



HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING MINUTES: March 14, 2019

City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 A.M.

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair David Bower; Board Member Margaret Wimmer, Roger Kohler, Michael Makinen, Martin Bernstein, Deborah Shepherd

Absent: Vice Chair Brandon Corey

[video started during roll call]

Chair Bower: Are we being recorded?

Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official: I don't think we are.

Ms. Robin Ellner: Yes, we are.

Ms. Amy French: Are we?

Ms. Ellner: Yes.

Chair Bower: Ok because I don't see lights but that's...

Ms. Ellner: You won't see lights in here.

[The Board moved to agenda changes, additions, and deletions]

Oral Communications

Board Member Kohler: We might have a speaker.

Chair Bower: Oh.

Board Member Bernstein: Here, we can share...

Chair Bower: No, I have...

Board Member Kohler: David's got two.

Chair Bower: Since Brandon is not here. Alright, so now let's go to oral communications. I see no people here period so we can move right beyond that. So, we've done official reports so let's go to study session and start with the retreat items.

[The Board moved to the study session item]

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Bower: There are no agenda changes or deletions.

City Official Reports

1. Historic Resources Board Meeting Schedule and Assignments

Chair Bower: Maybe we could get rid of some of the housekeeping stuff starting with our meeting schedule. There are a number of days I will not be here and I just – I'll list them, March 28th, April 11th, June 27th, August 22nd, September 26th, and February 24th.

Board Member Kohler: Are you moving somewhere?

Chair Bower: No.

Ms. Amy French: Wait, what the last one?

Chair Bower: October 24th, sorry. I guess I'll send you and Robin emails so that...

Ms. French: I don't think you have too, you just told us.

Ms. Ellner: Ok but I caught three of those.

Ms. French: Ok, I got March 28th, April 11th, June 27th, August 22nd, September 26th, and October 24th. Did we hear correctly?

Chair Bower: That's right.

Ms. Ellner: Ok, thank you.

Chair Bower: Those will – I will not be available for those.

Ms. French: Alright so I guess I know when the meetings are.

Chair Bower: Anyone else know of any other dates they will not be here? No, ok.

Board Member Wimmer: (off mic – inaudible) the back of our head.

Board Member Kohler: I'm – (inaudible) one of these times I'm supposed to be gone.

Chair Bower: July 11th?

Board Member Kohler: I don't know which one.

Chair Bower: Ok, well we'll...

Board Member Kohler: I'll let you know.

Chair Bower: ...circle back.

Board Member Shepherd: I'm not here July 25th, August 8th, or August 26th.

Ms. French: Ok so, in addition, there's no Deborah. We got that, copy that.

Ms. Ellner: What was the last one?

Board Member Shephard: (off mic) I'm saying it's August 22nd.

Ms. Ellner: Ok.

Board Member Makinen: June 13th I won't be here.

Chair Bower: June 13th.

Ms. French: Let's just take the summer off?

Chair Bower: Well, it typically happens and I would encourage all Board Members, any time you get an email about a meeting, to please contact Robin and just confirm you're coming or not coming. That way we'll know if we have a quorum.

[The Board moved to approval of minutes]

Study Session

2. **Historic Resources Board Retreat: HRB Discussion of the Following Potential Topics: (1) Comprehensive Plan Policies and Programs Related to Historic Preservation; (2) Midcentury Modern Context Statement; (3) Historic Building Code; (4) Community Outreach Regarding Palo Alto's HP Program**

Chair Bower: Let's begin unless there's an interest in having a different order, I think we can just start with the order given which is Comprehensive Plan policies and programs related to historic preservation.

Board Member Kohler: There's a card. Someone...

Chair Bower: No, that's a parking...

Ms. French: (off mic) That's a – not a speaker card.

Chair Bower: ...that's a parking card.

Board Member Kohler: Oh, a parking card. That's a get out of parking free card. Alright, Amy?

Ms. French: (off mic) Sure, yeah, so on Packet Page – well, Packet Page 6 starts our report on this retreat and Item One is basically just – it's informational. We had – I had mentioned it at the last meeting that we had on February 14th – 13th? 14th? And...

Female: (spoke from the audience) Excuse me? Yes, you (inaudible) turn on your mic because we cannot really hear you. Thank you.

Ms. French: Oh, alright, redo.

Female: (spoke from the audience) Thank you so much (inaudible).

Chair Bower: Sure.

Ms. French: Good morning. Amy French, Chief Planning Official.

Board Member Kohler: Redo.

Ms. French: We are here for the retreat item. I had prepared a report to kind of cover briefly all four items. Just to say we have a special guest, George Hoyt is coming at 10:00. Ideally, we could get through one,

two – Items One, Two and Four and then at 10:00 we have George here to discuss the building – the Historic Building Code. So, regarding Item One the Planning and Transportation Commission reviewed all of the Comprehensive Plan policies and where we are in terms of implementation at their meeting. That report I provided a link in your report for today. The Council then had this on their Consent Calendar, March 4th, to authorize transmittal of the status report on the Comp Plan to the state. The really important item there is the Housing Element and so we have an obligation to send that to the state. I guess there is new requirements to send the entire Comprehensive Plan policy implementation update as well so that's what was done. So, if you want to read more about that or maybe you have already, the Council memo that transmitted all of that with the Staff recommendation. Now, Packet Page 9 and 10, those are the Comprehensive Plan policies that I pulled out that are regarding preservation. On the screen here, in the room here, I just showed what the nomenclature of implementation. There had been – there's kind of a summary here showing that we have routine activities, we have in progress activities, short term implementation, medium implementation, and long-term implementation.

Board Member Makinen: (off mic) This is not in our Packet though.

Ms. French: Correct. This was – I showed this last – on February 14th and here it is again. It's not in your Packet. The Comp Plan policies are in the Packet Page 9 and Page 10. So, those are – so you're aware of the 2030 Comp Plan historic preservation related policies. What's on the screen here is a summary of how the Staff was transmitting this to communicate where are we in the implementing them. So, that's what that is, is nomenclature about that. So, here, for instance, M, the first one – L2.4.6 which is exploring the Transfer Development Right Ordinances so that is a medium, signified by the M here, medium, and P stands for -- I don't know -- pending. Most of these are pending, some of them are long, some of them are short. So, short term being we're going to do that within the first 5-years, whereas medium term is 5 to 10-years and then long-term is more than 10-years. Again, the first one, L2.4.6, is a medium time frame and again, 5 to 10-years.

Board Member Bernstein: Let's see Amy, what does that little symbol mean between the M and P?

Chair Bower: (off mic) (inaudible) the dollar sign.

Ms. French: Yeah, I think that...

Board Member Kohler: Means money.

Ms. French: Yeah, I think that was like do we need resources...

Board Member Bernstein: I see.

Ms. French: ... and how much resources to hire a consultant.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you.

Ms. French: Basically, get money -- allocate funds in the budget. Ok, so that was that that first one was a medium so 5 to 10-years. I'm just going to go through these because I don't have answers really. The second one, L4.10.2, is a shorter term so again within 5-years, more money, and its pending so that's kind of interest. I mean California Avenue is one of these areas that is frozen in time in the 1950s but it's interesting and it's near this Ventura, the Fry's site, it's quite interesting. There's the original Safeway there that was converted into Antonio's Nut House. That is eligible, an eligible California Register Resource but there's a lot of one-story in Cal Ave so it's interesting. L6.1.1, this one is a long-term so again over – beyond 10-years and this is the – is this – Tom is here?

Vice Chair Corey: Hey.

Ms. French: Oh.

Chair Bower: Oh, Brandon's here.

Ms. French: Hi.

Chair Bower: Good.

Vice Chair Corey: Hey.

Chair Bower: Join, welcome.

Ms. French: Welcome.

Vice Chair Corey: Hi, good morning.

Chair Bower: Coffee.

Vice Chair Corey: Is there coffee? Oh, ok cool.

Ms. French: For the record...

Vice Chair Corey: Did you...

Chair Bower: Brandon.

Ms. French: For the record Brandon Corey has...

Chair Bower: Has arrived.

Ms. French: ... has arrived.

Vice Chair Corey: Thank you.

Chair Bower: We're just starting so.

Ms. French: These are...

Vice Chair Corey: Sorry, (inaudible).

Ms. French: These are being televised or recorded. (crosstalk)

Chair Bower: No, this is for – this is you.

Vice Chair Corey: I need a mic though I guess.

Ms. French: No camera.

Chair Bower: We're sharing.

Ms. French: No, there is a camera.

Vice Chair Corey: Oh, perfect.

Board Member Kohler: It doesn't look like they're on.

Ms. French: Getting back to the Agenda Item One, so L.6.1.1 was an awards program so we're considering historic preservation awards as another companion awards to the ARB awards. It so happens that the ARB awards are every 5-years, the last one was 2015 and there were quite a few historic preservation projects – addition projects and such that – and rehab – that were on that. The library being a notable one; the Rinconada Library. So, it's interesting because we do kind of have an awards program associated with the ARB awards because the kinds of projects that were chosen at least last time had some kind of historic preservation component.

Chair Bower: I think we had three Palo Alto project that were recognized by California Preservation Foundation. The library – I'm trying to remember them. The library was one.

Ms. French: Was it the Sea Scout building maybe?

Chair Bower: Right, Sea Scout building and there was one other.

Ms. French: One other.

Chair Bower: Maybe it will come to me but that was a significant year.

Ms. French: Yeah, where we all went up to San Francisco...

Chair Bower: Right.

Ms. French: ... and partook of the celebration.

Board Member Kohler: Children's Theater? Was it the Children's Theater?

Chair Bower: Oh, maybe it was the College Terrace Library...

Ms. French: Oh, maybe.

Chair Bower: ... which was renovated too. Anyway, so that – so those were three projects recognized as historically significant renovations.

Ms. French: So, CPF has an awards programs, we benefited from that.

Chair Bower: Sure.

Ms. French: We don't have one. One of the things that I get asked by folks out in the community is gosh, how do we get one of those plaques? Because there is a plaque system but that's handled by the Palo Alto Historical Association.

Chair Bower: Palo Alto Stanford...

Ms. French: Stanford.

Chair Bower: ... Heritage.

Ms. French: Thank you.

Board Member Bernstein: PAST.

Ms. French: PAST.

Chair Bower: PAST. Sorry.

Ms. French: Thank goodness for acronyms.

Chair Bower: I know. So, let me interrupt here and ask what – how do you as the head of planning envision an awards program being developed? I mean is that something the Board could help with as a subcommittee?

Ms. French: Well, nice to ask about that. We should talk more about that and a subcommittee sounds like a good idea.

Board Member Kohler: (off mic) Here's somebody else.

Chair Bower: Well, it's in the – it's a way in which...

Ms. French: Oh, it's George.

Chair Bower: ... the Board could help move this particular project along. Especially since we're the Historic Resources Board and the ARB is making awards in 2015 that maybe we should have considered.

Ms. French: Right, well, I mean it says long-term here but it doesn't have to be that way.

Chair Bower: Right.

Ms. French: It also says pending so we can make it more immediately pending than long-term. Especially because 2020 is the next ARB awards.

Chair Bower: Right.

Ms. French: Maybe we consider, like the Olympics, every 5-years, tagging along to that whole thing.

Vice Chair Corey: I mean PAST has an interesting program today where they do those plaques and all of the tours. I wonder if there's something interesting we could do jointly with them.

Chair Bower: Right so just since I'm on the Board of PAST and Martin is a former Board Member, I can say that PAST will recognize buildings at their 100-year anniversary and they separately recognize renovation projects that preserve – upgrade really and preserve historic buildings. Those are – can be – they can be commercial, residential, and they include Stanford buildings. So, they – those buildings are nominated...

Ms. French: What's the frequency of that?

Chair Bower: Every year...

Ms. French: Year, ok.

Chair Bower: ... they make awards. I can tell you that we're having some trouble this year. There are only two projects that we're considering because there aren't very many projects that have been – that would qualify. Now we've recognized a number of houses in Professorville that have been renovated. That have really been taken down to the studs and then carefully put back together to resemble what they looked like before. Almost all of them includes some kind of addition but nonetheless, this is an opportunity for PAST to recognize preservation. So, anyone on the Board that has a suggestion should contact me because we're looking for any project that would qualify as a renovation – historic renovation. So, Martin, is there anything that I've left out of there? Ok.

Ms. French: It seems a good idea to have kind of an ongoing list. I mean it's certainly something that – things that – projects that come my way that I reach out to Page and Turnbull to help on a review of single

– Secretary of Interior Standards compliance. I could be keeping a running list of those and then check in to provide that list to PAST.

Chair Bower: That'd be great if you could.

Ms. French: But is there an interest in maybe 2020 as far as a -- you know we have the ARB awards, having HRB awards or do we want to have that like the winter Olympics and have it...

Board Member Makinen: (off mic) I think 6.1.1, I would recommend that we have not long-term but at least (inaudible) but maybe short-term. I think long-term is putting it off to far. It's almost like (inaudible).

