And here was the dorm that was removed years later. Back in 1924 we have a Sanborn map which shows the buildings that were present. The campus expanded a bit at that point. There were 230 students. We have another historical image showing the Birge Clark Building, which is the chapel that came along in 1926. And that remains as of today. So, these two buildings are the historic buildings on the site, the administration building and the chapel, called the Gunn Building. Then there were some other fun things on this map showing some Castilleja property off site here, with a couple of homes and a field, and then we had some tennis courts across Melville. Here's just a long history of use permits. The first use permit was issued in 1960, and that included a 90-student dormitory that exceeded the current, today's high limit, for sure. There was a variance for that. And there's a long string of changes to the campus through conditional use permit. Not to get into detail on this, but just to show you the use permit has been the method of modifying the campus over the years. Here's today's Castilleja School. And you can see this was formerly Melville Street, formerly went through the campus. It was, the City Council approved removal of that, abandonment of the easement and Castilleja extended the campus across there. So, here's today's school property showing the various buildings, etc. These are the Castilleja-owned properties on Emerson Street. They are two separate parcels today. Castilleja proposes to merge the existing campus parcel with these two parcels. And this is an adjacent separately owned property. It is an Historic Resource as well. So, this shows the Historic Resource, the chapel designed by Birge Clark, and this is the administration building. This is an adjacent classroom building that was from the 1960's. Here is that 1960's building. That's proposed to be demolished. Here it is as existing and here it is as proposed with the removal of the building and replacement with a new building. This is the historic Gunn Building. This is showing the Phase IV academic building that's proposed. This is showing, and the applicant will be providing a few slides showing this, but there's a couple of options that they're looking at. They propose to remove this building and expose the Gunn Building, the historic building, and they're showing potential treatments to that exposed façade. There are fences around the property. Again, this is a proposal showing the fence that would go in Phase IV next to the existing admin building, and between the new building that they propose and this admin building. So, you can see the fence is looking similar to the existing fence. This shows just a map showing the proposed space between. It's about fifty feet between the new proposed building and the chapel here, or sorry, the administration building, and where that fence would go that

was in the earlier slide. The aesthetics to put on that administration building, they're showing the cedar wood shingles. Again, the applicant says they have some slides on this. This shows the Emerson Street condition. The Environmental Document goes into, analyzes or reports out on the buildings on the campus and they also note this adjacent Historic Resource here on the separate property. Here are the dates of these buildings, 1912 for this house, 1979 for this house and 1917 for this house. So, here's the picture of the Historic Resource at 1215. It's National Register eligible. This is what the applicant proposes is to remove those two structures and replace with a park that would be a private park and with some access to the community. In any case, the consultant we have here today can answer questions about this, but basically Chapter Six of the EIR says that the historic significance and integrity of 1215 Emerson, the Resource, is not dependent on the adjacent nearby structure presence, and that the 1979 home that Castilleja proposes to remove is outside of 1215 Emerson's period of significance. So, I just pulled that out of the EIR to help out with the discussion. Here are the homes here showing that 1979 home and the 1263 Emerson, the 1912 home. I have some slides showing the changes that took place with 1263 Emerson. This is again pulled out of the EIR that talks about the architectural merit of 1263, you know, because the building has been significantly modified. So, those are some notes there. Again, I have some slides, because I did research through the building permits. In 1973 there was a detached garage that oriented to Melville. Then, the parcel map came through, that lots used to be, here two lots oriented to Melville, underlying lots. In 1977 they proposed to reorient the lots, so the lots were then reoriented towards Emerson Street. Then in 1979 there was a brief variance because the new parcel orientation created a smaller setback in the rear than 20, which was required. Then a new garage was approved, this garage in 1991. This was all before Castilleja owned the property. Here is the original entry of that 1263 Emerson. In 1993 Castilleja acquired this property and went through some changes here. This is the building today, has this porch which came about in 1998. That was around the time that Dames & Moore did the study of the City potential resources, and so it was around the same time that this remodel happened. This just shows the plans I found. This was the existing condition with that smaller entry and a separation between the building and the garage, and then this is the 1998 changes that connected the building with this building, and proposed this new porch that is there today. So, here we are at the purview. You know, there's an architecture review application that has been submitted. We have not visited the ARB yet. That won't be for some time because we're in the Environmental Impact Review portion of the review. And then the Planning and Transportation Commission has conducted the EIR hearing and they have not yet had discussions about the applications on file that are in their purview. So, that's all in our Staff Report about this. So, the next step is the applicant is trying to complete the architecture review application and the tentative map application. They have a file that came in August 22 that's available online for anyone who wants to see those, the map and the plans. And then we're projecting to move ahead with public hearings coming up this fall and winter. So, I'm going to, this is the slide that basically shows the CEQA process here that we're in. We have the initial study analysis preparation. This was in 2017. We published the Draft EIR July 17 of this year, and a final EIR would come out with responses to comments. So, I'm going to turn it over to our consultant.

Ms. **Kathryn Wha (phonetic)**: Good morning. As Amy said, my name is Kathryn **Wha**. I'm the senior project manager with Dudek, and with me today is **Katie Haley (phonetic)**. She is our architectural historian. I'm going to do the presentation myself, just to kind of keep it a little bit more efficient, but both of us are more than happy to answer questions. So, just a quick overview of my presentation, it kind of mirrors the format that Amy just went through, but a slightly different focus, just to give you a good overview of the EIR content, so you have a good understanding of the project overall. So, this site just lists the various entitlements that are requested with the project, again to provide you with the context of what the project involves. So, as Amy mentioned, the school operates under a conditional use permit, and so that's really, the main focus is amending the conditional use permit to allow building modifications, demolition and new construction that's proposed. One of the key elements of the project is to construct the underground parking garage, which would be in the location where the two residential structures are currently located. And then that allows for placing that park type setting at the ground surface where those houses currently are. As Amy mentioned, the Historic Resources on the campus, the administration and chapel building are not proposed to be modified, other than the exterior finishes and exterior staircase. Another key feature of the project is to remove the current swimming pool and reconstruct a swimming pool below grade along the Emerson frontage, and then to construct a classroom

or academic building, I think it's labeled on this slide, that would include library and classroom facilities and other spaces that are necessary for the school's educational programs. And then this site gives an overview of some of the landscaping treatment. The different colors are just sort of different zones of landscaping that are proposed, so there is a different sort of pallet of plants that are proposed in each one, and there's more details in the site plans. For the proposed new construction, again, the library is the portion that would be closest to the administration building, but as the slides that Amy presented show, there would be a much greater kind of setback between the two buildings than currently exists. And then this slide, the bottom image there shows the exterior staircase that would be added, or is proposed to be added to the administration building. So then, just a quick overview on the California Environmental Quality Act and what the City's obligations are under that regulation. So, this is the quick overview of the process. As Amy mentioned, we had an initial study and then Notice of Preparation that was circulated in 2017. And that was sort of our first formal description of the proposed project and how we would be approaching the Environmental Impact Analysis. So, all of the comments that were received at that time were reviewed and reflected in how we prepared the actual draft EIR. The draft EIR CEQA requires a minimum 45-day public review period. For this project, the City determined to provide a 60-day public review period, which ends this coming Monday, the 16th. And then once we have all of the comments, we will provide responses to those comments. Where necessary we can make amendments or revisions to the text of the draft EIR to help provide clarification and maybe some refinements to the discussion and mitigation measures. And then that becomes the final EIR, which is what the City Council ultimately would determine whether or not to certify, and that would indicate that the City Council believes that it has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of CEQA. The draft EIR is required to include a detailed project description, so we have a long chapter explaining all of the elements that are proposed within the project, and supported by figures to really demonstrate to the public what's proposed there. We have, we define what the existing conditions are of the project area specific to each of the resource topics that we're evaluating impacts for, and then determine whether the proposed changes that the project would bring about would have a significant impact on that existing condition. We also look at mitigation measures and project alternatives that can help us avoid or reduce any of those significant impacts. And then consider some of the other CEQA issues, such as growth inducement, accumulative impacts and those to give the City a full idea of the environmental effects of the project as a whole. So, these next few slides just run quickly through the impacts and mitigation measures that we round in each of the resource areas because I know that the Historic Resources Board is focused on historic resources and you don't really want to get into all the details. I wanted to just keep this as a really quick overview for you. We did find a few significant and unavoidable impacts, and these are primarily related to the way that traffic patterns would change by the proposal to create an underground parking garage and really concentrate all of the pickup and drop off activity in that garage. But an important consideration under CEQA is that if you find a significant and unavoidable impact, to make sure that is well documented and disclosed, and that would require if the City Council ultimately wants to approve the project and certify the EIR, they would need to adopt what's called a Statement of Overriding Considerations that explains what tradeoffs the City feels warrant accepting a project that has significant and unavoidable impacts. Those significant and unavoidable impacts, as I said, are related mostly to the traffic patterns, and so they really don't affect the Historic Resources issues, but I wanted to make sure you all were aware of those. So, one of those was under land use in terms of compatibility of the project with the neighborhood, but again, that discussion really focuses on the traffic issues. For all of the other impacts, such as the aesthetics and noise, we found that the project would be compatible with the neighborhood. It is really the change in traffic patterns that cause that to be a significant and unavoidable impact. With respect to cultural resources, which is the last row on this table on this side, we found that the impacts would be less than significant. The project would not adversely affect the historic significance of the Gunn Administration Building and the chapel building, and would not affect the historical significance of the neighboring property, as Amy discussed. Transportation, as I mentioned, is where we did find some key impacts, and so there are some mitigation measures identified. The project proposes to increase their transportation demand management efforts to help reduce the amount of traffic that may be brought in new traffic that may come to the campus. It also looked at the typical things of noise, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and several of these impacts or several of these issues, we found that there could be minor changes in the environment that required mitigation and the mitigation measures that we have identified are very typical standard types of measures that are applied

to most projects throughout the State. So, there's not really a unique consideration for this project compared to other projects of similar types. So, similarly, this site goes over some of the other topics of geology, biology and there was one other one on there, oh, energy conservation. We did find that this project would actually have a good benefit in terms of energy conservation by replacing older buildings with newer, more energy-efficient structures, and would incorporate solar voltaic panels on the roofs. Finally, hazards and hazardous materials is something that we evaluated in the initial study and Notice of Preparation and again, found that it's a very common thing that you'll find asbestos and lead-based paints and lead-containing materials in buildings of this age. So, again, it's very standard, typical mitigation measures that we identified to make sure that those don't cause adverse health effects in the neighborhood. And as I mentioned, CEQA requires that you look at project alternatives to try to avoid and reduce impacts, and so this slide summarizes the three alternatives that we looked at. The no project alternative is something that's required by CEQA, so that's where you just imagine the situation where the project has no change, it doesn't go ahead, and so the property stays the way that it is currently. We also looked at reducing enrollment to 506 students compared to the 540 that's proposed and we found that that would slightly reduce the building sizes and allow for some minor modifications to the site plan. And then the second alternative, excuse me, the third alternative was the same student cap, but we also played with the parking. The project proposes more parking than is required under the City's codes, and so we looked at reducing that sort of excess parking to see whether that could reduce any of the project's significant and unavoidable impacts. And we really found that all of these alternatives would result in similar impacts as the proposed project. There may be slight changes up and down, but nothing that would avoid any of the significant and unavoidable project impacts. So, the draft EIR has been out for almost 60 days now, and so we have received a large volume of comments, and this site just summarizes the main topics that we've been seeing repeated in those comments. So, there's a lot of comments about the land use intensity and density in terms of how, is this proposed campus and proposed student enrollment appropriate for the size of the campus. Obviously, concerns about traffic and noise and aesthetics. And then with respect to historic resources, and I know you guys have had a chance to review some of the comments, and so there has been concern from the neighbors about the historic significance of the Lockey House and as Amy pointed out, that was determined in our analysis not to be registered due to the extent of changes that have happened to that building over time. And then another more recently, there was a comment letter that related to consideration of whether the neighborhood around the school should be considered as an historic district, and that is something that the proposed project doesn't affect anything outside of its boundaries, and so that's not something that we typically would look at in a CEQA analysis, but we're certainly happy to answer questions on that one as well. I think the other comments are pretty typical of the concerns that we would hear from the community members on projects, so again, I just wanted to provide that context for you guys. And so, just to wrap up what the CEQA process required, as I mentioned, the public review period for this EIR ends on Monday, which means that all comments should be submitted to the City by the end of business on that day, and folks are aware of the email address that can be used to submit comments and they can also be submitted by standard U.S. mail or even hand delivered, for that personal touch. So, just the contact information is here on this slide for anyone who needs that information. And that was the conclusion of my presentation. I'm happy to answer any questions.

Chair Bower: Thank you Kathryn. I wanted to remind everyone today before we move on to the next phase, that the purpose of our meeting today, as articulated in our staff-prepared materials, is to provide members of the community with another opportunity to comment on the draft EIR and in particular, to allow the Historic Resources Board to discuss and focus primarily on historic resources evaluation, and there are attachments in the materials at the back, C and A, that list the issues we want to address today. What we don't want to address, and we don't have the purview of addressing are the land use issues, the parking issues, traffic. That's really not our scope of review. It's a legitimate issue for the community, but it's not our focus, and so I would like to keep our comments to the historic resource issues that we address as a Board. So, Amy, do you have any questions before we open up to public comment?

Ms. French: I don't. I mean, if anyone has questions for staff or consultants, may hold them till after the public comments, if that works?

Chair Bower: Yeah, I think that was my intent. So, write them down. Oh, actually, there are some housekeeping issues, so Brandon, you start.

Vice Chair Corey: Housekeeping?

Chair Bower: Disclosures.

Vice Chair Corey: Oh. I wanted to disclose that I own property within 500 feet of Castilleja. I don't reside there, but...

Chair Bower: I don't know if that would disqualify Brandon. Martin?

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, thank you Chair Bower. I would like to disclose I met with, earlier this week, a Kathy Layendecker. She is the Associate Head of the school, so I went to the property just to take a look at the historic structures there, and she was kind enough to give me a tour of the properties.

Chair Bower: And I need to disclose that in the late 1990's I worked on 1263 Emerson, the Lockey House, and I also built the house at 1310 Emerson in 1998. I'm no longer in business, so I don't think that presents a conflict, but just wanted to make sure everyone understood that I have some experience with the site and the buildings. Also, I've lived here for 68 years and understand the significance of Castilleja in the community. Anyone else want to make any comments? Okay, so we will circle back to comments or questions for staff. Let's start with Adam Woltag. He is speaking for more than five people, and so because he's aggregated the comments of other people, he has 15 minutes allotted time. Welcome.

Adam Woltag: Good morning. My name is Adam Woltag. I'm a design partner with WRNS Studio and we're the architects for the new Castilleja campus. So, I have hopefully, a brief presentation that I would really appreciate the Board's comments on the architectural resource on the Gunn Building. The new campus presents a really great opportunity for the east façade of that building, so we'd love to get some of your input. So, the first slide we have up here shows the existing condition, and in that dashed box which is really important to note is that actually the chapel building, the administration building and the classroom building are all co-joined together to kind of one large building. The proposed design actually looks at demolishing the Rhoades classroom building and building a new classroom building about 50 feet away from the east façade of the Gunn Building. That presents a really tremendous opportunity for new pedestrian gateway and entry into campus, and it frees up or liberates that eastern façade of the Gunn Building. So, these are some of the photographs of the photographs of the existing conditions today of both of the chapel building and the administration building. Great examples of craftsman architecture. They are beautiful buildings. Primarily the materials that are primarily used are cedar shingles, expressed roof details, a pebble flash stucco finish on the lower story of the Gunn Building, and kind of a mix of symmetrical and asymmetrical kind of window treatments along it. But really beautiful architectural kind of expression. On the left you see an aerial view of the existing campus and, again, just focusing on the fact that the Rhoades Building really abuts the eastern façade of the administration building. On the right is the proposed design of the campus and what you really, I think, need to kind of focus on is the fact that that new building is 50 feet away from the façade of the Gunn Building. The architectural character along that Bryant Street façade is also important to note, and the new architectural character is really influenced by the character of the existing architectural resources. So, some of the key findings that were pulled from the draft EIR we wanted to kind of bring out today. First and foremost, the Gunn and the Hughes Chapel Building are listed on Palo Alto's Historic inventory as Category 3 contributing buildings. All the campus buildings were evaluated that were over 45 years old for potential historic significance, and no additional properties were found eligible for the California Register or Palo Alto inventory. Even though the campus relatively holds to its initial kind of structure, it still lacks enough integrity to constitute as an historic district. And then finally, I think it's 1235 and 1263 Emerson Street residences were not found eligible for listing as historic resources on the local inventory or on the California Register. So, I'm going to walk through a little bit of the history of the Gunn Building and the Hughes Chapel