Ms. French: Well, it saying 10 – not indefinitely, 10-years, so I'm all for doing something prior to 10-years.

Board Member Makinen: (off mic) That's too long.

Chair Bower: Maybe you could share the criteria that the ARB uses just so that we could see what that is.

Ms. French: Yeah and I'm not the ARB liaison but I will remind Jodie that that's what the – because I've always done it. I mean since 2000 I've been the one that does the ARB awards programs. You know working with the ARB and stuff so I know very much how it works and why don't I agendize that for a future HRB meeting as far as sharing that...

Chair Bower: Sure.

Ms. French: ...sharing that whole process and brainstorming with the group.

Chair Bower: Good idea. I interrupted, please continue.

Ms. French: That's –The next one is L.7.1.1 which is – that's a big one and I don't see what the short-term – maybe that dollar sign is supposed to be an S.

Chair Bower: Or it just requires a lot of money.

Vice Chair Corey: That's what I was thinking.

Ms. French: Update and maintain the City's Historic Resource Inventory to include historic resources eligible for local, state, and federal listing. Historic resources may consist of a single building or structure or a district. So, this is a big one, I guess some pausing here as well because of L7.2 which we'll tap into later. I've – there's been several now homes that have been determined eligible for California Register through this – the IR Program, where somebody wants to come and demo it and we've found out that it's California Register eligible. The next natural step is to look at this policy and say hey, maybe this belongs on our inventory and maybe we should update the inventory but again, that is a consultant cost because it's happening with just Staff. It never has, it's always been an effort with community members and a consultant and that this kind of thing. I'll just keep going.

Chair Bower: So, we'll jump – we'll explore this in more detail when you get to the next page.

Ms. French: Yes. L7.1.2 is reassess the Historic Preservation Ordinance to ensure its effectiveness -- I don't know if those words were chosen well – to remind ourselves of the ineffectiveness of our Preservation Ordinance and explore how to maybe tweak it. I mean last time there was an attempt to change the History Preservation Ordinance it did not end well but maybe there's some that are – that we could have another session to learn about that and what happened and why. I mean it's a scab that I think has maybe healed over at this point but we can...

Board Member Bernstein: (off mic) Is Measure G (inaudible)

Ms. French: Yeah.

Board Member Makinen: (off mic) (inaudible)

Ms. French: Yes, so there are folks on this Board that know about that and remember it and some that weren't here and don't remember it. So, it might be of interest to – Staff can certainly share old reports and you can read about it and go ok, that's why nothings been done since 1998. Anyways...

Vice Chair Corey: I'd be interested in seeing those at some point.

Board Member Kohler: I think I got on the Board in 1998.

Board Member Bernstein: (off mic) Yeah, you were at the...

Chair Bower: Yeah, it was a very divisive election process and not – I think misleading as well and maybe the City is able to reconsider.

Ms. French: Well, it is in our Comp Plan so we – and it's noted as – I think that's an S so I think it should be coming up fairly soon to put it on our Work Program, put it that way. It's not on our Work Program today other than being in the Comp Plan so that's that. I'm going to move on, 7.12.1. is – I threw this in there because it's interesting. Parking excepts for historic buildings because you might have a historic building that wants to change use, let's say to residential but it doesn't have the parking. It's in the Assessment District. You know shouldn't we allow it to go to residential?

Board Member Makinen: (off mic) So, was 7.1.1 long-term or what was it?

Ms. French: Long-term, so 7.12.1 is long-term.

Board Member Makinen: (off mic) So, 7.1.1, (inaudible)

Chair Bower: The one right (crosstalk)

Ms. French: Oh, you went back.

Board Member Makinen: (off mic) Is that long-term?

Ms. French: I believe that – it's an S or a dollar sign. It might be an S.

Board Member Makinen: Might be short-term?

Ms. French: Might be short-term, I'll have to get back to you on that. I didn't write that report but we've moved past that and we're on L7.12.1 and now I'm going to move past that to the big one.

Chair Bower: So, let me ask a question about parking.

Ms. French: Ok.

Chair Bower: If you are in the parking -- Downtown Parking District, is there some ordinance issue about just staying in there if you're going to switch use? Why wouldn't they just stay in the parking district? Even if you're converting, I mean there's no downtown building that meets the parking requirement except this one, the City Hall. I don't even know if the City Hall would meet it even though there are 300 spaces here.

Ms. French: Technically in the parking district it's a blended rate of 1 per 250; 1 space for every 250-square feet so that applies to all of the commercial type uses. Every kind of commercial use you can imagine. I

think with residential we've looked at – because residential you're supposed to provide some parking spaces but...

Chair Bower: Yeah, one covered, one uncovered.

Ms. French: Yeah but in the downtown, there's – you know because its multi-family is all you can do here. You can't do a single-family home.

Chair Bower: Although there are some buildings that could be converted to single-family that still exist in the downtown area. Few but some.'

Ms. French: Right but I don't think we would allow that because we don't – we're looking at multi-family. So, there's – with all the housing ordinance and support for affordable housing and this kind of thing, there's definitely a push and it's being looked at as far as parking requirements.

Chair Bower: So, on the projects that get built downtown, they don't actually provide the parking – 1 parking space for every 250-square feet?

Ms. French: Yeah, new projects or – it's complicated but there's the parking in lieu fees that you can pay into the parking district for spaces not provided but certainly, there's a limitation because we have grandfathered structures. If they want to add housing on top of commercial, they can do that but where are they going to put the parking? So, I guess that's something in the past that parking in lieu has been used for commercial parking.

Chair Bower: Only but is there any prohibition from using it in a residential circumstance like you just described?

Ms. French: Yeah, I don't know, I can research that. I think it's being looked at right now with ordinance changes to clarify that because it's either silent or it says commercial or something. So, the code when I say it.

Chair Bower: Yeah, yeah, right, ok.

Vice Chair Corey: But the requirements would be different, right, so the residential versus commercial.

Chair Bower: Well, the – regardless of what the requirement is, the fact that they're in a district that can't provide parking. That's why there is a district and there is a mechanism in place that deals with commercial buildings which actually have a much greater parking requirement than....

Vice Chair Corey: Than residential.

Chair Bower: ...residential.

Ms. French: Yes.

Chair Bower: So, it seems to me that residential ought to be able to fit into that same program using the appropriate residential requirements. I don't know why it wouldn't especially – I don't know we would not have that as part of the program especially because we're anxious as a City to provide as much housing as we can.

Ms. French: Sounds like a topic for another meeting to learn about in lieu parking and its relevance for single-family. Just as a general topic. Ok, so here we are 7.2, this is the one I can say that I'm familiar with because I'm in charge of catching these and later on I had provide the – in the packet, let's see, Packet Pages – this is on the outreach item, Item Four. This is Page – Packet Page 71 is the presentation I did to SILVAR which is the Silicon Valley Association of Realtors. So, I had done a – by their request I had

entertained them for 45-minutes and including this policy, 7.2, and what we're doing. So, what we're doing is to – when somebody comes in for an Individual Review, which is a two-story home, meeting – preliminary meeting I will go to those and I will communicate that we need to study the property by our consultants with their money to see if its California Register Eligible or not. If they plan to tear it down and it comes back California Register eligible, we have an issue. If it comes back and it's not, we don't have an issue, they can tear it down because the Comp Plan policy does not say anything about local eligibility. It's just all about California Register eligibility and that's because of CEQA; California Environmental Quality Act. Once it becomes a CEQA resource, in other words, eligible for California Register listing, it becomes a CEQA resource and we have to care that it not be torn down. So...

Chair Bower: Well, it has to go through CEQA review?

Ms. French: Yeah, so technically it's not exempted from CEQA even – see normally we would exempt single-family homes from CEQA but in the case of – they're going to tear down a California Register eligible home, it becomes a CEQA problem. So, the good news is we've had – some of these have walked away from demos because of this. Then the other good news is because we've gotten a nice report prepared, a Historic Resource Evaluation, now the modifications to the building have a very robust report that we know what the character-defining features are, etc. whereas we didn't prior to that. That's the good news and I've got a running list of those projects we have evaluated and have come back. The question is once our consultant determines it's eligible, what's the process? It's not spelled out here but we definitely have to look and make sure we know what's going on. If somebody wants to demo it still, even though it's California Register, there is a process to move forward on that but it hasn't been spelled out in this policy. So, I don't know, I'll keep going, L7.8.1 is promote and expand the available incentives for the retention and rehabilitation of buildings with historic merit in all zones and revise existing zoning and permit regulations to minimize constraints to adaptive reuse. So, that's a medium-term implementation so 5 to 10-years.

Chair Bower: So, let me ask, what would be a constraint to adaptive reuse that you could...

Ms. French: Well, for instance, let's say the buildings cropped up inside with lots of little walls and they want to remove walls and make it a big restaurant. I don't know, is that a constraint? Is there some structural issue? That's a structural thing but there are other constraints such as well not they need a dumpster – a place to put the dumpster. We require new buildings at least to have a trash – you know trash be covered up and enclosed in the downtown...

Chair Bower: So, that's a – that's sort of a permit, so the dumpster issue is a permit restriction. For zoning, it might mean a change of use? So, I – the one I can think of that would trigger the most complication is moving from commercial to residential.

Ms. French: Sure, yeah, that's of interest. So, what are the – so, for instance, yeah, there's no parking and now they want to go -- do they need to provide the parking?

Chair Bower: Right, ok, so I just wanted to put some context in there.

Ms. French: I imagine that this one will, at some point, be on our Work Program to look at the – because it says zoning so Zoning Ordinance. We do annual Zoning Ordinance updates and so this could make it onto one of those.

Chair Bower: So, let me interrupt again. In – I think it's in the California Historic Building Code section of our Packet. I think there was a list of incentives that the City offers. Although, now that I'm trying to find it, I won't be able to but I think one of the incentives was expedited permit review. Another one was – there's a floor area – and it's not necessarily the California Historic Building Code but just the City's incentives for historic preservation. There's a 250-square foot...

Ms. French: Oh yeah.

Chair Bower: ...bonus...

Ms. French: Through the HIE Program, Home Improvement Exception.

Chair Bower: Right and there are a couple of other things that...

Ms. French: The basement thing where you have your finished floor higher than 3-feet.

Chair Bower: Right, though that's – which is significant so there are ways in which we can mitigate some of these constraints by designating these buildings as a historic resource or historic – put then on our inventory. One of the questions I have about this particular paragraph and the one above, 7 – L7.2 is how complicated you – is the process for getting on Palo Alto's historic inventory.

Ms. French: That sounds like another topic for another meeting, getting onto the inventory. I need discussion, like how is that done?

Chair Bower: There is – I'm asking these questions because I think when we get to four and outreach to our community, these are things we need to have at hand, ready and articulated. So, you can say so this is a list of things that we'll – you can use as a property owner to move your project forward and take advantage of benefits. Anyway, ok, that's it.

Ms. French: Alright, so we're on the second to last ones, L7.8.2 is create incentives to encourage salvage and reuse of discarded historic building materials. We do have a CND, Debris – Demolition Debris Division Program and I know this because I'm over Code Enforcement and when people don't do it, they have to pay fines and such.

Board Member Makinen: (off mic) Is there a facility to gather historical material or (inaudible) considered to be capable of being reused? (inaudible) with any type of stores or outlet?

Ms. French: I don't know if we have an involvement in that or not.

Chair Bower: It's not a City – I'm 7-years away from this because I haven't done this for a long but there were a couple of local groups in the City 10-years that provided us a list as a contractor of organizations that would come pick up or would except things like interior doors that matched a certain age like say the 20s, building materials or windows, double hung windows were particularly popular, they liked to get those but they would also take aluminum windows, they'd take vinyl windows, they'd take lots of parts, any light fixture that came out of the building. They even take some appliances so you go through and you kind of strip the house of the things that you could – that these companies would take and that puts them back into the stream. It takes it out of the waste stream and puts it into a reused stream.

Board Member Makinen: (off mic) Well, there used to be a person in East Palo Alto, Paul (inaudible). I think he uses to have (inaudible) salvage but I think he went out of business but that was a very useful (crosstalk)...

Board Member Wimmer: I've actually been in contact with him recently and he's not – he hasn't gone out of business. The cost of doing his business in East Palo Alto prevented him from remaining there but he does hold the Whole House Salvage service. If someone is going to demolish the house, he can go in and hold a whole house salvage sale.

Board Member Makinen: (off mic) I think it would be great if the City was – could integrate some of their resources and maybe supporting it for selling or private persons can out (inaudible) that type of reused facility. The big problem is they can't afford a place to store their (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Board Member Wimmer: Yeah, exactly.

Ms. French: Yeah, I think Palo Alto's... (crosstalk)

Board Member Wimmer: Nor can the City.

Ms. French: ...expensive.

Board Member Wimmer: I mean the City can't (crosstalk) organize...

Ms. French: There is Habitat for Humanity in Redwood City. I know because I've taken stuff there...

Board Member Wimmer: There are several locations.