Building and how they kind of got married together over time. In 1910, as you see here in blue, that was really the original configuration of the Gunn Building. It's entrance initially faced Bryant Street, as you see there. There is also an historic foot on the lower right-hand corner of the slide where you can kind of see that eastern façade as it was originally designed. A key to point out there is a gateway that runs along Bryant Street and reaches towards the other, I think it was a dormitory building at that time. In 1926 the Hughes Chapel was constructed as a separate independent, stand-alone building with its entrance facing Bryant Street. They did not touch at that time. They functioned independently from one another. Similar in architectural details but, obviously, not the same. In 1967 Rhoades Hall was built, completely different architectural style, a cast-in-place concrete building. It went all the way up to that eastern façade, did not necessarily connect to the Gunn Building, but it did come up and really just touch that façade. Again, the chapel building and the administration building were still separate independent structures. The most significant improvements and adjustments to the project came in 2000, when both the administration building and the chapel building were significantly remodeled on the interior. Basements were added to each one of those buildings, and the entries were reorganized into kind of a co-joined kind of lobby space you see there, that really connected those two buildings together to function as one building. And then Hughes Hall was actually connected and provided a required exit from the Gunn Building through Hughes Hall and out to the exterior. The proposed design actually now demolishes the Rhoades Hall and creates a new pedestrian entry facing Bryant Street that leads directly into the circle, the center of campus. It opens up an opportunity there to provide a required exit from the Gunn Building and an opportunity for a new campus gateway. These are the elevations of the Gunn and Rhoades, I'm sorry, the Gunn and the chapel building. The two bottom elevations are of most significance here. You can see the proposed kind of revised eastern elevation of the administration building. And across from it, 50 feet away, the proposed elevation of the academic building, the library building, that would be facing that elevation. A key to note are the architectural materials that the new campus building will be using, inspired by the wood shingles of the historic resources, that library building will be using the same type of cedar shingles, cast-in-place concrete and metal details and highlights throughout the rest of the campus. So, looking at that Bryant Street elevation, it is the design intent here to continue the same architectural gateway that you see along the Embarcadero, all the way along Emerson and to basically connect the library building to the Gunn Administration Building there. The same brickwork, the same metal detailing and concrete caps. As we scoot around to face that freed-up elevation, that eastern elevation of the Gunn Building, you're starting to see the required exits there that we're proposing in Option 1. The intent of this design option is to provide a complimentary but contrasting design approach. The stair is going to obviously be designed to not kind of confuse any historic reference to the building. We think it's simple. We think it's elegant. We think it's quiet and it provides the most minimal, we think, structural and architectural impact to that eastern façade of the Gunn Building. It's going to be interesting to see what is going to be revealed after Rhoades Hall is removed, but the idea is to continue to same architectural language along that eastern façade, the incorporation of cedar shingles, the pebble flash stucco treatment, the same color of paint, all of that to just carry that same architectural character around that eastern façade. These are some views that illustrate how that stair would be incorporated to that façade. Key to note here is that stair would be landing on basically on the edge of a planter that would pick up again on some of that brick detailing that would carry in from the gateway along Bryant Street in to campus. Here's another view, a little bit of an aerial view that shows how that would all come together along that façade. Option 2 looks at something that is a little bit more robust and one might say starts to blur a little bit more the lines of what is new and what is historic. The architectural cues here for that exit stair start to pick up on some of the architectural detailing of the Hughes Chapel. A little bit thicker posts, thicker rails and a bit more engagement on that eastern façade of the Gunn Building. Larger, you know, fenestrations, a little bit more impact to the building. We think it's appropriate but it does have a much more significant impact to that façade. Here again, you start to see from the interior of campus looking out towards Bryant and again from Bryant Street looking back into campus and you can see the impact of that stair. So, really, the summary slide here just starts to outline the differences between each one of those design options. The first one is really a lighter, we think a little bit more, you know, complimentary but contrasting design approach to the existing architectural resource. A little bit less impact to that façade, but again carrying on the same architectural language, we think, and picking up on those same details. Option 2, much more robust and we think maybe blurs the line, maybe we went a little bit too far

along that blurring, but we think it's something we wanted to look in contrast and get some of your opinions on. I am able to take questions here or I can sit down and wait.

(no mic)

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you Chair Bower, and thank you for your presentation. Your name again, please?

Mr. Woltag: Adam Woltag.

Board Member Bernstein: Adam, thanks. Let's see, did you show a slide of the existing Gunn Building before there was an attachment? Let's go back to that photo of, I think there was an historic photo, I think, of the eastern view. There was a sketch I think, or something.

Mr. Woltag: Oh, there was an historic photo, yeah.

Board Member Bernstein: There you go, yeah. Have you considered the, because the HRB has approved previous projects where as long as there is some photo documentation of what was there existing, to actually go back to restorative to make it look like that photograph? Have you considered that?

Mr. Woltag: We did look at that. I think what we can start to discern from this elevation compared to what we're being proposed, it looks like there may be some windows along that façade that we would definitely consider, you know, looking at putting back into the building. It does, though, start to provide a little – it does start to provide more impact to that façade and we wanted to put forth to this group if that's something that would be beneficial or not to the architectural resource.

Board Member Bernstein: So, that could be something the Board, Chair Bower, that could be something that the Board looks at is actually, since there is photo documentation what that east façade looked like, that's something the Board then we can discuss. If that could be our recommendation.

Chair Bower: I think when the project comes back in the next phase, aren't we going to review the actual architectural detailing?

Ms. French: Well, this is, we're cutting into the presentation here, so should adjust that accordingly. The Palo Alto Municipal Code does not have Category 3's and 4's coming to the Board, if they're outside of downtown or National Register District. So, technically, it does not have to come back to this Board as the architectural review application. The ARB could refer this to the HRB for comments. So, you know, I think you could provide comments today that would be captured in minutes. You could request a session to talk in more detail, since we're just seeing these today. We can do that.

Chair Bower: Okay. Since we don't have any action today, we're just doing the review, why don't we consider your comments or any Board Member's comments as part of the record, and then we can review the comments later and then decide whether we want to request that the ARB send the project back to us. But I think it's perfectly appropriate to, for Board Members to comment on these changes to the historic buildings. So, noted.

Board Member Bernstein: Okay, just a quick comment then.

Chair Bower: Okay.

Board Member Bernstein: You said Adam, right?

Mr. Woltag: Correct.

Board Member Bernstein: So, Adam made a reference to Option 2 being a little more robust and I would agree with Adam's comment that it looks a little bit too robust and it starts to just distract from the historical quality. So, that's why I looked at the historic thing. So, the windows again may interfere with the program of the existing building. Certainly, there have been enough examples throughout history, as you may know, where at least you could put on the window frames on the outside, again, just historical reference. And I think that can then respond to your comment about maybe Option 2 is too robust. We have some good historical records here and for the historical qualities to maintain that Category 3 building, yeah.

Mr. Woltag: Great. We will definitely look into that. Yes, thank you.

Board Member Bernstein: My other question, a general question is, will the HRB minutes be part of the comments that are incorporated into the draft Environmental Review period?

Ms. French: Yes, they will.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you. Thank you Chair.

Chair Bower: I'd like to follow up on Martin's observation and let other Board Members express their questions. In the two options you provide, what's striking to me is, excuse me, Option 1, I think, has a minimal impact on the building and since we consistently see before this Board changes to buildings and have to evaluate impact, even though all of them could be undone, I think minimal changes that keep the existing building or return the building, in this case, to its more, closer to its original form is desirable, rather than a more robust, as you describe it, statement that clearly differentiates it, but then once again has a greater impact. So, my feeling is less is better. Okay, anybody else have a comment on this particular presentation? Okay. Well, thank you very much. Next speaker is Andy Reed followed by Rob Levitsky. And three minutes for comments now. So, state your name for the record.

(off mic)

Chair Bower: Okay, sure. Also, please stay very close to the microphone.

Andie Reed: Okay, great. Thank you, Chairman and Historic Board Members. I appreciate your hard work today in consideration of this project. My name is Andie Reed and I live at 160 Melville Avenue. In Chapter 6, Cultural Resources, the DEIR only studies the area of the school property as it exists today, and the two residential properties that the school proposes to demolish to use those lots for the school, making it a half acre larger than it is currently. Dudek did not study the surrounding area. A very important element of the National Historic Preservation Act is Section 106, in which the area of potential effects needs to be determined and should take place early in the environmental review process. Further study of the effects is required if the land use changes, which it does from residential to school property, or does the destruction of the buildings change traffic patterns, which specifically yes, because it is demolishing houses and trees in order to accommodate an underground garage. Here is what I call the short block of Emerson. I have circled with green and the green surrounding blocks are residential. The red outline is the school property and the red hash marks in the two residential blocks are proposed to be subsumed into school property. This next slide is the same area, but a larger view. All of the yellowed ones have been listed in Priorities Studies 1 or 2, or the Cultural Resources Book as eligible or potentially eligible for California Registry and the green outlined buildings are all dating from 1900 to 1930. And Professorville is right across the street. These surrounding areas of eclectic older houses that contribute to the character and atmosphere of the block would be substantially degraded by the change of context, replacing houses with an underground garage exit. Also, in Chapter 5, Aesthetics, the DEIR states that the Emerson Street frontage would experience a great degree of change in condition because of demolishing houses, including the 100-year-old Lockey House, but it concludes that these changes would not substantially alter the visual character of the site. Here I'm showing you the two houses that are on the chopping block, and this is the Lockey House alone, how beautifully it is surrounded by its trees. Who would determine that replacing these residences with an underground garage exit would not affect the

visual character? As the City's Historic Review Board, please note the DEIR's erroneous conclusions and note that the garage structure would change a residential block to commercial. Please recommend retaining the residential feel of our neighborhood, and leaving this block intact. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Thank you for your comments. Rob Levitsky followed by Kimberly Wong.

Rob Levitsky: I'm waiting for the slides to come up. I want to thank Adam for his architectural chatter. But I'm here to talk about another historic resource, which is the trees. Nothing that seems to have been mentioned in the last 15 or 20 minutes. We have, even new builders, several of you are builders, know that Palo Alto has an ordinance protecting oaks and redwoods, and yet none of that shows up in the DEIR. The Environmental Impact Report is supposed to get everything out so that policy makers can make decisions that are appropriate, and yet we have no information about the trees. From the Palo Alto Technical Tree Manual, which you builders would know about, oaks wider than 11½ inches in diameter or redwoods 18 inches in diameter are protected by definition in the City of Palo Alto, and there's about, let's see – so here's a picture of the six redwoods trees pushing 100 feet in height, not mentioned in the report other than to say that they found only insignificant, less than significant value. So, the Technical Tree Manual says that you can cut a tree down if it's dead or dying, if it's hazardous like structural problems with branches, if its roots are interfering with the utilities or with a basement, or if you're affecting more than 25 percent of the buildable area. And none of the protected trees shown on the Castilleja property meets those criteria. So, it would take an overriding consideration by the City Council to kill any of these trees. Now, Stanford ten years ago started working on the Med Center and they had a similar problem with some oaks, and these are the oak trees next to the Stanford Hospital and there's nine of them and they show up in the biological resources section of the EIR, which does not exist on the Castilleja DEIR. And what Stanford decided to do was protect these trees and had several options just dealing with the minimum impact on these trees, and they decided to, in fact, not build over this location here, and in fact, make it a special **caplin (phonetic)** lawn is what it's called. And so they, Stanford, chose as their preferred option to protect the trees. Here again are the trees at Castilleja, another view here, and then here's another view from Emerson Street, and you'll notice the canopy is about 100 feet high with oaks in front of it, all something that people see as they're walking down the street, and cannot be replaced with some mitigation of 15-foot trees from a box. Beep, beep, beep. Anyway, this DEIR will not stand. It will have to go back for further review because they've – you can't just ignore local ordinances and murder all these trees. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Great. Thank you. Kimberly Wong followed by Neva Yarkin.

Kimberly Wong: Hi. My name is Kimberly Wong of 1260 Emerson Street. Thank you for reviewing the draft EIR Cultural Resources report of Castilleja's proposal before the Lockey House, as well as its neighbor is demolished. I feel that the evaluation of the Lockey House as an historical resource was not sufficient. There were several items of my own research that were overlooked. The Lockey House was next to three homes on the Melville Street that the City gave to Castilleja for its playing field in 1993. This was a loss to the fabric of the neighborhood. And now the school is attempting to remove two more homes, leaving only one out of six homes on that small block, and for what? A garage to bring more, to bring significant and unmitigable traffic and unavoidable impacts to the neighborhood. The report also forgot to mention that in 2010 there was a celebration and dedication of this home to Miss Mary Lockey and the school's alumnae. The fact that this home is associated with persons of significance with our past, founding the longest lasting nonsectarian girls' school in the U.S. today should qualify the home for the National Historic Register. Dudek also failed to name an architect or builder for the Lockey House. Gustav Laumeister's son-in-law, Henry Seale, who sold Miss Lockey the plot of land was hired to develop the campus for her. The possibility that this famed Professorville developer could have also built the Lockey House was not studied and should be. Lastly, Dudek's historian on page 16 reports that the Lockey House that still holds guests and events, no longer retains the integrity of the original design, just because of a few additions. Please take a look at the photos and determine whether or not it retains the characteristics of the turn-of-the-century home. I think it still looks very lovely. I request that there be a full historical evaluation of the Lockey House to determine the architect or builder, the year that it was built, because I found a lot of discrepancies, and subsequent building permits to evaluate the significance

of these alterations. And whether the fabric of the neighborhood would be replaceably and significantly changed with its loss forever. I would prefer that Castilleja keep the Lockey Home to house guests and intimate get togethers, as they do now. They could also convert part of the home to a museum to showcase Castilleja's and Miss Lockey's and her alumnae's contributions to Palo Alto's rich history for future generations to enjoy. Thank you very much.

Chair Bower: Thank you. Neva Yarkin followed by Peggy McKee.

Neva Yarkin: My name is Neva Yarkin, and I live at 133 Churchill Avenue, around the corner from Castilleja. If Castilleja gets their expansion for another 125 new students, this whole area will be changing. Over 70 percent of the students come from outside of Palo Alto. How is this expansion helping Palo Alto residents? Rebuilding classrooms, changing the pool, the redwood trees would disappear, two houses will be destroyed and an underground commercial parking garage will be built. All this will change the landscape and structure of this six-acre site, and also the historic character of the neighborhood. The Bryant bike boulevard will be destroyed in the process. How can you have many cars entering from the Embarcadero the new underground commercial parking garage on the same street as bike riders? There will be accidents waiting to happen, and all for a modest amount of new parking spaces for the garage. Besides massive construction for years to come, 125 new students will add to our traffic problems we already happen to have. How will Castilleja expansion really be beneficial to all the citizens of Palo Alto? Thank you for your time.

Chair Bower: Thank you. Peggy McKee followed by Heather Allen Pang.

Peggy McKee: Hello. Good morning.

Chair Bower: Sorry, could you state your name into the...

Ms. McKee: I was going to say good morning first.

Chair Bower: Okay. Fair point.

Ms. McKee: Okay. My name is Peggy McKee. I live on Cowper Street between Seale and Santa Rita. It is my pleasure to speak to the HRB on behalf of Castilleja, its place in the Palo Alto community and in Palo Alto's history. I have lived in Palo Alto for more than 50 years, and like many others, I cherish the way it has enriched my life and the lives of my family and friends. We settled here in the 1960's, sent our children to Walter Hays Jordan, as it then was, and Paly. I taught history at Castilleja for 45 years, and helped to develop curriculum that would ensure a state-of-the-art, cutting edge education for young women of Palo Alto and its environs. My granddaughter graduated in 2016. The mission and goal of the school to educate young women to reach their fullest potential have never changed. It remains the only nonsectarian all girls high school in the Bay Area. Indeed, Castilleja at the lofty age of 112 years is almost as old as Palo Alto itself. As a Palo Alto resident interested in my community, I served on the Board of the Palo Alto Historical Association, currently co-edited its newsletter and helped to arrange and publicize programs that highlight Palo Alto's unique history. I was an early member of the Palo Alto History Museum Board and am presently an archivist at the Women's Club. I enjoy taking visiting friends on walks through old Palo Alto, the Jobs House, Professorville, the Garage and Crescent Park, the Zuckerberg Compound, pointing out who has lived where and what used to be there. Palo Alto is near and dear to my heart and I consider it one of Palo Alto's crown jewels. Like many of you, I have watched the architectural evolution of Palo Alto, as small houses which I remember with some fondness are replaced by large, new constructions, some in jarring juxtaposition to their neighbors. These, of course, accurately reflect the prosperity, wealth and status of many residents, but they have also changed the ambience of the old neighborhood. That means I have to stop, right? Castilleja has respected the conception of its own buildings and the integrity of the neighborhood in which it has made its home for more than a century. It would border on tragedy, in my opinion, to shatter those links. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Heather Allen Pang followed by Allen Cooper.

Heather Allen Pang: My name is Heather Allen Pang. Good morning. It is a pleasure to speak to the Historic Resources Board this morning. I grew up in Palo Alto on the 300 block of Melville, and I walked across Embarcadero with no traffic light to attend Castilleja. I have been teaching history at Castilleja for 20 years now. I am the school archivist and the co-author of Castilleja's history book celebrating a century. And I am proud that I work for a school that does care about its own history. I also have a Ph.D. in American History from U.C. Davis and I am a member of the Palo Alto Historical Association Board at the moment. Castilleja has been in Palo Alto at its current location longer than most institutions have been in Palo Alto. The school was founded with the support and encouragement of people from Palo Alto and Stanford, and the location has been central to the traditions, ideas and goals of the school. It has been, and continues to be an ideal place to educate young women in the heart of a city that has always valued education. In this plan for modernization, Castilleja has been careful to stay true to the history of the school and the neighborhood. The school cares about its history, preserving the Birge Clark Chapel, the circle and the administration building. Many of the school's long-standing traditions, for example, are opening ceremony on the circle, our senior speeches, creative and entertaining arts programs and baccalaureate and historic chapel take place in these historic buildings. These spaces are not being impacted by the proposed project, other than the re-exposing of the side of the Gunn Building to be as it was before the current classroom buildings were built. We want to make the new buildings fit into the historic character of the neighborhood and continue to teach and learn around this circle, the literal and metaphorical heart of the school. The school is critical, the circle is critical to the school's program in that it provides an open space for community sport and learning. The new building designs honor the materials and character of the neighborhood in a more respectful way than the existing buildings to, while they vault us into the 21st century in both supporting educational needs and environmental sustainability. This project incorporates tenants that are valued by Palo Alto. The care the school is taking to build to the highest environmental standards, serving as a leader in Palo Alto, a City that is leading the way in the fight against climate change, the way Castilleja works to educate girls which honors both the history of the school and the history of Palo Alto, and the attention to the architectural feeling of the City and the neighborhood. As one of the few institutions that has been here in the City for more than 110 years, we're proud to continue to work towards things that have historically been important in Palo Alto – education, leadership and the environment. Thank you for your attention.