Ms. French: ...and I seek stuff there.

Chair Bower: What was the place – Frank – something Freight and Salvage in Berkeley Oakland right on the border?

Vice Chair Corey: Omega.

Chair Bower: Maybe that was... (crosstalk)

[many people started talking at once]

Vice Chair Corey: Omega does the (inaudible) (crosstalk)

Board Member Wimmer: Omega and Iron Ore.

Vice Chair Corey: Urban Ore (inaudible)(crosstalk)...

Board Member Wimmer: Urban Ore, Urban Ore.

Vice Chair Corey: ...takes any – they are more anything and Omega is more early 20th century (crosstalk)

Board Member Wimmer: More antique type.

Vice Chair Corey: Yeah.

Chair Bower: So, the – yeah?

Vice Chair Corey: Paul also has a -- I was going to say that the resource -- where he has a newsletter he sends out and he does do multi-weekly things at those houses that get stripped. So, you can – but again you don't have the storage but he will offer an initial thing. Then you – just the on-site stuff there so that still does happen.

Board Member Makinen: (off mic) I've used his stuff, you know? Years (inaudible)

Chair Bower: One of the most astounding things that was recycled from projects that I did was the original hardwood floor material. That takes a lot of work but people wanted it so.

Board Member Makinen: (off mic) So, I guess my point is that I'm trying to direct you to maybe take an interest in sponsoring some type of facility or partner with somebody to provide the physical space where they can conduct this type of operation. You know it's just words if you don't do something. (inaudible) let's take some (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Board Member Wimmer: You need to put your microphone on when you're speaking.

Female: (spoke from the audience) Thank you so much.

Ms. French: Alright...

Board Member Makinen: If we could – somehow if the City could get more involved with partnering with some of these people by providing the facility of the means maybe to engage and reuse. Maybe it's a little bit out of your – out of the comfort zone for the City.

Ms. French: It's out of my – what I am overseeing but thank you for your suggestion.

Board Member Makinen: I don't know, does everybody else feel the same way?

Vice Chair Corey: Yeah, no, I mean I like the same idea. If the City actually had space because I think there are resources like Paul who actually are willing to go and do this. The problem is, as Margaret mentioned, is (crosstalk)(inaudible)

Board Member Makinen: We get push back, I feel like you're pushing back a little bit.

Ms. French: Well, I – you know it's not within my purview to (crosstalk)

Board Member Wimmer: Well, I think unfortunately it's business, it's a business model that someone has to prove that it's worth doing and they've – he's tried it. Several people have tried it and they – it's not a money-making endeavor and so people are only willing to...

Ms. French: It sounds like a public/private partnership.

Board Member Wimmer: ... do failing businesses for so long.

Board Member Makinen: That's why I... (crosstalk)

Vice Chair Corey: Well but I mean the fact that they have many of these that still survive outside of this area.

Board Member Wimmer: Yes, true.

Vice Chair Corey: So, the problem is the business model doesn't work when...

Board Member Wimmer: The real estate is so high.

Vice Chair Corey: ...commercial's is \$250 a square foot but it reverses where it does in many other areas. It's just that the cost is are so high, particularly here. So, I would – I mean I like – like Mike said if we actually had some underutilized resource of the City's from a space perspective. I mean I'm not saying we do...

Board Member Wimmer: Like Cubberley or something.

Vice Chair Corey: ... but it's an interesting – I mean from a (inaudible) perspective it is interesting.

Ms. French: Sounds like somebody might want to look into that. Ok, 7.8.3, seek additional innovative ways to apply current codes and ordinances to older buildings. Use the State Historic Building Code and so we have that on our agenda today so we don't need to really talk about that because we have that as an agenda item. One thing that I was thinking is we're set up really here like if there's people here. If we want to take a break maybe at 9:30 and consider reordering ourselves into a more conducive physical layout of people. We could all just kind of move to that end of the table maybe and...

Chair Bower: Or some of us can just move over there.

Ms. French: Yeah, right, that's what I'm saying. Maybe all of us can go sit over there at an appropriate time to facilitate...

Chair Bower: Yeah, that's fine.

Ms. French: ... face to face. Not just my face.

Chair Bower: So, I...

Vice Chair Corey: You don't feel comfortable just sitting there across from us all, Amy?

Ms. French: I don't want to be the star of the show.

[many people started talking at once]

Chair Bower: You've done very well on your report today, Amy.

Ms. French: Thank you, thank you.

Chair Bower: So, are there any (crosstalk)

Ms. French: I'll accept a B+.

Chair Bower: So, I think we've -- so you've gone over the Comp...

Ms. French: We've done that.

Chair Bower: ...Plan issues. Are there any other comments from Board Members or any suggestions or additional things we ought to consider?

Board Member Wimmer: One of the themes that was touched on in a couple of these points is that incentive program which we still haven't, I think, mastered. I know that we've talked about the Mills Act is the most obvious incentive program that comes to mind and we've tried to make some progress on that. I don't know if there's any smaller, lower level incentive like expediting approval processes, reducing the application fees. I'm just trying to think -- the person who's going to be most impacted by these programs is a person who owns a house in Professorville who has a historically sensitive property and they want to do something to it. Those are the people who probably would be most interested in some kind of ease of the process. If we could just ease up on the process. Maybe if their property isn't Mills Act worthy but I think -- I see that as an achievable incentive just to make it easy for these homeowners to go through the process but I don't know.

Ms. French: I'm uploading the City's webpage to...

Board Member Wimmer: I don't know how to quantify that for...

Ms. French: Let's have a look. Our webpages -- every -- this kind of bleeds over into and we can start, I guess talking about that if you want, the outreach. What's our current webpage looking like? Do we adequately convey the incentives? So, we do -- if you haven't seen the webpages in a while, you should have a look and see how we are conveying. I don't know why this is so big. I can't -- ok, so I was going to go ahead and open that up on the topic of incentives; here we go. Let's see areas of work, we have all of this going on here...

Chair Bower: Oh, there it is preservation incentives (crosstalk)

[many people talking at once]

Mrs. French: ... preservation incentives. I mean I'm pretty proud of our webpages for historic preservation. I think they -- Emily did a good job on this and then the City -- Citywide did a redo of the webpage. So, I'm going to go ahead and get us there. This is really pretty overly big. So, here we have the Palo Alto municipal codes, it talks about the standards and the historic building code predominately there. It does say, "which applies to all researches designated local, state, and federal levels." So, we are already telling people about that and then we say, here we go and you scroll down. There's building code...

Chair Bower: Oh, there it is. Wait, Incentives (crosstalk)

Mrs. French: Yeah, this is on the incentives page. Palo Alto Build Code, Chapter 16. I don't know why this is so large. So, this is what we're telling folks on our webpages, so there's that, about the building code and then we have the municipal code. It has all the parts the Municipal Code that have incentives so now...

Chair Bower: That's right, this is what I found yesterday, printed off, and left at home.

Ms. French: Oh, well, here it is again.

Chair Bower: How convenient.

Ms. French: So, we are announcing to the world, if they choose to look on our webpages, what our incentives are. We go over this subdivision incentives, the basement, the attics, we have the 250...

Chair Bower: 250-square feet.

Ms. French: Oh shoot, that needs to be changed because we changed that this last year. So, I'm looking at this one here where my cursor is. Sections -- so because the HRB brought this up we put it into the code change last year and so in 2018 this changed. So, it is available for Categories Three and Four buildings. So that -- I'm going to make sure that that gets changed today. I didn't realize that -- well, Emily left so she was updating the webpages before. Let's see, yeah, so I'm going to go through and make sure that these are all current with our codes but we definitely are -- oh here's another one. Allowed to transfer, I think that might still be the case, for Transfer Development Rights is still only available for Categories One and Two. So, for instance, we have to have -- we have a project that -- The Toy World I believe and they want to graduate to Category Two from Category Three so that they can take advantage of Transferable Development Rights. They are in the downtown in the Parking District so this is an incentive for that project.

Board Member Makinen: Is this in our Packet, right here? This...

Chair Bower: No, this is...

Ms. French: No, I'm looking on online, this is the City's webpage. So, Margaret brought up why -- how are we letting the world know about our incentives and this is how we're letting them know. I mean that's the limit of it, it's on a webpage. So, if people find the webpage -- you know how are we directing people to the webpage to learn about all these, that's a question as far as how well are we doing with that. Did you want to...

Board Member Wimmer: I do think -- I mean I have looked at the webpage and I do think like for instance that bulletin that we did about 2-years. I think that's very effective in explanatory to just the general public on where their property might fall in, in terms of their status. I thought that was really remarkably well done.

Ms. French: Well, actually that needs to be updated too since the event of 7.2 Policy.

Board Member Wimmer: But I think it was just such a great document. I think it was very helpful so – and it's great to update it obviously.

Ms. French: Anything else before we move on to Item Two, the Mid-Century Modern Context?

Chair Bower: No, I don't think so. I don't see any.

Board Member Bernstein: Amy?

Ms. French: Yes?

Board Member Bernstein: On the slide where it says SOFA Phase I, Bonus Floor Area, does it – scroll down. Does it say what Bonus Floor Area, how much square footage – how much Bonus Floor Area is provided?

Ms. French: No, it just tells you these are the types of incentives. So, you have to go kind of look at that document.

Board Member Bernstein: Ok, thank you.

Ms. French: I mean we – webpages ideally have things – more things you can click on.

Board Member Bernstein: I understand.

Ms. French: Active hyperlinks so that would be an improvement we could take on. Now I'm looking here on the – do we have the most recent – I think this might be from the old Comp Plan, these policies on the webpage. So, it's good that we're looking at the webpage because this may indicate a need to update so I'm going to check that as well. I don't see the Comp Plan Policies we just looked at on our webpage. I'm seeing different ones here which I think might be the old ones.

Chair Bower: Also, I think the federal tax incentive credit changed since this; the 2017 Tax Law.

Ms. French: Where did you...

Chair Bower: Rather – well, we're – no, down...

Ms. French: Do you see that on here?

Chair Bower: ...no, go down. We just hit the – below subdivision. Yeah so, I don't know what that says because I couldn't see it but just triggered a – the California Preservation Foundation had sent out an email...

Ms. French: Oh look, we have it – we do have the 230 Comp Plan so – at least and then we have Cal Building Code, incentive, programs and...

Chair Bower: Yeah, I was looking at this portion...

Ms. French: What is that?

Chair Bower: ...of our – our particular portion of the City's website and for the first time it was quite easy to navigate.

Ms. French: Interesting, here's something, I didn't know...

Chair Bower: Wow, that's very old.

Board Member Wimmer: It says that it's been edited though.

Ms. French: Edited, yeah, this is awkward. Wow, I should go mining our – well, you know this is an idea for a subcommittee. If anyone wants to be on a subcommittee to look at the webpages and see if there something broken or that needs enhancement; resolution. I'm all for having help in that way.

Board Member Wimmer: (off mic) I'll take a look at it.

Chair Bower: You know the problem with doing that Amy, at least from my perspective as a Board Member, is a lot of this stuff I have no understanding of. I mean I can read it but I don't whether it's accurate because I don't know what the current status is. You're probably the only person in the City that could look at this.

Board Member Wimmer: (inaudible) (off mic)

Ms. French: I mean it's beneficial to have – I mean I wouldn't call any of you lay people when it comes to historic preservation but certainly from a standpoint of, let me look at this for the first time and see if I understand this and see wow, look at this. What's this thing that says Dennis Backland on it? I mean that's the kind of feedback that would be helpful and there could be a list of things to fix. So, I welcome input and help.

Board Member Makinen: You want an editor.

Ms. French: Yeah, I'm not taking this project on tomorrow or the next day. So, if...

Chair Bower: Actually, what you're looking for is a reviewer.

Board Member Makinen: (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Ms. French: Yeah, somebody who is interested in quality control because clearly – yeah, this Staff vacancies is a problem. I think we need to move onto Item Two if you don't mind?

Chair Bower: Yeah, lets.

Ms. French: Would you like to do the fire drill and reseal.

Chair Bower: Well, why don't we break right before 10:00, say maybe 10 to 10:00 and then we'll move – we'll then immediately move to the California Building Code when...

Ms. French: Ok, I just thought maybe for the...

Chair Bower: Yeah, we'll do that before – at a break...

Ms. French: ...Mid-Century Modern you might want to have a conversation but – with face to face. That's up to you. Here it is. Mid-Century Modern Context Statement has been prepared by two Staff members over the several years and never submitted. It needs council authorization to do something like this because it relates to budget and whether Staff is going to be able to commit their time to doing that. As well as get a consultant and it's got to be on a Work Program so it's not a Work Program and May is fast approaching. By the way, I had hoped to hire a Historic Planner, this is the second time that I've gotten to final interviews and...

Chair Bower: Offers?

Ms. French: ... I don't want to say more because we're still in the process but it's been very difficult and we still don't have a Historic Planner. I'll just say that.

Board Member Makinen: You're getting closer?

Chair Bower: Not clear.

Ms. French: It feels like we get closer and then we're just as far away as we ever have been, so we're still in the situation with – since March of last year with...

Chair Bower: That's when Emily...

Ms. French: ... using the consultants.

Chair Bower: Emily left March...

Ms. French: 1st.

Chair Bower: ...2018.

Ms. French: Yes.

Vice Chair Corey: Wow, has it been a year?

Chair Bower: A year.

Ms. French: It's been a year, over a year.

Board Member Shepherd: Can you say more...

Ms. French: And don't I know it.

Chair Bower: Debbi?

Board Member Shepherd: Can you say more broadly, is it about the cost of living here fundamentally or...?

Ms. French: Well, I'm sure that's a lot of it, a lot of it because we do try to recruit people that have qualifications. They usually are not living right here in the Bay Area, the ones that apply, because they see the price – they see the salary and they think that's a nice salary. Then once they start looking...

Chair Bower: And then they see these \$17,000...

Ms. French: ... it's unaffordable.

Chair Bower: ...a month rent for a house. I saw a house advertised for \$17,000 a month; 4-bedrooms so it was a lot of room. You could put about 20 people in it. Anyway, sorry to interrupt. So, we're talking -- we're now on Page 11 of the Packet.

Ms. French: Yes.

Chair Bower: I read – let me just say, Amy, I read through this and it seems to me like this particular grant application is ready to go if the dates change and if the...

Board Member Kohler: What page are you on?

Chair Bower: ... funds – on – well it's Page 11 through 17 in our Packet.

Board Member Kohler: Oh ok, alright.

Chair Bower: Actually 19 in the Packet. I don't know whether, on Page 18, these are current costs.

Ms. French: Yeah, this would have been done starting with Matt and finishing with Emily.

Chair Bower: Yeah, I remember.

Ms. French: So, it's – so this reflects a past year so I don't know what the – how much we would – today – in today's dollars we would have to request.

Chair Bower: So, federal funds, grants, are those still – are the two matching or the grant from – fed. Grant of \$45,000 may be \$40,000 it says here and then the CLG's matching \$30,000 shared. It seems to me this work is all been done and what we ought to be doing is updating this and encouraging the Council to move it forward for next year. I don't see that it happens this year. Isn't the deadline like the end of March?

Ms. French: Oh, no, it's May but that's still too fast...

Chair Bower: Yeah.

Ms. French: ... and again, no Historic Planner. You know we have Staffing problems in our Planning Department.

Chair Bower: Well, so maybe we can get an estimate from a consultant to see how much they would charge to be the planner. I don't think we want to wait until we have a planner considering that it's been so difficult to find one. We're in – you're in the second or third round of interviews?

Ms. French: Well, this is the second – yeah, this is the second times we've gone out and tried to get somebody.

Chair Bower: Right and lots of people have interviewed and you get right down to the end and you can't get a...

Ms. French: It's tough.

Chair Bower: Can't close the deal for a variety of reasons. The basic work though has been done here and we ought to be harvesting that work.

Ms. French: Ok well so I hear that as an encouragement for – to shoot for 2020. Again, I would have to work with the Director, Jon Lait, regarding our Work Program but I will let him know that at least a few of you are thinking it's a good idea to – would you like to do any kind of straw poll – what do you call that?

Vice Chair Corey: (inaudible) (crosstalk)

Chair Bower: Well, it's a sense of the Board.

Ms. French: A sense, there you go.

Chair Bower: I'm assuming from comments that I'm hearing that all of us support this.

Board Member Wimmer: Yes.

Chair Bower: Is that accurate? Martin? Yeah, I...

Board Member Makinen: It's kind of sounds like the new normal since we're not going to have a Historic Preservation Planner.

Chair Bower: Well, I think there's a chance we won't because of the cost of housing. I mean it's a good salary until you have to live here.

Board Member Makinen: So, what the alternative? You go to a contractor to do it.

Chair Bower: Oh, right.

Ms. French: Well, we are – you know I...(crosstalk)

Chair Bower: It's just what we are doing now.

Ms. French: Yeah, Page and Turnbull is our professional support for this program.

Chair Bower: Page and Turnbull did both the Professorville Design Guidelines and the Eichler Design Guidelines. They are very thorough, very competent, and they are easy to work with at least in my experience on those two projects. I don't -- this might not require a lot of their time so I would encourage you to explore with them.

Ms. French: Yeah, I can ask them to give an estimate...

Chair Bower: Right.

Ms. French: ... and share that with Jon.

Board Member Kohler: Probably have to know how many meetings there are a year which is pretty random.

Ms. French: So, we're talking right now about the Mid-Century Modern...

Chair Bower: Just about the Mid-Century...

Ms. French: ...Context Statement.

Chair Bower: Right so there is a – in this proposal, there is an estimate of what the time requirement will be. Somebody's gone through – I think Matt did this when he was the Preservation Planner.

Ms. French: Well and Emily updated it because it does have...

Chair Bower: The red.

Ms. French: ...the hope here was May/June 2019...

Chair Bower: Right.

Board Member Makinen: I think your only alternative is to contract a planner.

Vice Chair Corey: Yeah, I know.

Chair Bower: Well, it's the application. You have to apply for the grants and that's what the Council has to approve.

Ms. French: Right the Council has to approve that -- the budget for the consultant and the budget for or the allocation of Staff resources in kind for Staff to devote themselves to this. That's where it gets hard to because again who's sitting in the chair?

Board Member Makinen: Sure.

Board Member Wimmer: Well, it also under Number Three Administration it's asking -- part of the -- what they're asking who are the professionals who are going to take on this task?

Chair Bower: It's Page 15.

Board Member Wimmer: Emily's name is still listed here.

Ms. French: Yeah because I haven't updated this since she worked on it.

Board Member Wimmer: Right, right but I mean -- I mean when it's updated, I think the part of achieving the grant is to prove that you have people who are actively involved with it.

Ms. French: Yeah.

Board Member Wimmer: I guess you could say the -- you could list the HRB in this category. I don't know.

Ms. French: I don't know. This is why we're not going after this year...

Board Member Wimmer: It's kind of tricky.

Ms. French: ...one of the reasons to not go after it this year...

Board Member Wimmer: It's really tricky, yeah, it's a challenge.

Ms. French: ... because you do need to have live bodies that are qualified.

Chair Bower: I'd also like to point out what every Board Member knows and that is that a Mid-Century inventory would include nearly half of Palo Alto's residential housing because it's 1940s to 1970s, is that what this is?

Ms. French: Yeah.

Chair Bower: Yeah, I mean prior to 1940 there was virtually nothing south of what we now know as Oregon. There wasn't even Oregon, that was developed in the 60s. All the Eichler houses, 2,700 -- 2,500 to 2,700 residences would qualify for this. They were all built in that -- really in the very -- in a much narrower timeframe.

Board Member Bernstein: Post World War II.

Chair Bower: Yeah so, I mean this is a really significant portion of our residential building structures and it seems to me we have an obligation to look at this and get it inventoried.

Ms. French: Well so inventory being -- so normally the nomenclature would be more like register, the local register. We call ours inventory. I mean Dames and Moore did it -- did a survey but those didn't make it onto our inventory or register.

Chair Bower: Right so this a list of the Historic Inventory. It's on the website, easily found, it's every building and this is from Dames and Moore's 1998-2000, I think.

Ms. French: No, that's from 1970s.

Chair Bower: 70s?

Ms. French: That's the inventory because Dames and Moore – all of those they never made it on inventory. They were filed with the state as eligible for California (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Bower: This is 10 pages of buildings by address, both residential and commercial, so...

Ms. French: So, that's from 1978 and those are the two-page historic resource evaluation that don't say all that much. Anyways, this would be Context Statement so it's not exactly an inventory that goes out and puts addresses on a list. It's not the same thing as that. It's just...

Chair Bower: A sense of...

Ms. French: A sense of what's important.

Chair Bower: In this. Other Board Member have comments? Margaret?

Board Member Wimmer: Do we ever look at – and see what other Cities are doing in these efforts? I mean I know that often times I'll see stuff from San Jose or Redwood City. I mean it's not a bad idea to see what other people are doing. Do we ever try to look and see? I mean who else is making these great efforts?

Ms. French: Emily might have known, I haven't researched it myself.

Board Member Wimmer: I mean that might another thing if we're all kind of looking for things to do in our free time.

Chair Bower: Oh, yeah, right.

Board Member Wimmer: I mean I was...

Ms. French: (inaudible) having to show up twice a month for meetings.

Board Member Wimmer: I also like when I'm – because I do to different Cities, I do projects in various different Cities so when I'm walking through, I'll see something oh, historic preservation in Redwood City. I have like collected pamphlets and things like that because I think that's interesting but I mean maybe that's another thing I guess we could just see. Like what other – well what kind of efforts are other people doing?

Board Member Shephard: Isn't this something that you can ask Page and Turnbull? I mean they probably...

Board Member Wimmer: They must know.

Board Member Shephard: ...already contract that they've executed for...

Ms. French: Sure.

Board Member Shephard: ... Mid-Century Modern Context Statements.

Ms. French: Sure, I mean once we get into the – I authorized to spend my time researching for this and put it on the Work Program as we want it. So, I'll have a conversation with Jon and I could – if I'm authorized to move ahead and ask people for things, I can ask that. I mean yes, that's normally part of a consultant's job when they are doing something for a City is to benchmark. Certainly, if they have been the

consultant that's helped another City, they wouldn't have to do a lot of benchmarking because they've already had the experience.

Board Member Wimmer: It also just seems like – I mean let's not overburden ourselves, I think. I mean we don't have the Staff because we're – not because we don't want the Staff. We're trying to recruit Staff to assist in these programs but until we have those people in place, I think we can only be hopeful to move these things along but to really execute it I think we need have the professionals assist us in doing so. I just think some of these things like – we keep adding things to our list of already full fill list of work tasks.

Chair Bower: You mean the already overflowing list?

Board Member Wimmer: I know what that feels like just – it's just overwhelming.

Chair Bower: It's that the modern-day workplace?

Board Member Wimmer: Yeah, that's true and living in this area...

Chair Bower: It's a 24/7 job.

Board Member Wimmer: We're all workaholics so you just want to work around the clock.

Chair Bower: So, let's maybe make an appointment, you and I meet with Jonathan, and see if we can move this forward.

Ms. French: Ok.

Chair Bower: I would like to point out that the pictures – see these are great pictures that you've used to accompany this. The one that I was looking for was the City Hall building which...

Ms. French: The what?

Chair Bower: This building.

Ms. French: (off mic) Oh yes, Edward Durell Stone.

Chair Bower: Yeah, I mean...

Ms. French: (off mic) because (inaudible) use to have an (inaudible) (crosstalk)

Chair Bower: Yes, right.

Ms. French: (off mic) ... of any color trees (inaudible)

Chair Bower: There were beautiful awnings that were so dangerous that they had to take them down because they were built – they weren't built to spec and they weren't engineered. It was really sad because I think they were quite dramatic but this building itself still would qualify is my understanding. Even though it doesn't have it's – the original canopies that were out here.

Ms. French: (off mic) This is not the only one of its kind. I guess Edward Durell Stone built a couple of these City Halls across the county.

Board Member Makinen: Oh yeah, he's very – Stone was very well known.

Chair Bower: Yeah, I mean he...

Ms. French: (off mic) Right so there's another City Hall just like this in Ohio.

Chair Bower: Really? He also was the architect for the original Stanford Hospital which is sadly going away someday.

Ms. French: Soon.

Chair Bower: It's the last building in the sequence of 3-million square feet in building -- new buildings.

Board Member Makinen: Of Edward Durell Stone?

Chair Bower: Yeah, he designed the hospital which can't be saved.

Board Member Makinen: (inaudible) and they are too.

Ms. French: (off mic) So, definitely some of these are -- I have a book that shows Mid-Century Modern and (inaudible) (crosstalk)

Board Member Kohler: (inaudible)

Ms. French: ... Methodist Church are were my parent met.

Chair Bower: Really?

Ms. French: (off mic) This -- little anecdote. Yeah, there's a story there. This is in that book of notable Mid-Century concrete formed -- I mean that was the big deal, right? The concrete forming of shapes.

Chair Bower: And I like the four forty California's Avenue things, the Bank of the West. I don't know whether it's -- I know what the bank is now but it was very interesting.

Board Member Shephard: It's still Bank of the West.

Chair Bower: Is it still? That tray in front of this picture now is a giant tree.

Board Member Wimmer: Oh Amy, we're being reminded again to turn...

Ms. French: Oh, sorry.

Chair Bower: So, maybe this is a -- unless we have other things to discuss on this, maybe this is a good time to take a break and come back at 10:00...

Ms. French: Yes.

Chair Bower: ...for...

Board Member Kohler: What?

Chair Bower: ...a talk with our building inspector. We'll take a break.

Ms. French: And rearrange our chairs?

Chair Bower: Yeah, sure.