Chair Bower: Thank you. Allen Cooper followed by Kathy, I'm not sure if I can...

Allen Cooper: Yes. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Allen Cooper. I live at 270 Kellogg Avenue, directly across the street from Castilleja. I live in a house that was built in 1909, one year before Castilleja was built at that site. I would like to address the issue of damage to historic buildings in two ways. We feel, I feel that we live in an historic district in the area with the surrounding streets. All of you have heard and seen a map of all the historic homes. These are potential Category 3 homes. My home is a potential Category 3 home. I worry that the DEIR has not addressed the issue of neighborhood historic homes and the potential damage to those homes through environmental impacts of dust, vibration, chemicals during the construction of the Castilleja site. On a secondary thought, I'm concerned about the potential damage to the historic buildings at Castilleja, the administration building and also to the property on Emerson due to liquefaction. The geologic report that was done for the DEIR is in error, as was also pointed out by the review of that report, but nothing has been done. And the main problem is that liquefaction does not appear to be a bad issue unless, that's without a garage, but if you take away the over burden for the garage, it then does become a potential issue, and this was pointed out. What is needed is more information. So, there is a potential for damage to those buildings in a case in which the environment conditions were such that you could have liquefaction and a large earthquake. So, those, that collapse of garage would induce that problem. I think that my own personal feeling is that more needs to be done by the DEIR in addressing the historical issues to the neighborhood and to these buildings on Castilleja property and adjacent to it. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Thank you for the comment. One moment. Amy, do you want to make an announcement?

Ms. French: Yes. Earlier Commissioner, Vice Chair Corey had mentioned that he owns property, does not live within 500 feet, but owns property, and you know, we weren't aware of that before, and my understanding is Board Member Corey was thinking this was a study session and then was not a place where comments were at issue. I think it's, I've consulted with our City Attorney. She has confirmed that he is conflicted and, therefore, it's best to recuse for any matter pertaining to Castilleja, including today's meeting. So, I would suggest departure.

Vice Chair Corey: Thank you.

Chair Bower: I'm sorry. The City's interpretation of this is that if you're conflicted you can't be in the room because the mere presence of a conflicted individual that's on our Board could have an impact on other Board Members, even though we're not coming to any conclusions today. In honor of the City's requirements, Corey has to leave. So, I'll take over timing. All right. Thank you. Sorry for the interruption. Kathy, and I apologize for not being able to pronounce your last name. I can't read it, so help me with that.

Kathy Layendecker: It's Layendecker. I have actually a request to make. There is somebody who would like to speak today. Her card is in, but she can't stay the whole time. Could I swap my time and speak later when she was...?

Chair Bower: Sure.

Ms. Layendecker: It's Catharine Garber, and I'll go wherever Catharine is in that stack. Thank you.

Catharine Garber: Well, similar name, so that works. Good morning Chair Bower and Historic Resource Board. Catharine Garber. I'm a principle at Fergus Garber Young Architects and have been practicing architecture in Palo Alto since the mid 90's. I live right next to Green Middle School. My children, both boys, attended Palo Alto schools. My strongest relationship with Castilleja is that I ride my bicycle by it on my way to work on Town and Country every day. In my 20-plus years of practice as an architect here in Palo Alto, I have done quite a few extensive remodels and additions of historic homes within several blocks of Castilleja, two each on Ramona, Bryant and Kingsley, two on Cowper and nine on Coleridge, and I have designed a number of new homes in the neighborhood, one each on Kellogg, Emerson and Waverly and two on Cowper. This City staff and Review Board Members have repeatedly stated that our designs have been compatible with the neighborhood. It's something I take great pride in. I love Professorville and old Palo Alto, and have enjoyed being part of its preservation and its evolution into what I think is one of the most interesting neighborhoods anywhere in the country. As with other interested community members, and as a curious architect, I've taken a look at Castilleja's proposal. I like its overall design. I was pleased to see that the historic Gunn Building will retain its look and again, have its eastern façade exposed. And I think the new construction is compatible. The new buildings are very quiet and the materials nicely compliment the historic building. It's reassuring that the scale and the massing will not be much different from today, so the neighborhood should feel similar. I also wanted to comment on the handsome gates and fencing that the landscape architect is proposing. They are more interesting and better detailed than you see on most commercial buildings. And I think it will blend in nicely with the neighborhood. I was also impressed with the selection of their plants and trees. I think the landscaping looks dense and is well crafted as is found on most residential projects in the neighborhood. Lastly, I wanted to add my two cents on removing the two houses on Emerson and replacing them with a park. I ride my bike by them almost every day and both of these properties present themselves with the single 18 or 20-foot-wide garage door. That's what you see from the streets. It's not that appealing. I'd much rather ride by a park. Thank you for allowing me to share my thoughts on the project.

Chair Bower: Great. Thank you. Dan Chapman followed by Mindie Romanowsky. You're last.

(off mic)

Chair Bower: Oh, okay, fine. Please Kathy. So, Dan is not coming up.

Kathy Layendecker: Dan is here but he has ceded his time for me.

Chair Bower: Okay, so Dan you've become Kathy. All right.

Kathy Layendecker Good morning Chair Bower and Historic Resources Board Members. I'm Kathy Layendecker, as you've heard, Associate Head of the School of Castilleja. And in that capacity, I'm responsible for overseeing the CUP application process. Thank you for this opportunity to share details about Castilleja's new master plan that seeks to modernize our learning spaces while honoring the school's historic significance in Palo Alto. As you've already heard, Castilleja has been part of the educational fabric of Palo Alto since 1907, and at its current location since 1910. As such, we have celebrated our historical significance to Palo Alto through a thoughtful planning process that considers both our traditions and the 21st century needs of our students and our campus. The buildings we hope to replace have served Castilleja well for almost 60 years and we want to create new spaces that will last even longer. With such a rich history at this location, we have worked hard to preserve the historic buildings, the chapel theatre and the Gunn Administration Building, and the many other enduring traditions, such as the circle at the heart of our campus and the robust canopy our many trees provide. At the same time, we want to embrace the future with flexible spaces that will support 21st century learning, sustainable systems and operations that minimize our impact on the environment and improvements to our design that will allow us to blend more gently into the neighborhood's aesthetic while minimizing our impact on the neighborhood. As a City, Palo Alto strikes a balance between revered traditions. Castilleja is seeking to do the same. We are pleased that the draft EIR, Environmental Impact Report found our project to be 100 percent compliant with the City's Comprehensive Plan. Palo Alto and Castilleja have a long history. They were young together and have grown into robust and interconnected communities over the last century. It is gratifying, though not at all surprising to see that the City and the school's goals and values are so closely aligned. It is also gratifying to realize that the DEIR found no significant impacts in either its aesthetic or cultural resources reviews. We have created and concise proposal that protects the historic elements of our campus throughout the project. The final details of our preservation plan will be prepared by a historic preservation specialist and through every phase of construction, personnel will receive specific cultural resource awareness training. The DEIR notes and supports all of the measures we have created, and choices we have made to protect the historic cultural and architectural resources on our site. At Castilleja, we are steeped in tradition as a community. Our students are joined through generations of shared experience on this campus, can I take Dan's time too? Okay, thanks. And our students, employees, alumnae and families all value our rich history, value our neighborhood and value Palo Alto. The project keeps those values at its core. The DEIR found that our new spaces will better suit our one neighborhood aesthetic than our current buildings, incorporating elements that improve the architectural, cultural and aesthetic relationship between the buildings on our campus and the houses in our neighborhood. We look forward to this next phase in Castilleja and Palo Alto's shared history, and we welcome feedback from the Historic Resources Board as a valuable step in the process. Thank you for your time.

Chair Bower: Thank you. Mindie Romanowsky followed by Aysem Kilinc. Pardon me for mispronouncing names.