Board Member Kohler: (inaudible -- off mic)

Chair Bower: No, not yet, you're not paroled yet.

Board Member Kohler: Ok.

Chair Bower: So, let's...

Vice Chair Corey: Paroled.

Chair Bower: ... be back in 10-minutes.

Ms. French: Great.

[The Board took a short break]

Ms. French: Welcome back, I know you're the Chair so you can...

Chair Bower: No, I'm just welcoming you and we're very appreciative of you spending time with us and talking to us about the Historic Code – the California Historic Building Code; which is, of course, a primary interest to us because we're in the business of – as a Board of trying to protect historic properties. Amy, you want to...

Ms. French: I'll tee it up.

Chair Bower: Tee it up.

Ms. French: Packet Page 23 is the Historical Building Code. Then, of course, to introduce the item on Packet Page 7 I had reached out to Page and Turnbull, our historical consultants, who had talked with their colleagues and confirmed that it's up to each jurisdiction as to decide whether a building is considered qualified. Certainly, on our website as we saw this morning with the incentives and as is noted here it can be that they're on the City or county registers or inventories to qualify. It doesn't have to be national or California Registered. Other buildings can meet the standards for use of Historic Building Code so – but here is George. I did provide a note as well and a report from what George has said and provided these copies here if we want to get into the depths of the codes.

Board Member Kohler: (off mic) So what page are we starting?

Vice Chair Corey: Page 23, Page 23.

Board Member Bernstein: Packet Page 23.

Ms. French: That's the code itself.

Mr. George Hoyt, Chief Building Official: Just one thing here, I mean we've included the whole California Historical Building Code in this binder here. So, it's not very large and how it's kind of broken down into is different sections that would apply to different section of the Building Code Standards. So, there's an egress portion, there is administrative, use and occupancy, fire protection, things of egress, structural, accessibility, mechanical, plumbing, and that sort of thing. The last chapter kind of goes back into some of the qualifications of the requirements. Basically, when we come across a building that an applicant is utilizing the Historical Building Code, we look at this as our guidance documents to see where potentially some leniency could be given to existing components in the building and look at it for guidance if we need to take some consideration into some existing structures that really can't be altered if we're utilizing the building. Through past experiences as a Building Official for over 5-years now, I've had an opportunity to work on a couple of historical projects. One being across the street in what use to be known as University Arts. We applied the Historical Building Code to that and for one instance like the main exterior open stairs in that building that goes throughout the building. Well, per current the code that would not be allowed but we did allow it through the Historical Building Code because they upgraded into a sprinkler system,

plus they also did a pretty aggressive seismic retrofit on it. So, it's kind of a – the Historical Building Code gives us that latitude to balance the good with the bad so to speak and try to provide the most – the best product at the end of the day that allows us to maintain some of the historical resources in the City. So, I'm available to answer any direct questions you might have regarding the Historical Building Code or whatever.

Board Member Bernstein: (off mic) I just want to...

Chair Bower: Martin, your mic.

Board Member Bernstein: Oh, I'm sorry, thank you. Liability, what does the State of California offer any Chief Building Official? Let's just say that you approve a change, let's just say if there becomes a safety – someone gets hurt during a building and let's say litigation happens. It says look, this doesn't meet current Building Code. The State of California offers protection from your decisions? Do you know?

Mr. Hoyt: I don't know if they actually offer protection.

Board Member Bernstein: Just a question...

Mr. Hoyt: I think we are – we're responsible for the decision that we make and we try our best to document the processes and the benefits. So, and so forth. I mean we never want to have an unsafe condition...

Board Member Bernstein: Of course.

Mr. Hoyt: ... out there and as long as we've really documented that we've increased the life safety of the building. Historically the department has been in pretty good shape.

Board Member Bernstein: Ok, yeah, it's just a comfort level because you're making it – it's your decision...

Mr. Hoyt: It is (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Board Member Bernstein: ...and what's your comfort level?

Mr. Hoyt: I've had conversations with the state regarding that and (inaudible) with University Arts. We balanced the positives and negatives of doing and we really think we have a superior life safety building. Making it seismically safe and added sprinklers which would distinguish any fire.

Board Member Bernstein: So, it sounds like as long as things are documented then that becomes safe. (crosstalk) Saying here's the basis of our decision.

Mr. Hoyt: (inaudible) these are the basis of our decisions.

Chair Bower: So, George, I'm interested in – of the current status on fire sprinkler systems. I think the law has changed now so that almost any reconstruction would trigger a sprinkler system in a building. Is that an accurate – I mean it's over...

Mr. Hoyt: I'd have to look at our (inaudible) (crosstalk)

Chair Bower: It was over 50 percent.

Mr. Hoyt: Yeah, it's pretty impressive at this point; 15,000 and 16,000 in your Building Code. If you're doing your remodeling in an existing space that doesn't have sprinklers. There's a good chance that that space will require sprinklers.

Chair Bower: Alright and the California Historic – I read the fire portion. It clearly talks about sprinkler systems and so there's no avoiding them in a historic building? Ok, well, I have to say – I'd also like to say that on my daughter's 1907 building in San Mateo, as I've said to the Board before, we managed to put a sprinkler system in without any interruption – really without any invasive work on an elaborate first-floor boxed beam ceiling. We did it all in attic spaces and things and it was...

Ms. Hoyt: (inaudible) (off mic)

Chair Bower: Yeah, we were able to cover the whole house and not have to tear the whole house apart so that's a good thing.

Board Member Makinen: Yeah, to follow up on that, when I was involved with the adaptive reuse of the building at Moffett Field. Invariably we'd have to go in and sprinkle them and that would by us a lot of latitudes as far as doing other things we wanted to do. That seemed to satisfy a lot of the requirements once we sprinklered. We sprinklered just about all those buildings.

Mr. Hoyt: (Off mic) My experience with working with life safety engineers, they do rely on sprinkler systems and other forms of sprinkler systems (inaudible) that do not have them. (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Mr. Makinen: I had one other questions. I know there's a thing called soft structures that we attended a seminar in San Francisco I think we were at. Where if you have a... (crosstalk)

Chair Bower: The first-floor soft structures.

Mr. Hoyt: (off mic) Soft-story structures? (inaudible)

Chair Bower: Right, where the first floor is basically all windows and garage doors.

Board Member Makinen: Yeah, big openings for a garage.

Ms. French: Or like 2555 Park?

Board Member Makinen: Do you have anything that you want to convey with us as far as what your experiences with that or what's the current program is? I know there's new legislation I think that's going into effect that you have to seismically upgrade these soft structures.

Mr. Hoyt: (off mic) I'm not sure if there's legislation. I'm not currently aware of legislation at the state level in regards to that. I know we are exploring some local regulation and there's a lot of other Cities such as Los Angeles and San Francisco that have a very aggressive soft structure program. I think Oakland has recently launched a new one. That is something that PCE and Development Services is looking into. They did a great comprehensive seismic mitigation study a few years ago, they had some recommendations. Currently, soft story structures are not our seismic hazardous list, however, we do have a primary inventory of them and we also encourage the seismic retrofit of them. We are considering the options and we'll be coming forward with a proposal in the near future.

Chair Bower: We don't have very many buildings in Palo Alto that have soft...

Mr. Hoyt: (off mic) Soft story? I think there's around 300 or so.

Chair Bower: 300, well that's...

Ms. French: That's a lot.

Mr. Hoyt: There's quite a few, more than you think.

Ms. French: In the era of construction is the 50s through the 70s? Is that...

Mr. Hoyt: A lot of them are multi-family building...

Chair Bower: Yeah, right.

Mr. Hoyt: ...because they had garages and carports and (inaudible).

Chair Bower: Yeah, ground floor so I can think of them. San Francisco has a very aggressive program right now and that's become of the Loma Prieta earthquake damage in the marina.

Board Member Makinen: So, do they require the seismically upgrade at least for these buildings then in San Francisco?

Board Member Bernstein: But there are moment frames on the garage doors.

Chair Bower: Right so it's complicated and it depends on what you want to do. Pretty much anything you come in for a Building Permit and they'll look at that and they're very aggressive about tying any change to some kind of mitigation of those soft story buildings; which is, I think, a good thing actually. They are the worse Building Department I ever worked with in my life.

Board Member Bernstein: I have a great experience with them. I love that building (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Bower: Well, I have good experiences with their builder – with their inspectors, it's just the permit process is nuts. Anyway, other questions? Margaret.

Board Member Wimmer: I have a quick question but I don't have a microphone so I'm going to borrow yours...

Board Member Makinen: Sure.

Board Member Wimmer: ... because I want everyone to hear me. No, I'm kidding. I just wanted you to speak briefly about how – because the Historic Build Code applies – it's interrupted per each jurisdiction. So how do you evaluate a project and say yes, the building code applies to this structure and no it doesn't? Then, for instance, I do a lot of residential projects so how – what would you -- how would you view a project to determine whether the Historic Building Code would apply? Then what if this part of the project was to remodel an existing historic structure but then there's an addition to it? I'm guessing that the Historic Building Code would apply to the remodel but the new part of the structure would need to follow the current Building Code. Is that a correct interruption or assumption, I guess?

Mr. Hoyt: Yeah, I mean that would be -- so those start off with how would I establish a project would be or the Historical Building Code would be utilized on the project. It's really dependent on the applicant coming in and requesting such and has done their due diligence and figure out how they want to apply it. First thing, if we come across a situation or Staff comes across a situation where they want to utilize it, then we look to see if the project qualifies for it to be utilized. We would look at the National Registry, we would look at a state level registry, we would look at a local and confirm with our Planning Department that it's on that. Then take a look at the existing resources of that. Ideally, especially in commercial buildings, it's ideal for us to identify what the historical fabric and components of the building are that we are trying to maintain, how we're going to utilize the Historical Building Code to do that and work around those obstacles. So, we would utilize that, we would really rely on a third party, a historical person who is evaluating the building, to establish what those important components are. If it be the exterior features or some of the interior features and document that and try to work with them on that accord. There's a distinct difference between creating a historical building and creating -- completely tearing down the building and building a replica of the building. A replica is not necessarily playing the Historical Building Code.

Chair Bower: It's not historic.

Mr. Hoyt: It's not historic anymore, we're building a replica that looks historic. So, we have to take all those things into consideration when we're doing that. When we have a mixture of new versus old, we apply the Historic Building Code in the existing area and the new Building Code would be applied to – and the current Building Code would be applied to the new portion of the building.

Chair Bower: So, the Avenidas building, which is now currently under construction, the expansion was a case and point where they had...

Ms. French: Well, it's finished but...

Chair Bower: What's that?

Board Member Bernstein: It's finished.

Chair Bower: Is it finished?

Ms. French: They had an opening a couple of weeks ago.

Chair Bower: Oh really? Oh, I'm behind the times.

Mr. Hoyt: You were darn close.

Chair Bower: You know that's the original City Hall...

Mr. Hoyt: Yes.

Chair Bower: ...police building and I remember when we reviewed it that they had issues about floor levels because the new addition they wanted higher ceilings and so they were trying to figure out how to blend that in. The old building, I think was renovated under the California Historic Building Code; of course, just as you described. It's kind of a tricky issue. Could you talk a little bit about really the nuts and bolts about the application? So, you said it's up to the applicant to really do the research and demonstrate how the Historic Building Code could apply to their building.

Board Member Bernstein: (off mic) They request the application of the Historical Building Code.

Chair Bower: Right so the process, it sounds to me, is that an applicant has an idea of a project they want to renovate, expand a historic building. They get a historic resources inventory or evaluation report. They incorporate that into their building plans. They determine what section of the building would apply to the Historic Building Code and what – if there's an addition that would not. Then I think there's a requirement I read that City actually designates the building as part of their inventory. It has to be Category One to Four. Is that part of the ordinance that I...

Ms. French: So...

Chair Bower: It's in...

Ms. French: What I'm seeing in the stuff that we've unearthed for this meeting is that it does not have to be on the City's inventory. It can also be eligible for California Register which is we have some of those.

Chair Bower: So, I thought it said in the materials that the HRB had to determine that the building was eligible. No?

Ms. French: No, I mean we have some – ok so we have some on file at the state, some being the Dames and Moore effort, 165 of them ended up at the state as National Register Eligible. They're also California Register eligible. Those are all allowed to use this. As we go forward, per Policy 7.2, other buildings come up and are found to be eligible. The question -- by our consultant the questions is do we then send those to the state? Is there a process? This is what I was eluding too earlier. Certainly, if somebody wants to use the Historic Building Code and they come forward and say hey, we want to actually be on your inventory or send that off to the state then I guess we could do that. Just – we haven't set that whole program up.

Chair Bower: So, on Page 63 of our materials on paragraph – this is the City ordinance – adopted City ordinance from June – from 2016. So, 16.49.040, Designation of Historic Structures, and it talks about the procedure for designating this and I read – as I read through this, I thought that that suggested there needs to be a designation prior to the application of the Building Code. Is that not correct?

Board Member Bernstein: (off mic) Well, this needs to be on the list.