Mindie Romanowsky: Good morning. My name is Mindie Romanowsky. I am a partner with the law firm of Jorgenson Siegel McClure & Flegel in Menlo Park, and I am the land use attorney representing Castilleja in this project. Thank you for the opportunity to speak this morning about the cultural resources related to Castilleja's proposed master plan project in this application. Before we embarked on the design of the master plan, it was critical to understand the historic constraints, so for that reason we hired the historic architecture firm of TreanorHL formerly known as Carey & Co. to educate our team on the historic significance of all of our structures and features on campus. Based on that analysis, we embarked on the thoughtfully designed master plan that you have before you today, and that was studied in the draft EIR, all with respect to the integrity of the historic structures and features on campus. And as a result, when the draft EIR was published we were very pleased that the cultural resources section of the

draft EIR found no significant or unavoidable impacts. Castilleja is deeply interested in ensuring that this EIR evaluates all the CEQA impacts, so that it's a legally defensible document. To that end, this morning I would like to highlight a few minor items that need to be clarified in the final EIR that are related to cultural resources. They've already been touched on, but they include the fact that there was a minor oversight in the cultural resources section indicating that the Gunn Administration Building would not be impacted, and as you've heard this morning, it will be slightly impacted to be re-exposing the east façade of the building, and you've seen some of the options that have been considered. In any event, we intend to fully comply with the mitigation measures already discussed at 6A and 6B in the draft EIR to respect the features of the Gunn Administration Building throughout construction and into the future. Finally, the question has been raised about the historic integrity of 1263 Emerson, the Lockey House. I think it's of interest that the house was named after our dear founder, Mary Lockey, but Miss Lockey never did live in the home, and just because a building is named in the memory of someone, legally it does not make it historic. That is not the legal standard. We do have the utmost of respect for our founder, and that's why we gave it the name. We will likely name other things in her honor in the future. Finally, as you will hear from our historic consultant, there has been follow-up research about the Lockey House and it is of no legal historic significance and we will be submitting detailed comment letters to that end. Thank you very much for your time and your service.

Chair Bower: Thank you. Aysem Kilinc and followed by Pria Graves.

Aysem Kilinc: Hello. My name is Aysem Kilinc I am an architectural historian at TreanorHL, known as Carey & Company. We are an architectural firm in San Francisco specializing in historic preservation. We looked at the 1263 Emerson Street. The cultural resources study by Dudek only addressed the integrity of the house, but did not look at the historic significance under all California Register criteria. So, we performed additional research on the house. We went to the City of Palo Alto. Oops, that's okay?

Chair Bower: That was not for you.

Ms. Kilinc: That was quick. So, we went to the City of Palo Alto, the Assessor's Office at the County and Palo Alto's Historical Association and we (not understood) on-line resources, and we reviewed the house at 1263 Emerson Street, but did not find it as significant for listing in the California Register or (not understood). We also reviewed the project that was prepared by WRNS Studio on the administration building, and in general we find that the removal of the connection between two buildings and the addition of new doors and stairs will be in compliance with the Secretary of the Interiors Standards. The project will not adversely affect the character-defining features of the administration building. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Thank you. I apologize for the poor performance on the timer. All right, Pria Graves, followed by Rita Vrhel. I'm sorry again.

Pria Graves: Good morning. My name is Pria Graves. I live in College Terrace. Not near this, but I do bicycle by it all the time, and I have already expressed my concerns about the impact on the bicycle boulevard, both of construction and the long-term effect of cars trying to get into the underground garage. This morning, though, I want to keep my comments brief and simply reiterate the concerns about the isolation that is being imposed on the lovely little house at the corner of Emerson and Embarcadero, as well as the impact on the rest of folks on Emerson, losing a lot of their cultural context. They're losing the houses across the street, which while not wonderful, gives them a residential context, not a commercial context. And I think that's very dangerous. I would like to see the EIR evaluate more of the surrounding neighborhood, and look at what the impact of this change is. Not all of it is bad, but I think that there are, more evaluation is what's needed. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Thank you. All right.

Rita Vrhel: I'd like my time not to start until we can put a slide...

Chair Bower: The guy who's got the slide.

(off mic)

Ms. Vrhel: He's already got it. It's part of Rob's discussion. So, please don't start my time.

(off mic)

Ms. Vrhel: Does somebody else want to speak?

Chair Bower: Dan Chapman is my last card, but I don't know whether you, yeah, okay. So, we don't have anybody else.

Ms. Vrhel: Bad time to take a break. So, I want the slide of the garage.

(off mic)

Ms. Vrhel: Okay. So, my name is Rita Vrhel. I live over on Channing Avenue, but I am a Castilleja parent. My daughter went there for five years. I would encourage you, since the entire DEIR was mentioned in this presentation to review the entire DEIR and you will find when you do, that this DEIR is sloppy, incomplete and very inaccurate. I reviewed sections on geology, dewatering and noise, and the report actually tells us that they cannot tell us the amount of noise for construction because they don't actually know what equipment will be used. I find that ridiculous as a parent who read Richard Scarry's construction books to their child. This is basically what will be, the neighbors will be looking at. This is the City Hall garage, but a garage similar to this is proposed for the site of the two houses that are in question regarding historical significance. One of the things that is frequently said is that whoever pays for the report gets the report that they want. I certainly think that this is the situation here. You saw the picture of the Lockey House with the redwood trees behind it. So now this is what the neighbors are going to get on Emerson Street with a park instead of the City Hall building. This in four to five years of constant construction. The two houses in question on Emerson are crucial to Castilleja's expansion. They're just not two little houses that have garages. If the garages are making them non-historical at this point, take down the garage. But please ask for another historical analysis, because the analysis that is presented in this sloppy DEIR is inaccurate, incomplete and I think, shameful. Thank you very much.

Chair Bower: Thank you. That completes the public comment section. I'd like to bring the discussion back to the Board. In the public comments this morning there were four, and I suggest these are general topics that were addressed. One was the change, all changes to the administration/chapel buildings, and in particular the new stair that's coming on and how the building, the portion of the administration building that's going to be revealed by the demolition will be handled. In that discussion, or in comments the compatibility was addressed, massing, size, scale, materials used, architecture and design, and then how those modifications contrast with the existing building so that they are not misinterpreted as original features. Second is tree protection. Third is the Lockey House. And then the fourth, there are actually five, the fourth issue was whether an historic district is a consideration. And finally, whether the DEIR, there are a number of questions about the thoroughness and competence of the DIER. So, if we could, I'd like to go back and talk to staff about how the Lockey House was evaluated, and to start with I imagine that the Lockey House could come before the HRB and be presented as a renovation, and in, if you can imagine that project, what the project designers would argue is that all the changes could be undone and the building could be recovered in its original form. So, when I see a report that says the original features have been compromised, I think about how that could be done in reverse and so I'd like you to address that issue for the community. Is that question clear? So, imagine this in reverse. It's a renovation and the proposal is to take off all of the changes, undo them, and bring it back to where it was. Why wouldn't that, yeah, so that approach. And the reason I'm asking that question is because your report says the house has been compromised by changes, but we frequently see projects come to the Board that have, that ask to have the changes reversed and to renovate the building. And so...

Female: I think if you were going to propose doing renovations...

Chair Bower: Key your mic.

Female: I'm sorry. I think you were going to propose to do renovations to the property that would bring it back to its original appearance, including especially attaching the overall building to the garage and replacing the porch that changed the massing of the building, that maybe you could then, again, after those changes have been implemented, reassess it for significance. Because then it would read as the early 1900's home that it was initially constructed as. But as it currently stands, I do substantiate the finding in our technical report that as it currently stands, it doesn't read as it was originally constructed, and lacks the historic integrity to convey its significant association as an early 1900's building.

Chair Bower: Okay. So, as an example of a project we recently reviewed, it's the Palo Alto Sport and Toy World on Waverly. It had been significantly modified in the 70's, took a lot of historic fabric off. They came to the Board and they said, 'we want to restore this building. You can't restore historic fabric, but we want to put it back the way it was, because we want a Category 3 designation', so they can do other things. We approved that project. They've done that work and the building now looks remarkably, or when it is completed, it's almost complete, will look remarkably like it did. Then they would come back. My point here is, the report says that building has no significance, but I can foresee a situation where it could recover its significance.

Female: It could, but that's not the... We are evaluating its existing condition, and we can't foresee that somebody is going to... It's not part of the project to say that, it was different if one of the project elements was to look at the Lockey House and say an Option 2 or 3 of the project was to look at it and say, 'okay, well we're thinking about bringing it bringing it back.' That's different, but then we would still need to reassess it after it's been brought back. Does that make sense?

Chair Bower: Yeah, it does.

Female: Because that's the hard part is that we're not evaluating somebody's future plan for it, or even speculative future plan. We have to look at it as it currently stands today.

Chair Bower: Absolutely. So, I am reminded, and the reason I'm being somewhat persistent about, in this questioning, in the many seminars I have taken on CEQA application, the one phrase that repeatedly is expressed is, there is no mitigation for demolition. So, once demolition occurs, it's done. And I'm simply trying to raise the issue that, while this project calls for the demolition of that building, because it currently doesn't have, doesn't merit any classification in the City or State or Federal Registers, it still could be renovated. It could be recovered in the future, and once it's demolished, it's gone. That's my point. So, thank you for clarifying that. I have another question for you. The idea that there is an historic district that could be created by houses surrounding the project, could you address what would be considered if an historic district were going to be established? What kinds of criteria would be considered? And I'm sorry, I don't mean to put you on the spot on this, but just in general what kinds of things would you consider?

Female: For a local district you would want to look at the general character of the area and you would want to see, you know, what the, how many contributing buildings, how many noncontributing buildings and establish a period of significance for the neighborhood. But I think it's important to state that that wasn't addressed in the report because the study area was limited to the school. So...

Chair Bower: I'm not making comment...

Female: But, you're just, the questions focused on, you know, what you'd have to do.