Ms. French: Well, so this is for the inventory, Category One, Two, Three or Four but if it's eligible then the State Building Code allows us and that's in Packet Page...

Chair Bower: That's ok. Alright, I'm just trying to clarify.

Board Member Bernstein: (off mic) If you're not on the list then to be – to use the Historic then you better be on some list. So, then here's the process to get on a list.

Mr. Hoyt: On a list.

Chair Bower: Right, I see, ok, so that's...

Mr. Hoyt: This is a process to get on the local list.

Chair Bower: Right.

Vice Chair Corey: So, just to...

Ms. French: Right, so this – so Packet Page 8 has the – this is what George had provided. Yeah, Packet Page 8 was the current paragraph from – that's Section 18955 and I bolded it because I thought it was interesting. This shall include historical buildings or properties on or determined eligible for. Ok, so if we have determined that something – if the City has gotten its consultant to determine that it's eligible for California, then it's – I think that's enough. We haven't put it on our inventory but I think that's ok. If you read this literally and it works.

Vice Chair Corey: But what about a historic district?

Chair Bower: Go ahead. Well, a historic district would qualify...

Vice Chair Corey: Would that be automatically qualified?

Chair Bower: ...because everything in the district is considered part of it but an Eichler, for instance, is not probably going to be listed anywhere. Certainly, Eichlers are – individual Eichlers are eligible even though the City Resolution...

Ms. French: Well they would have to be found eligible through an HRE and we have – you know we're not going about and doing that proactively or anything.

Chair Bower: Yeah, no, so if for some reason an Eichler homeowner wanted to use the Historic Building Code for whatever reason. I mean it's a long process but that's doable.

Ms. French: Are we thinking that Eichlers need this kind of thing? I don't...

Chair Bower: It just – I don't know. I can't imagine why they would want to use the Historic Building Code but...

Board Member Bernstein: (off mic) If it saves money for construction that's why (inaudible)

Chair Bower: Yeah.

Ms. French: I mean to retain a glass window that should be tempered glass? I don't know. A big – one of those big windows, does that...

Chair Bower: Right, that's actually the first thing that I thought about is those plate glass windows that are – where not tempered when they were installed and who would want that?

Ms. French: Well, who would remove it? Unless it got broken because that makes the house.

Chair Bower: I guess – but you're doing an entire renovation of a house, you'd trigger the 50 percent rule. Wouldn't that glass have to be upgraded to tempered glass to meet...

Mr. Hoyt: (off mic) Only if you're replacing – only...

Chair Bower: The glass.

Mr. Hoyt: (off mic) ... if you're replacing the glass.

Vice Chair Corey: That's probably an expensive piece of glass.

Chair Bower: Yeah, those are huge pieces. Ok, sorry to interrupt or digress but...

Ms. French: That's a good example.

Mr. Hoyt: (Off mic) But there's – I mean in those type of situations it really depends on how aggressive the remodel would be on an Eichler home. I mean you could also use the California Energy Code and maybe to meet the California Energy Code you would need to replace the exterior glazing to meet the (inaudible) factors and SBC factors and reach their TD values that need to meet to comply with codes. So, there's a lot of different drivers that establish what the actual requirements are. The section – just briefly go back to the section of purpose and how we apply the purpose. In the section that Amy had read was straight out of the Historical Building Code, Chapter 8.1, which is the administrative portion; 8-101.2. So, that's where that language directly came from, so in combination with the guidance that's in this document as well as what's in our local ordinances and the state law, that's how we establish (inaudible) (crosstalk)

Ms. French: At one point – and this is a planning thing too – at one point if somebody's demoing or modifying a building more than 50 percent is the whole evaluation thing. Then they wouldn't be able to use the Historic Building Code because it's no longer existing to the – you know? So, if an Eichler or somebody comes in and wants to do something so major that it's no longer there, then they can't use it.

Board Member Bernstein: (off mic) I think it's – I've used the code before, especially the archaic materials. Its...

Ms. French: Microphone.

Board Member Bernstein: Anyways, so I think it's – I think it's a great written or well-written ordinance. It's – we've done things where we've actually analyzed the wood fiber of 2x4s that you can't drive a nail

threw because it's so strong. So, it's -- but the archaic materials are really listed here. I mean we used Stucco has sheer value and there are words in here saying it is reasonable and then that's where the proof of the -- so we've done engineering prior to your attention here. We actually did an engineering analysis of the wood fiber and -- which that was Fred Herman was the inspector. He said look it meets the strength and I said yeah, mathematically it does. Anyway, so the idea of archaic materials, it's a great chapter in here.

Vice Chair Corey: I had an interesting follow up to that and also related to liability. So, in the archaic materials as far as a lot of the foundation materials; mason, adobe, things like that. It says that you can actually replace them with like kind. Does that require a -- because I would imagine it would be on a testing an existing. I would imagine that's something that could be done but I would find it hard to believe that a structural engineer would sign off on like replacing a brick wall because does that ever become an issue? Say you had a brick wall that you wanted to replace with the same materials rather than tuck point. Wouldn't you need a structural engineer to sign off on, on actually replacing that or would...

Mr. Hoyt: (off mic) Yes.

Vice Chair Corey: But how would you find one who would be able to calculate masonry? I'm just being -- in a serious way, right?

Board Member Bernstein: Well, here's...

Vice Chair Corey: Because you do have that -- the sign off procedure, right?

Board Member Bernstein: So, to answer your question how do you find an engineer? Well, my engineer has the record (inaudible) -- he has a collection of old Building Codes from 1920 so that's how he finds out what the Code was in 1920.

Vice Chair Corey: I was more thinking from the liability perspective because structural engineers generally don't like -- they don't like to over-architect and they don't like to sign off -- they like to over-engineer. So, I'm saying even if you could find those codes, how would you find one who would be willing to sign off on that? I think that would be hard but maybe you know someone.

Board Member Bernstein: Well, the -- well, you are correct that I would say any person of any profession either are going to have their limit of comfort zone of what they are willing to do. Yeah, it does come down to the individual provider of service for sure.

Ms. French: It's interesting, I'm noticing on Packet Page 55 which says qualified historical districts, sites, and open space. So, I'm trying to imagine in what scenario -- now we're in Professorville or we're in one of the two Eichler National Districts. What -- does that mean it applies to all of the properties in the district that are eligible? I mean for instance in Professorville not all of those homes are historic. There are some new homes in there. Just because they're in the district doesn't mean that they are eligible to take advantage of the Historic Building Code. It was kind of interesting that that's in here.

Board Member Bernstein: Now it does say the word qualified so for example, a noncontributor to a historic district...

Ms. French: Oh, is this in -- on the same page?

Board Member Bernstein: Page -- Packet Page 55, 8-01001.2 scope. That's the paragraph you were reading, Amy?

Ms. French: Yeah.

Vice Chair Corey: (off mic) Qualify historical.

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah, it says qualify so if there's a non-contributing building in a Professorville district, for example, I would believe that be considered a non-qualified building.

Chair Bower: Right so a new building in a historic district doesn't contribute...

Ms. French: Would not qualify.

Chair Bower: Right, so it wouldn't qualify.

Ms. French: That would be silly to apply it to that one.

Chair Bower: But the district is the sum of its qualified historic buildings and I can only think of – in Sacramento they have that historic district down near the railroad museum where every single building is or almost every building...

Ms. French: Old Town.

Chair Bower: Yeah, Old Town, right, is a historic building. In that case, everything would qualify but in Professorville there'd be lots of buildings that would not.

Ms. French: Yeah, Preservation Park comes to mind too; transplanted.

Board Member Bernstein: It sounds like from, George, from your point of view as long – so it's up to the applicant to show enough data to make the point that looks, this is – there's enough quality of historize, I guess, and then here's how our – almost make a proposal. Entering a proposal saying we want to keep this stucco here, we want to keep this, and then here's some engineering comment for your review and then you make your determination.

Mr. Hoyt: (off mic) I mean that's kind of the premises of our whole department is we look at the proposals and determine if it's complaint or not and with the applicant provide a code compliant issuance. To kind of get back to Brandon's concern about liability and using previously established things. It's really keys for the structural engineer to be involved, to look at those assigned values of those materials being utilized. For instance, like the hollow clay tile situation, there's a way to strengthen that hollow clay tile that would not take away from the historical features but then there are cases where it's not. Especially, when it's utilized for an exit way or a rated corridor which can happen quite frequently over time. Actually, in the building across the street that was utilized and we made the determination that's – for it to come out. We did leave it in aspects of the exterior wall but we strengthen it and we had the engineer strengthen it in an appropriate way.

Chair Bower: (off mic) Do they have hollow clay tiles?

Mr. Hoyt: They still do. If you – those inset walls on the exterior of the few balconies areas up on the upper floors. That is hollow clay tiles still but it has a steel framed wall on the inside that anchored and structurally designed to keep it in place. So, it's just – there's a lot of technology out there these days and there's a lot of ways to get around it.

Chair Bower: After the '89 earthquake I demolished a single-story clay tile house. It was irretrievably damaged and it was the most frightening experience. Basically, the first – the excavator very carefully grabbed part of the building, trying to pull it towards the excavator and the entire building crashed. I mean it just – there was just nothing there and after that experience, I don't even want to be in a building that has hollow clay tile. It's just scary, anyway.

Board Member Bernstein: (off mic) George, can you speak about ADA like what kind of accommodations say getting into a building with a wheelchair? I think there's something (inaudible) provide another exit

with literally 200-feet or something from the freight entrance? There are some exceptions where the ADA can be in the back rather than in the street facing façade. There may be some new comments you might have.

Chair Bower: Martin, what page are you on?

Board Member Bernstein: Looking at Packet Page...

Mr. Hoyt: 43.

Board Member Bernstein: ...50 – oh, Page 58 I guess, Packet Page 58. Waivers from ADA requirements. I mean it's – yeah, Packet Page 58.

Chair Bower: Oh, yeah, I see.

Board Member Bernstein: Equivalent facilitation.

Mr. Hoyt: 58, alright.

Board Member Bernstein: (off mic) So if there's street facing façade and all of a sudden there's no way to comply with ADA. Are the exceptions to that? Does that become your approval for exceptions to that?

Mr. Hoyt: (off mic) Yeah, it does, it does become...

Board Member Makinen: (off mic) I tried to do that on a building...

Board Member Bernstein: You need your microphone on.

Board Member Makinen: I tried to do that at a building at Moffett Field, Building 20, which is now occupied by Carnegie Mellon, to put the ADA access in the back of the building. It didn't work out so well. We actually had to remove a window and put a little elevator in the front of the building.

Board Member Bernstein: (off mic) Oh, my gosh.

Board Member Makinen: So, the window was removed and a little door was made that looked like the window and – but they said that's not correct to require a disabled person to use something less than an able person would. It's demeaning to them or something, it diminishes them.

Board Member Bernstein: Who's the governing administrator on Moffett? Is that the federal government?

Board Member Makinen: Yeah.

Board Member Bernstein: So, was it – what department approves projects on Moffett Field?

Board Member Makinen: Well, I had to go – if had to go before – they had a Chief Building Official there too. Similar to what -- like a City and – but we had Page and Turnbull work as our consultant on that. They convinced me, I was the Historic Preservation Officer at the time, that that would not fly by putting the ADA in the back of the building.

Board Member Bernstein: So that goes back to George's comment about each CDO has the authority to make the decision one way or another.

Board Member Makinen: Yeah but they convinced me not to go down that road.

Mr. Hoyt: (off mic) I mean it is important to take all those considerations into – those aspects into consideration and there are abilities for waivers but there's also facilitation that needs to take into consideration. It's kind of going back to that how do you document these trade-offs for life safety issues versus other life safety issues and how we improve that. It's about the documentation, recording that we had done the best effort that we can, we've taken into all of the sensitive (inaudible) as much as possible.

Board Member Makinen: Yeah but the people affected by ADA are very vehement about not being treated as second class citizens.

Mr. Hoyt: That's right.

Board Member Bernstein: I understand. If you look on Packet Page 57 there's that – on the bottom under Section 8-603, Packet Page 57, there's the 200-feet that I was mentioning where...

Ms. French: Oh yeah.

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah, so I actually had a project in downtown Palo Alto where it was a historic building and that got approved. It was before George's time. Where we put the ADA entrance 200-foot linear from the front the door and that meant it be behind – so you had to go down the alley near Max's Smoke Shop and then the entrance is back there. Anyway, we used that 200-feet.

Chair Bower: Really?

Board Member Bernstein: Then there's a little accessibility sign saying entrance in the rear type of thing but again, Mike Makinen is pointing out the idea where this CBO, the Chief Building Official he was working with, denied that or they said don't. Don't even apply for that.

Board Member Makinen: Basically, they encouraged us not to proceed with that.

Chair Bower: Encouraged.

Ms. French: Well, that's interesting, it also says here Item 3 on that same section where security is a problem remote monitoring may be used. So, if you have a secondary entrance that serves as the ADA, you can have some kind of button that a person could push and then allow.