Chair Bower: We received as a Board information that suggests that an historic district could be created there, and the purpose of our hearing is to explore that kind of an issue, because that might have impact

on this project. So, obviously, the number of contributing buildings would be important, their age. Those are, I think, the threshold.

Female: We would want to establish what the period of significance is for the residential district, and you know, what's the theme of the residential district. Is it based on architecture or is there also an event or significant historical association that it also has tied to? So, I mean, it would be probably an extensive study to figure out what the correct criteria. And maybe it would fall at the local level, it could fall under a few.

Chair Bower: Okay, thank you. So, the reason I'm asking the question again is, this is raised. We can't address it here today, but the significant elements of an historic district would be, as you point out, the number of buildings, the area, its significance, the district's significance in Palo Alto's history, maybe the people who lived there, the architects who designed buildings in there, the people who paid for and lived in the buildings. Those are the things that made Professorville an historic district. They created Professorville as an historic district because it was a multitude of factors, and in the information presented to us as a Board, there is really just the beginnings of an idea of a district, and I didn't see in that information, and it's not part of your job or description in terms of this project to evaluate that, but I bring up all of this and I'm being verbose about this, because I don't see that that has a really likely potential of being an historic district based on what we normally see.

Female: You would also want to make sure that you understood what, you'd have to establish an historic boundary for the district, exactly. Or, you know, in addition.

Chair Bower: Right. Good luck with that. We had a lot of trouble with Professorville establishing a district in this City for years and years and years, so. Okay. I don't want to dominate the discussion. Deb, did you have a question?

Board Member Shepherd: I just had a point of clarification. I'm sorry, I didn't get your name. You're sitting in the last row in the back there, yes. So, you presented some information about the Lockey House, a further evaluation that you did to supplement what we received from Dudek. Who engaged you to do that?

Aysem Kilinc: Hello. Aysem Kilinc. Castilleja School engaged us to look at the property's historic significance.

Board Member Shepherd: Thank you very much. I'm sorry I missed that, and that seemed important.

Chair Bower: Martin.

Board Member Shepherd: I just want to finish.

Chair Bower: There is another question for you. Do you have a question?

(crosstalk)

Board Member Shephard: And I just want to comment on that, because Annie, when you presented we had received that information as a Board in a letter, but in your presentation today, you didn't reference what we also received, which you just referred to, which is an additional report from our architectural historian named Kostura, which addressed or raises these questions about the Lockey House, and about other historic potentially contributing buildings in the neighborhood. And it just raises questions and I feel not enough research has been done. Go ahead.

Ms. Kilinc: I just want to add one more thing. We will be submitting a detailed letter to the City that covers all our research and evaluation for the Lockey House.

Chair Bower: Martin, you have a question for the same.

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah. Aysem is your name?

Ms. Kilinc: Aysem.

Board Member Bernstein: Aysem, Aysem, thanks. So, first question just for process, is your report in the draft Environmental Impact Report?

Ms. Kilinc: No, it isn't.

Board Member Bernstein: So, I think it would be useful, I believe, for the HRB to see your report, so is there a process where we can see reports, we can evaluate what you're reporting?

Ms. Kilinc: We will submit a letter to the City by Monday, so you can see it, I guess, on Monday. I don't know how to process.

Board Member Bernstein: Okay, because there might be an opportunity based on what you present in your report that the HRB may have some comments on it. So, I don't know what the process is of how we can see your report and then comment on it if we think comments are appropriate.

Ms. Kilinc: I think Amy is going to...

Chair Bower: Amy.

Ms. French: It's Amy French. The comments are due on Monday for the draft Environmental Impact Report in its entirety, including the cultural resources and the supplementing documents, the technical documents. The document that the applicant's historic preservation specialist refers to was not a part of the draft EIR, so comments on that are not due on Monday, because they're not part of the draft EIR.

Board Member Bernstein: Right.

Ms. French: So, you know, certainly any application materials we receive from the applicant we post to the project web page, you know, plans and the like. This is a report. We will be happy to post that to our, you know, community facing electronic files. I'm happy to send it to you in the next packet or however by email, I'm happy to do that, once received.

Board Member Bernstein: All right. Thanks. And then, let's see, the HRB received by email an historic commentary from William Kostura. Is that part of the draft environmental impact? Is that included in the draft EIR also?

Ms. French: It is not. It's a comment. Amy French again. It is a comment on the draft EIR that is considered in preparation of the final. So, you know, staff and the consultant will be combing through all the comments and the final EIR addresses the comments, so it's a comment on the draft EIR.

Board Member Bernstein: Okay.

Ms. Reed: If I may...

Chair Bower: Could you tell us again who you are.

Ms. Reed: Yes. My name is Andie Reed and I'm with the neighborhood group that surrounds this area and we asked Mr. Kostura to take a walk with us around the neighborhood and, yes, I agree it comes close to what may be an historic district, but he says in the report that it's a draft and it's a start at it, and that it wouldn't likely qualify the high levels of that designation, but rather to... I'm trying to let you

all understand how this neighborhood and its eclectic older houses, how important it is to all of us to retain that character. And our request not to have that impacted. We're not against the school modernizing. We don't want the underground garage, the houses torn down in our neighborhood for the underground garage. Thank you.

Board Member Bernstein: Question for Kathryn or Katie. Under, when you presented your alternatives, I did not see on the list of project alternatives to retain the two homes on Emerson Street. Would that be appropriate to add as a project alternative?

Ms. **Wha (phonetic)**: CEQA requires that when we look at project alternatives, they are alternatives that can meet most of the basic project objectives while avoiding or substantially reducing one of the project's significant environmental effects. So, based on the draft EIR analysis, we didn't find any significant environmental effects that are directly tied to a loss of those two houses, and that's why we didn't look at that as a project alternative. However, as we go through all of the comments that are, have been received and will be received, if that has been raised as a community concern, so that's definitely something that we will do a little bit more work on or perhaps a lot more work on to refine the analysis and determine whether or not we need to elevate that concern to be an environmental impact. But there's a lot of, you know, the CEQA guidelines really direct how we determine whether something is a significant impact or not, and so that is really tied to that consideration.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you for that. Also, on the DEIR on packet page 118, you can turn to that before I ask my question. When you're ready I'll ask my question. Packet page 118.

Ms. French: Is there a paragraph?

Board Member Bernstein: Under Emerson's three properties, it says 'the property no longer retains integrity and, therefore, not qualified to be, for historic. So, I see these words here. Is there a report, an historic report that's in this DEIR that supports that conclusion? I didn't see one, but maybe you know if there is such a report.

Ms. **Wha (phonetic)**: So, that page that you're looking at, that is part of the historic resources evaluation. So, the text, you know, that section, so the prior page there's a heading that says "CRHR Criterion Three". So, this is the analysis and I believe that sort of the history and the documentation of the changes that have occurred to these properties are also presented in that report.

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah. And who's the qualified historic person who prepared that report?

Ms. **Wha (phonetic)** So, that's the report that was prepared by Dudek, the primary preparer is Samantha Murray. She and Katie have worked together and work on reviewing the materials.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you for that. All right, just my last comment in support of Chair Bower's comment about the reversibility of projects. The HRB has reviewed and approved other projects where based on enough documentation what was an original house from the turn of the century, the HRB has approved renovations that removed and reversed non-historic things to it. So, that would be something that I think the HRB, or at least I'm interested in seeing further information on that aspect for the Lockey House. Thank you.

Chair Bower: So, Michael, you're next Margaret.

Board Member Makinen: I'd just like to comment on Chair Bower's thought about the historic district. I think that does have merit. This school may have had significant influence on the early Palo Alto history, and I think that it's not been captured adequately and a consideration of an historic district theme, I think the EIR downplays that. And I think it really should be explored in more detail, the potential to be an historic district.

Board Member Shepherd: Can I add to that?

Chair Bower: Certainly.

Board Member Shepherd: I agree when you mentioned the word theme. I think the unique relationship historically between the school and the community is something that, it's a very delicate balance, but it's a story worth telling and we should be careful not to lose it.

Board Member Makinen: Yeah, there's some significant early contributors to this school, I think, that are worthy of being recognized as part of an historic district. Of course, the event would be the contribution to the education of the City in its early formative days. All those things should be considered in an historic district report. I don't think they're adequately addressed here.

Chair Bower: Okay. Martin has to leave in eight minutes. Margaret you had a comment and then I'd like to bring it back to the Chair.

Board Member Wimmer: Yes. When we were just discussing the Lockey House, and the fact that the alterations over the years have rendered it potentially no longer historic, were those alterations done by Castilleja School?

Ms. French: They purchased it in 1990.

Board Member Wimmer: So, I believe those alterations were done by Castilleja?

Ms. French: Yeah, 1993. I'll bring up those slides again that I prepared. In 1993 Castilleja acquired and modified, changed the address to Emerson. That's correct, okay. Back before Castilleja acquired it, in the 70's, the garage that was oriented to Melville was removed, so that was maybe the original garage, I don't know, or it could have been later. The orientation of the lots was changed from Melville to Emerson. The new garage came in 1979, 1991, sorry. This was also before Castilleja purchased the property. And this looks like the original entry, and that was replaced in 1998 with this modification that added the porch.