Board Member Bernstein: (off mic) To give assistance.

Ms. French: Yes.

Board Member Bernstein: But it's up to – well, they pointed it's up to the CBO whose jurisdiction it is to make the decisions.

Mr. Hoyt: (off mic) I think this table was really created to outline where these different sections – these different sections are all illustrated in the body of the code but kind of outline where the applicability could be versus a Title Two project versus a Title Three project for public entities, private entities, and (inaudible). So, taking into consideration what is the intent and how the provisions are being applied. This is really a tool – this Appendix A is a tool for the Building Official and their (inaudible) needs to try to make sure that we're facilitating in the right discipline.

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah, this building has a power-assisted door for example.

Ms. French: Yeah, that you want to use that way because it's hard to open if you don't use it that way.

Board Member Bernstein: I use them all the time, they are great. If your hands are full you just push it.

Ms. French: I've tried to run to the train at the end of the day and it's hard to push manually so I don't use that one when I'm in a hurry.

Board Member Bernstein: All the ADA ramps are great for bicycles and skateboarders.

Chair Bower: Any other questions for George? Well, he's here...

Ms. French: George, thank you for coming.

Chair Bower: ... and he's busy. Thank you for coming and spending time with us.

[many people started talking at once]

Mr. Hoyt: You're very welcome. Hopefully, this effort was helpful and provide some clarity.

Chair Bower: Well, it's now a record for people to be able to hear your descriptions. I mean that's the probably the highest value.

Ms. French: Well, and it's nice to have it in a bound version. I mean I keep this handy as well.

Chair Bower: Absolutely.

Board Member Makinen: Just one further question, it's kind of – handrails are like – I think they are like 44-inches for porches.

Mr. Hoyt: (off mic) Guard rails?

Board Member Makinen: Guard rails.

Board Member Bernstein: (off mic) 42.

Board Member Makinen: 42 but if you have a historic property where contextually it's not correct to have something 42-inches sticking up as a front porch.

Board Member Bernstein: (off mic) Oh yeah, that would actually be a great question, George. Say we have a qualified historic building and there's a 38-inch high guard rail or they call it guards now.

Mr. Hoyt: Well, looks, I mean we can look at the requirements and see if we can find it here real quick.

Ms. French: Yeah, you – somebody brought this up at the February meeting. Handrails as an example of one of these interesting – that comes up a lot.

Board Member Bernstein: Well, it would be the guard. The handrails are...

Ms. French: Guard, sorry.

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah, it's a guard.

Mr. Hoyt: Its 8-504, Page 10 of the Historic Building Code.

Ms. French: Packet Page...

Chair Bower: 42 maybe.

Mr. Hoyt: I'm finding – I'll find it here.

Ms. French: 42.

Board Member Wimmer: (off mic) Oh, here it is. Yeah, 42, (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Board Member Bernstein: Packet Page 42, very good.

Board Member Wimmer: The last section.

Ms. Hoyt: Yeah, the heights are beryllium guard rail and the spacing of the balusters may continue at their historical height and spacing unless a distinct hazard has been identified or created by a change of use in occupancy. So, basically what that is saying is if you're utilizing in the same fashion that you were before the building then it's probably ok unless it's falling and then it would be a hazard.

Board Member Bernstein: Sure. It's funny I've got a building where the guard is about this high. To me, it's a trip hazard. You fall right but...

Board Member Wimmer: Well, if you look across the street there's railings – like Juliet balcony railings on the historic University Art building and those are 24-inches.

Ms. French: But that's not – no one is going to (inaudible)(crosstalk)

[many people started talking at once]

Chair Bower: Those are decorative.

Board Member Wimmer: Right but it's an example.

Chair Bower: You could climb out the window I suppose.

Ms. French: Yeah, at your own risk.

Chair Bower: I don't think there's any (crosstalk) – there's nothing to stand on.

Mr. Hoyt: (inaudible) If you look at the Ramona side, there is some exterior balcony that have some lower access.

Board Member Wimmer: Some lower access.

Mr. Hoyt: So, I mean tried to take all of that stuff into consideration so that's an example of where the code gives us a little bit of discretion but also gives us some guidance.

Board Member Bernstein: Sure, yeah, good. Fantastic, this have been very useful, thank you, George.

Chair Bower: Thank you.

[many people started talking at once]

Mr. Hoyt: It was a pleasure meeting all of you.

Ms. French: We should have experts like you come more often.

Chair Bower: Yeah, we should.

Mr. Hoyt: I'll keep that in mind. Thank you (inaudible)

Board Member Makinen: Thanks, George.

Board Member Kohler: Thanks for coming.

Mr. Hoyt: You're very welcome.

Chair Bower: Ok so we're at our last topic of discussion which is community outreach regarding Palo Alto's...

Board Member Kohler: (off mic) What's his official title?

Chair Bower: Chief Building Official.

Board Member Kohler: (off mic) Oh yeah, sounds great.

Board Member Bernstein: Someone you should know.

Board Member Kohler: (off mic) (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Board Member Makinen: Stay on good terms with him.

Ms. French: So, I noted on Item Four in the Staff report that I would provide the Historic Preservation webpages At Places and I see that I did not do that. I do have my computer...

Board Member Bernstein: On the screen.

Ms. French: Yes, we were looking at that earlier so we've kind of covered that I guess to some extent.

Chair Bower: So, I think we're on Page 71 of the Packet.

Ms. French: Oh right, so this again was the – this was my presentation that I had prepared to give to the Realtor organization. They had requested that we – that I come out and give a presentation. So, I had prepared this, gave a presentation all about our program this fall. It was in October and so this just – so it lets you know what I've – they had some additional requests that – they wanted to know about Building Permits for housing units and such so that was part of my presentation. I basically covered what is our program, showed them the Professorville map, showed them about the webpages and that's where they can find things, talked about the Eichler Guidelines, talked about historic districts in our inventory, and explained that we have incentives for Categories One through Four, talked about the Dames and Moore windshield survey that ended up with 165 National Register eligible homes. Then one thing that is interesting is that 235 homes were deemed ineligible for National Register but that didn't mean that they were all ineligible for California Register. So, that was kind of one of these things that I've learned as part of this. For instance, in one case we had a National Register ineligible property that I had Page and Turnbull look at a little deeper to see if it was California Register as one of these two-story home projects came through. So, there are 1,750 homes that weren't evaluated further and these were all from circa 1948 and earlier. Obviously, there are more homes that haven't been evaluated now, since 1948. I told them about the process bulletin that we have and I showed it to them. We have the Group A; Group B and I think we're – I don't know. Everyone's familiar perhaps except Debbie who hasn't been with us as long. We have this bulletin that Margaret referred to earlier. This is one of our main tools to help people understand what the process is. That's Packet Page 81 – 80 and 81. It's kind of hard to see Page 80 but this is how we – we divide things into Group A or Group B and then I told them about the Comp Plan policy and how we're doing that. I talked about criteria for designation for historic resources so this came up earlier. If somebody wants to be on our inventory which is our register, they can come forward and propose that they get on or elevate their Category from a Three to a Two as the Toy Shop is planning to do. So, that they can ask for the TDRs or Bonus Floor Area. Anyways, this is just to tell you what I've been up to as far as exhausting the realtors with all this information.

Chair Bower: I did find – I knew I had seen in the Packet, there were incentives on Page 85. You actually have Zoning Code exceptions and incentives. Floor Area exemptions, attics of 500-square feet, basements, etc. Minimum Lot Size exemptions and Home Improvements exceptions yielding up to 250. These are – I knew I had seen them somewhere but I just couldn't put my fingers on them earlier. This is a good starting list. What I'd hope to add to that is expedited review time which would be a nice thing to be able to offer people who want to do historic renovations. Public Works especially, expedite a Public Works review. Martin?

Board Member Wimmer: (off mic) (inaudible) Staff...

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah, I agree with what Margaret Wimmer was just saying that expeditions, great. That would probably need additional Staff resources and I believe that that's not available right now. I would think it would take additional Staff resources to expedite.

Ms. French: (off mic) Well, so there's Staff and then there's Staff. I mean (inaudible) you mentioned Public Works. What kind of control do we have over Public Works? None.

Chair Bower: It's a City agency.

Ms. French: (off mic) It is, yes, I agree but you know that's a conversation that we can have as far as what types of (inaudible). The Public Works permits themselves that are not Planning Permits are Right of Way Encroachments, Street Work Permits, this kind of thing. Then Public Works also reviews our Planning Permits and our Building Permits. So, where is the sticking point with Public Works is where I'd like to understand?

Chair Bower: So again, in my ancient experience which is not currently up to date there use to be a big bottleneck at Building Plan Review. The City solved that problem by outsourcing that to private agencies that were identified by -- actually, I think the City now they just send them to somebody.

Board Member Bernstein: Correct.

Chair Bower: When I was working, we could choose so that took a 4-month review time down to a 7 to 10-day review time. Then it would go to Public Works and it would just sit there and they'd have to review it and there were all these issues that would come back. Where is the driveway cut going to be? Could you use the same driveway cut? Those are the ones – the only two I can remember. Sidewalks, do they need to be replaced? Now, I don't know, it just seems to me that one of the ways you could incentives people to use – to preserve their historic building is say ok, you apply and we'll put you at the top of the list – the deck. Now, I mean who would like that if you were not a historic building?

Board Member Bernstein: Exactly.

Chair Bower: Not anybody but I'm just – I'm thinking out loud. Incentives are just that.

Ms. French: (off mic) That's what...

Chair Bower: Make it worth somebody.

Ms. French: (off mic) ... has tools, right? So, I think Public Works does have the same tool that the Building Department has had for years. They do...(crosstalk)

Chair Bower: Really? They're outsourcing? Good.

Ms. French: ...some of their stuff.

Chair Bower: That's great. Alright, any other comments?

Board Member Bernstein: I have a question regarding – going back to the Historic Category or let me see, it's the Plan – let's see, Type A and Type B.

Vice Chair Corey: Group A?

Board Member Bernstein: Group A, yeah, thanks. Type A – Group A and Group B.

Ms. French: (off mic) That's a class.

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah, that if a building is determined or a project is determined to meet the conformance with the Secretary of Interior Standards then that removes any CEQA analysis. Is that correct?

Ms. French: (off mic) Oh, so if we have an HRI I think, a good one, not just the two pagers from the 1970s inventory and we're able to perform a Secretary of Interior Standards Compliance Review because we have enough information about the character-defining features etc. then there's no CEQA review. Is that what you're asking?

Board Member Bernstein: That's what I'm asking, yes.

Ms. French: Yes.

Board Member Bernstein: I like your answer.

Ms. French: (off mic) Sometimes we have homes that are on the inventory and somebody comes in and wants to change them and those 1970s inventory forms, if you've seen them, are a two-sided of this is a nice old building basically. Oh, and by so and so and so they moved out in whatever era. So, it doesn't have enough there for us to help with that. Well, we can guess at it but it's nice to have more robust information about the home.

Board Member Bernstein: Ok, well good, ok. So, a focus would be on – yeah, a focus would be to – yeah, so if the project is deemed to be conforming with the Secretary of Interior Standards and that change – then there's not a...

Ms. French: (off mic) Right, then it's exempted.

Board Member Bernstein: It's exempted, thank you, great thank you.

Board Member Makinen: Just one point of going back to Page 84, the first sentence up here. "If the structure is identified with the lives of historic people are important events in the City, state, or nation." We have discussed in the past doing a review of the technical facilities in the City and that seems – that fits into important events. Some of the tech facilities have never been captured as being historically significant. Where do we stand on that?

Chair Bower: I'd like to offer some information about the PAST – what do they have, those walks? I can't...

Board Member Bernstein: (off mic) Historic...

Chair Bower: Historic tours, sorry, walking tours and just last spring – I mean last fall Board Member Crane and I led a tech walk of the downtown area where Bo had inventoried various places where tech companies had started. Obviously – and we ended at the Hewlett Packard garage property but there is – I'm sure I can get Bo to forward that to me and I'll forward that to you.

Board Member Kohler: (off mic) (inaudible) two doors from my house.

Chair Bower: It's a pretty interesting thing and it's not even remotely exhaustive. I mean he's done a huge amount of work but there's still more stuff. He has also, un-parenthetically, just finished a list of rock star sights in Palo Alto. Places where rock stars were born or lived or created bands and it's really astoundingly interesting.

[many people started talking at once]

Board Member Makinen: Who's doing this?

Board Member Kohler: Bo Crane.

Chair Bower: Bo Crane is a Board Member of Palo Alto Stanford Heritage.

Board Member Makinen: Oh yeah?

Board Member Kohler: (off mic) He's two doors from me.

Board Member Shephard: If we went – someday when we have the Palo Alto Museum or History Museum all of that will hopefully be interrupted.

Chair Bower: I've actually asked Bo if he'd be interested in coming and talking to the HRB about this.

Ms. French: Is he?

Chair Bower: Yeah, sure.