Board Member Wimmer: Right, but the report says that both residences were acquired by Castilleja in, oh, in the 1990's. It was not specific.

Ms. French: Yeah, 1993 was the date that Castilleja, was the year.

Board Member Wimmer: 1993. So, the alterations that rendered it potentially no longer historic were done prior to Castilleja acquiring the property, or did they, in fact, do those alterations?

Ms. French: I believe Castilleja did those alterations in 1998.

Board Member Wimmer: So, I mean, isn't that kind of...

Chair Bower: Let me interject here. I worked on this house in the 80's, not in the 90's. I did a kitchen remodel on the original house. The garage was there. This house, my clients exchanged this house for a house across the street at 1310 Emerson, and then they tore that house down and I built them a new one. My understanding is Castilleja did the entrance modifications and the connection of the house to the garage, because when I worked there in the 80's, it didn't exist. So, I think Castilleja, I'm not certain about this, but I think Castilleja owned the building when those modifications were made.

Ms. French: I'm sorry, so you said the kitchen remodel happened in the 80's. So, that's before Castilleja owned it.

Chair Bower: Right, yeah. Because I worked for the then owners, who now...

Ms. French: So, that's back here, this kitchen area, I guess. Is that the kitchen.

Board Member Wimmer: But I think the alteration that most significantly alters it is the connection between the garage and the main house, and the addition of the front entry porch, which was done by Castilleja, correct?

(crosstalk)

Board Member Wimmer: So, I guess what I'm leading to is now they've done that, now they can say that it renders it potentially no longer historic. I just was bringing up that point.

Ms. French: Well, to be clear, it was not put, when Dames and Moore did the study in 1998 to 2000, this was on the potential list. They went through both those priority lists one and two, and then 165 ended up being sent to the State as National Register eligible. So, it was evaluated for, you know, on some level, as many others were, and then there were only, you know, a couple, over 100 that ended up National Register eligible. We still do have an obligation to evaluate homes for California Register eligible before issuing demolition permits. Those that were initially identified as potentially eligible.

Board Member Wimmer: And then my second quick question is, I mean it seems to be that there are some themes that the public is bringing up. You know, being sensitive to the neighborhood in general, you know, the trees and other miscellaneous thing. So, does the EIR, now it's a draft, but does it take it a step further and address some of those, you know, themes that seem to be coming up in terms of what the, how the community is reviewing this and what their questions are? Do you address those specifically?

Ms. **Wha (phonetic)**: Yes. So, the final EIR will have two main parts. One is the responses to comments and the second is any revisions that we make to the draft EIR. You know, as I said before, CEQA has some really strict guidelines as to what would consider as an environmental affect, and so sometimes the responses to things that are, you know, important to the community still don't raise to the level of what CEQA would consider to be an environmental affect. So, we certainly address all of that in the responses to comments, because that is... You know, the City needs to consider more than just the environmental review in deliberating upon a project. But CEQA has a fairly well-defined envelop of what is considered an environmental impact and what is more of a community concern. So, we do, in the responses to comments try to make those kinds of issues clear, and then where the comments have touched upon something that is an environmental issue, then we do make modifications to the draft EIR to help clarify or elaborate upon or amplify some of the analysis.

Chair Bower: So, Martin has to leave shortly. Do you want to make a quick comment, because I want, before you leave?

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, thank you. The issue of the demolition of protected trees, is that listed anywhere in the draft Environmental Impact Report?

Ms. **Wha (phonetic)**: Yes. That's evaluated in the land-use chapter. There's a table that identifies each tree and what is proposed to happen to that tree, and then was mitigation needs to happen to ensure that the project complies with the City's tree preservation and replacement ordinance.

Board Member Bernstein: Great. So, Adam, on your tree page T2.0, you list, well, you name, I mean the name of your company is on it, but it's BFS Landscape is actually the author of the plan. It does list tree number 112, which is a redwood to be removed, but on, maybe you can make a comment to the BFS Landscape architects. It doesn't show on that plan that it's going to be removed, so that should be corrected. It's tree number 112, and that's on page T2.0.

(off mic)

Chair Bower: Martin, I want to honor your need to leave.

Board Member Bernstein: I have one more question.

Chair Bower: Okay, then you have to stay until...

Ms. French: Just to clarify, because you're bringing up plans, we're not really focused on the plans to day. I don't have a set in front of me, but we're pretty sure what you're referring to is a tree that was removed several years ago. So, because it was determined to be diseased.

Board Member Bernstein: Good, okay.

Ms. French: Yeah.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you for that. This is my last comment and then Chair will take his comment. So, I'd like to enter into the record to request that the ARB does refer the proposed modifications to the Gunn structure to the HRB. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Okay. So, what I would like to do is just briefly poll Board Members. My sense of our hearing today is that the Board, in questions we have asked have concerns about the Gunn Administration Building's modifications, the Lockey House evaluation and historic district consideration. So, I would say, I'm interested in knowing if Board Members feel that those are areas where the draft EIR has, is not sufficient and that we, whether or not Board Members feel that they should be addressed more fully and also to follow up on Martin's suggestion. I do think that the HRB should see the final design considerations for the Administration Gunn Building as part of our normal oversight. So, is that a fair evaluation of our, evaluation of this particular DEIR? I'm not going to take a vote. It's just a sense of the Board kind of issue. So, if there is support for those things, is that, could you just indicate?

(off mic)

Chair Bower: Margaret, I feel the same.

Board Member Wimmer: Yes.

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, I agree.

Chair Bower: All right. So then the response to the portions of the DEIR that we have purview over, it seems that Board would like more information about the three items I just mentioned, and that they be addressed in a final draft, and that for Amy and the ARB interface, maybe you can communicate with them that we would like to see this. I would be happy to be there with you to do that.

Ms. French: Sure. And they would receive a copy of the minutes of this meeting as well.

Chair Bower: All right. I think, since Martin has to leave and I think we've covered questions that would wrap up Item number two on our agenda, and that will go to housekeeping. Maybe we'll take a five-minute break to allow those people who don't need to be in our housekeeping issues to leave. Thank you all for participating today. This is what makes projects better. I know that it's not always reassuring when you come to meetings like this, but all input is taken seriously and it does improve the final result. So, thank you again for coming.

[The Board took a short break after which the Board moved to City Official Reports.]

Approval of Minutes

3. Approval of Historic Resources Board Draft Minutes of July 25, 2019.

Chair Bower: All right, and then the last item is approval of minutes, not the last item. That's the second to the last item. I continue to be frustrated by the transcriptions, but that's probably the result of my inability to be articulate and clear. But anybody have any changes or additions to the minutes for July 25th? Not hearing any, do I have a motion to approve?

Board Member Wimmer: I move to approve the minutes.

Chair Bower: Second?

Board Member Shepherd: I have to abstain, because I wasn't at the meeting.

Board Member Makinen: I abstain too. I wasn't there.

Chair Bower: I could second it. Why don't we just push this forward, continue the consideration when we have our next meeting?

Ms. French: Well, I mean, because they're pretty much verbatim, I think delaying approving them might be detrimental to the process that they're in with that NVCAP.

Chair Bower: Okay, I'll second. All in favor say aye. All opposed? All abstain. Okay, two in favor, two abstentions, no denials.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 2-0, BOARD MEMBERS SHEPHERD AND MAKINEN ABSTAINED, VICE CHAIR COREY, BOARD MEMBERS BERNSTEIN AND KOHLER ABSENT

Subcommittee Items

Chair Bower: Subcommittee Items, the Subcommittee for the Palo Alto Sport and Toy World Building is going to meet after this meeting and conclude what I think is the final issue about the tile. We don't have any other subcommittees currently active. Any

Board Member Questions, Comments and Announcements

Chair Bower: Any Board Member questions, comments, announcements?

Board Member Wimmer: Yes, I have a question. I know that each year we're required to do some educational programs. I don't believe I've done any this year, that I recall.

Chair Bower: Neither have I.

Board Member Wimmer: It's a calendar year, right?

Ms. French: Yeah. There's something coming up, a few things coming up. I can send those out and gently encourage. You know, there's so many opportunities. There's webinars and this kind of thing that you can do for, you know, and let us know about them.

Chair Bower: They haven't had very many here in the Bay Area when I've been in town. So, I haven't gone to any this year either. But webinars are, they are a possibility.

Board Member Makinen: I took the webinar from the California Preservation Foundation on contextual infill.

Chair Bower: Oh yeah.

Board Member Makinen: It was pretty good.

Ms. French: And so, any time you do take some kind of course, you should alert me so then, you know, I have this task every year to prepare this annual report of how's our driving. Not so good on my part.

Board Member Makinen: Yeah, I'll send you an email.

Chair Bower: All right, good. Any other comments, questions? No. Not seeing any, then I'll adjourn the meeting. Thank you all.

Adjournment