Board Member Kohler: (off mic) You know I just had a strange memory.

Ms. French: I believe we could put it on the agenda for a future meeting.

Chair Bower: Sure.

Board Member Makinen: But I don't know...

Board Member Kohler: The future museum is over there near...

Board Member Bernstein: (off mic) Roth Building.

Chair Bower: Roth Building.

Board Member Kohler: (off mic) I think – for some reason I have a – you know I'm...

Ms. French: Oh, turn on your mic. I keep forgetting to ask that (crosstalk)

Board Member Kohler: Oh, I'm having a bit of memory problem anyway but I think – I took a bunch of stuff and put it in one of those little rooms in that place. I think it was – maybe the stuff is still there. I can't remember what it was but I remember going down there and filling this little room with some of my stuff. I don't know what it was and...

Chair Bower: Well, it's probably over at Cubberley now because everything – there was – there were some records down there but I think they've been moved to Cubberley.

Ms. French: (off mic) The Archive Center.

Chair Bower: All the stuff in the basement of the main library, the Rinconada Library, moved over there. All that eventually is going to come back.

Board Member Kohler: So, they're going to redo my high school – Cubberley. It's going to get wiped out and redone.

Board Member Makinen: Oh yeah?

Chair Bower: Maybe.

Board Member Kohler: Did you see the paper? They're redoing all the...

Ms. French: That's on the agenda either but...

Chair Bower: That's not on our agenda.

Board Member Kohler: Well I'm just saying maybe it should be is what I guess I'm...

Ms. French: If – there's another topic. There are a number of topics that, being that we don't have a lot of projects come through this Board, stuff that was mentioned today. Perhaps David and I will have a meeting and talk through some of the topics that were brought up today and think about – given that he's going to be out for a few meetings -- which dates might be appropriate for study sessions or something.

Chair Bower: You certainly can have meetings without me.

Ms. French: Well sure but you know we need to mastermind what's going to come when and what's more important to come sooner and later.

Board Member Makinen: Well, that tech facility things were emphasized by one of our former Deputy Mayors. I can't recall his name right now. He was very interested in us pursuing the contributions of the tech facilities that exist in Silicon Valley. Here this is supposed to be the epic center of technology and we haven't recognized any of these buildings.

Board Member Kohler: That's right.

Board Member Makinen: We up to a lot of criticism for that.

Board Member Kohler: Yeah, this is the one right here that I drive by almost every day.

Chair Bower: Ok we have probably finished the topic on outreach. Martin?

Board Member Bernstein: Oh, does outreach include the how do we find – get – going back to Board Member Makinen's comment at a previous meeting about the outreach using Pasadena's model. Is outreach part of that of the subject of outreach?

Chair Bower: Remind me what your comment was?

Board Member Makinen: Well I said we probably should do more in the way of outreach with the community to have them recognized. We certainly should have something highlighting the local significant architects and builders who have built this town and made it historically correct. I don't see anything like that.

Board Member Bernstein: One comment I had and I – when I was President of PAST, I brought this subject up and that was who are the next generation of historic building property owners? That's the children of people who own historic buildings today. So, is there anything in the school system – how can we reach

school children and teach local history so that they understand as teenagers this historic environment instead of waiting for adults to learn about it?

Chair Bower: One of the things we talked about at last night's PAST Board meeting, speaking of outreach, is the – this is the 125th anniversary of Palo Alto. Next year will be the 100th anniversary of Birge Clark's first buildings. Now he actually was or participated in the design of the Hoover House at Stanford but apparently, he was – I was told last night that he was assigned a job but his first building in Palo Alto were built in 1920. That's something that we could certainly celebrate or recognize. That's pretty significant, a 100 – in a small community like Palo Alto in 1920 to have buildings that one architect – Pedro deLemos is the other one – have them survive 100-years. That's a pretty significant achievement.

Board Member Bernstein: From people – my colleagues in Italy laugh at that idea.

Chair Bower: Well, ok, well this is not Italy, this is Palo Alto.

Board Member Bernstein: I don't but I just say they always laugh.

Chair Bower: 125-years ago there was not a lot here. In fact, I don't know that there are any buildings that survived from 1894 except maybe the water tower. The water tower building might but I think...

Ms. French: (off mic) The oldest house in Palo Alto in College Terrace that came up recently. I'm trying to think of the address. It's a Victorian.

Board Member Makinen: Well, I know in Pasadena there's a group called Pasadena Heritage and they celebrate a lot of their significant architects. Green and Green and there's a whole number...

Chair Bower: Oh yeah.

Board Member Makinen: ...of different architects that were very significant in contributing to the arts and crafts movement in Pasadena. That is exposed to the people in that town continually.

Board Member Bernstein: The -- in Pasadena in the Central Business District for example, on all the corners of all the streets, it actually talks about the history of what happened on that street. There's like a large plaque like this and it says who owned the building, what happened here and all that stuff. So, that people of all ages, including children, start hearing – getting that information right away.

Board Member Makinen: If that isn't pasted on it's going to be lost. We got some significant contributors here in this town that...

Ms. French: (off mic) Yeah, it seems like a good thing for PAST to (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Bower: Yeah, that's true. Are we done with outreach?

Ms. French: Yep.

[The Board moved to Agenda Item Subcommittees]

Action Items

Approval of Minutes

3. Approval of the draft Minutes of the February 14, 2019, Historic Resources Board Meeting

Chair Bower: Let's jump down to approval of minutes since I think we can get rid of that quickly. Are there any corrections or deletions? Martin?

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, thank you, Chair Bower. On the Packet Page 104.

Board Member Makinen: What page are we on?

Chair Bower: 104.

Board Member Bernstein: Packet Page 104...

Chair Bower: Those are the pages on the bottom right-hand corner – left-hand corner.

Board Member Bernstein: ... under – about the 4th paragraph up where it says Board Member Bernstein and the middle of that paragraph it says I just didn't want another tree permit on our property. I should be corrected to say I just don't want another Tree Permit – that's right –Tree Demolish Permit. It should be Tree Demolition Permit.

Chair Bower: Ok so fourth paragraph?

Board Member Bernstein: Let's see, it's the – from the bottom, it's one, two, three...

Chair Bower: Oh, from the bottom.

Board Member Bernstein: ... four...

Ms. French: Fifth from the bottom.

Board Member Bernstein: Fifth from the bottom.

Ms. French: I got (inaudible).

Chair Bower: Fifth from the bottom.

Board Member Bernstein: So, it should say Tree Demolition Permit and then on Page 10 – Packet Page 106, the first paragraph where it says Board Member Makinen and the sentence – second line, and Board Member Makinen you can collaborate this. It says and that to make it suitable for modern living, not moderate living, correct? Yeah. Then on the same Packet Page 106, the second sentence from the bottom where it says divided light versus a tree divided light...

Chair Bower: True.

Board Member Bernstein: ... it should be versus a true divided light.

Ms. French: (off mic) I'm sorry, say which page you are on again?

Board Member Bernstein: Packet Page 106.

Ms. French: (off mic) Ok and the second paragraph from the bottom?

Board Member Bernstein: No, the second sentence up from the bottom. Oh, second line up from the bottom where it says...

Ms. French: (off mic) Oh, true divided light.

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, it should be true divided light.

Ms. French: (off mic) Yeah, I've seen some other errors just as we were looking here so I'll – like overriding principle, I think it's overwriting...

Board Member Bernstein: Oh yes.

Ms. French: (off mic) ... and (inaudible)

Chair Bower: It depends on whether you're writing or riding.

Board Member Makinen: (off mic) And also going back to the first paragraph I was quoted.

Board Member Bernstein: What Packet Page is that?

Chair Bower: It's 106.

Board Member Makinen: (off mic) It's 106, the third line, I think that's the overriding...

Ms. French: (off mic) Yeah, that's what I was just saying. It's – yeah, overwriting. Then I also noticed on the same – 104, Bernstein's paragraph, where you call that an (inaudible) Demolition Permit which is an error, just a typo, it needs to say to close, to close to a tree.

Board Member Bernstein: Oh, yes, right. Yes. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Alright, if any other corrections, deletions, changes? Not seeing any do I have a motion for approval?

MOTION

Board Member Bernstein: Motion to approve as amended.

Chair Bower: Ok, second?

Board Member Makinen: I'll second it.

Chair Bower: Ok, Michael will second. All in favor? Any opposed? None. Ok so...

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0 WITH VICE CHAIR COREY ABSENT

[The Board moved back up to oral communications.]

Subcommittee Items

Chair Bower: Let's – we don't have any subcommittee reports.

Board Member Questions, Comments and Announcements

Chair Bower: Board Member's announcements or – I would like to highlight tonight's meeting with Supervisor Simitian in the – I guess it's in the Council Chambers or in this room. He's a – it's an open house – no, it's a constituent meeting about the Stanford General Use Permit; focused on that. There is a (inaudible) – as I'm sure you all know there's a significant proposal by Stanford relating to their historic building. We had that proposal reviewed for a set of meetings last year when Laura Jones from Stanford Historian came and they are still – they are pushing a very, very narrow application of criteria that I think is going to get relatively significant push back. Not clear my Stanford should have their own unique historic

review of their properties. So, I encourage all that can to watch or participate in any way. It's pretty significant. Stanford, of course, is a big partner with Palo Alto and...

Ms. French: Do you know what time the meeting is?

Chair Bower: 6:30 I think.

Ms. French: That's tonight?

Chair Bower: Yeah. Is that right Debbie? You would...

Board Member Shepherd: (off mic) That sounds right. Unfortunately, I can't go but your (inaudible) (crosstalk)

Board Member Makinen: Right here?

Chair Bower: Yeah, its in this building. I think it's going to be in the Council Chambers because there will be a relative, I think robust conversation. Martin?

Board Member Bernstein: Also, this – let me close that door.

Board Member Wimmer: I'll get it, I'll get it.

Board Member Bernstein: Ok, yeah, and then I'll make my comment. Great, thanks. On this Monday -- I don't have the meeting date and location, this Sunday there's a discussion regarding the State Senate Bill 50...

Chair Bower: Oh, right.

Board Member Bernstein: ... and some significant legislators are going to be there. It's – I can email maybe – if you want – if people want to know I can email you?

Ms. French: Sure, and I'll it sends it out.

Board Member Bernstein: The discussion is Senate Bill – State Senate Bill 50 is proposing that Cities will not have any control over the heights of buildings...

Chair Bower: Zoning.

Board Member Bernstein: ...including in residential zones that are near transit areas. So, Professorville is near a transit district area and then so no height limit or they can go up to 50-feet. Anyway, that's this Sunday.

Ms. French: (off mic) I imagine that's just for commercial areas, right?

Chair Bower: No, it's any area (crosstalk)

Board Member Bernstein: It says transit – any place near transit, period. It doesn't matter if it's zoned for commercial or residential.

Chair Bower: There are specific zones if you are within 2,000-feet of a major transit hub like San Francisco – the Palo Alto Depo, then that's one zone. That's the hottest zone.

Ms. French: (off mic) 2,000-feet?

Chair Bower: I think or maybe even less because then there's a quarter mile zone.

Ms. French: (off mic) That's like the walking (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Bower: Then there's a half mile zone and my house, for instance, is in the half-mile zone because University Avenue is considered a major transportation center – artery. So, we could have a 5-story building built next door to us. It's pretty amazing and it's very – this came up last year. This is Senator – is it...

Board Member Bernstein: Weiner.

Chair Bower: Weiner, right. The former San Francisco Supervisor and the purpose of this is to develop housing, residential housing but it's blunt force trauma on local planning decisions.

Board Member Bernstein: Mayor Filseth had made reference to it at his State of the City Address and he showed examples of a house – an Eichler house over here and a 50-story building – 5-story building right next to it. Anyway, so that'd be – so that becomes state law that says to the Cities well, thank you for your zoning ideas but here's what you're going – a developer is going to be allowed to do it.

Chair Bower: Right, a developer...

Board Member Bernstein: And how does that transform into – how's that conflict with any of the historic preservation goals?

Chair Bower: It doesn't.

Ms. French: (off mic) So I want to be cognizant of time and parking. (crosstalk)

Chair Bower: Yep, I think the – alright any other announcements? No, and so I think that completes our meeting. Thank you very much for all your contributions. See you – Amy, any idea when our next meeting will occur?

Ms. French: (off mic) Well, I was going to go back and look at it. I know you said you weren't going to be here.

Chair Bower: next -- Two weeks from now I don't – did you have anything on that...

Ms. French: Somebody was not – you weren't going to be here on the 11th either so I would say the next one is...

Chair Bower: The 25th?

Ms. French: ...April 25th.

Chair Bower: Alright.

Ms. French: If we want to have all available...

Chair Bower: Good, well lets...(crosstalk)

Ms. French: ... we can start chatting...

Chair Bower: ... work on our agenda.

Ms. French: ... about what we might put on the agenda.

Chair Bower: Great, thank you.

Ms. French: Alright, thank you.

Chair Bower: Thank you.

Adjournment