



Historic Resources Board

Staff Report (ID # 14007)

Report Type: Approval of Minutes **Meeting Date:** 2/24/2022

Summary Title: HRB Draft Minutes October 28, 2021

Title: Approval of Historic Resources Board Draft Minutes of October 28, 2021

From: Jonathan Lait

Recommendation

Staff recommends the Historic Resources Board (HRB) adopt the attached meeting minutes.

Background

Attached are minutes for the following meeting(s):

- October 28, 2021

Attachments:

- Attachment A: HRB Draft Minutes October 28, 2021 (DOCX)



HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING

MINUTES: October 28, 2021

Virtual Teleconference Meeting
8:30 A.M.

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Caroline Willis, Vice Chair Christian Pease; Board Members, Michael Makinen, Margaret Wimmer, Christian Pease, Gogo Heinrich, and David Bower

Absent:

Oral Communications

[None]

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Willis recommended that the approval of the minutes be moved to the beginning of meetings going forward.

Motion by Chair Willis to move the approval of minutes to the beginning of the agenda of all future meetings. Seconded by Vice Chair Pease, the motion carried unanimously, by roll call vote.

Approval of Minutes

4. Approval of Historic Resources Board Draft Minutes of September 9, 2021.

Motion by Vice Chair Pease to approve the minutes of September 9, 2021. Seconded by Board Member Bower, the motion carried unanimously, by voice vote.

City Official Reports

1. Historic Resources Board Schedule of Meeting and Assignments

Chair Willis requested that the schedule include both the January and December meetings. Ms. French advised that the Board Retreat will be held on December 9th and could be done in-person, which would be a hybrid meeting. She said the Council will hold their first in-person, hybrid meeting this coming week. She said that only the Chamber is currently set up to do hybrid meetings, so the retreat would have to be held at the Chambers, because it is a requirement that the meetings are recorded, and with a quorum of members. Hybrid meetings are not required until January. Ms. French explained that a hybrid meeting is when all of the Board Members are present in the Chambers, and the public may attend. Staff will be present remotely, and Zoom participation will also be available for the public. Chair Willis asked if they could meet in the staff area, around a table. Ms. French wasn't sure since the meeting will be filmed.

Chair Willis requested the Board meet in person for the December meeting. All Board Members agreed to this. Chair Willis hoped that they could meet at a table, face-to-face, as opposed to seated on the dais.

Chair Willis advised that the meeting scheduled for December 23rd probably won't happen. The January meetings would be scheduled for the 13th and 27th, and she hoped to hold both of them in order to get started working on goals set at the retreat. Board Member Bower advised he will not be available on the 13th, but could probably attend via Zoom. Ms. French said the options for HRB meetings are officially listed as the second and fourth Thursday of each month, although typically it is based on what is on the agenda. She commented that she would prefer to get staff reports out before the week of the 20th for meetings in December.

Chair Willis reiterated she would like to get back on a regular schedule, and she would like the Board to be more proactive than reactive. She would like to meet on the second and fourth Thursdays of the month through 2022 and suggested this be discussed at the retreat.

2. Review Potential Discussion Topics for December 2021 Retreat.

Chair Willis asked for feedback from the Board Members on items for discussion at the retreat. Vice Chair Pease thought she had outlined the topics very well, although they have not yet discussed the teams the Chair wished to organize. Board Member Wimmer thought the teams were a wonderful idea and that they should perhaps go over each team and discuss their tasks, add or subtract from them, and learn the Chair's thought process on each of them.

Chair Willis began discussion on Team One. She said she felt mapping is important, because their historic districts are their strong suit, and if there are concentrations of other historic buildings, it would be good to have a visual awareness of them. She hoped there might be a City program that would make it easy to do this as an overlay. She suggested that a team of two take this on and come back at the December retreat and share how this might actually work. Board Member Bower asked for clarification on the term mapping and what activity would be involved in this. Chair Willis wasn't sure but said she assumed the City has a mapping program used for various purposes, such as zoning districts, flood plains, et cetera. She thought they could take the map and outline Professorville and the downtown, as well as potential historic districts that Dames and Moore had identified. She thought they might be able to highlight the ones and twos in terms of historic properties, and the threes and fours.

Board Member Bower asked Ms. French if there was such software. She replied there is a GIST system in Palo Alto which is used to create the parcel maps. She commented that, due to the shape of the city on a map, it may be difficult to look at this on one map. She said they do have maps of Professorville and the zoned districts online currently. Chair Willis asked if there was a map that could be pulled up showing the four historic districts on one map. Ms. French responded that there may be, and she will check on this. Vice Chair Pease thought this was a good idea and ideally, they could have a map with layers to reduce confusion. He said there was great data in the packet provided by staff, and ideally, those could be integrated. He wondered however, how realistic it was and how many resources it would take to do it. He thought it would be wonderful to have a site where residents and Board Members could go to look at the map and layer it with such things as what is in the inventory and what's not, where the historic districts are, et cetera.

Chair Willis said she is willing to start small, and if all they could do was take a map of Palo Alto and mark out the districts and properties with a marker it would be better than nothing. She hoped they could work towards something in which the historic districts are integrated with the rest of the information. Board Member Wimmer said she uses the parcel maps often to look up properties. She said people use them to look up their own properties, and a click of a button will bring up a summary of the property with certain details, including a historic rating. She thought they could possibly start there, by perhaps applying a special color for certain properties, since it is a map already in existence. She felt it would be easy to accentuate the existing map with that feature first, as a first step, and then pulling that information onto a special HRB map, or a historic planning map. Chair Willis asked Ms. French if someone on the staff could look at the parcel maps and figure out a way to identify things that are already designated historic. Ms. French thought they should engage Roland Rivera from the Planning Department, who would have the knowledge base for that. She suggested the first meeting of the Committee Number One might try to get Mr. Rivera to come to the meeting to answer these types of questions.

Chair Willis asked if there were further comments and asked if anyone was interested in this committee. Board Member Heinrich was interested in participating. Board Member Bower thought the discussion on SB 9 and SB 478 might have some impact on this, because, as he understood the staff report, historic districts and historic properties on the Historic Register are exempt from the legislation, so this might be an incentive for owners of potentially historic properties or people living in potential historic districts to escape this subdivision of land that will be occurring. He looked forward to hearing more about those two bills and thought it might also have a bearing on how to move forward on this particular initiative.

Chair Willis shared her thoughts on Team Two, stating she was curious why the properties that were identified 25 years ago as National Register eligible are not on their local inventory. She thought this might require some history and understanding of what has come before them. She said that updating their inventory is crucial and she hoped Team Two would take this on. Board Member Wimmer questioned how

to accomplish this, because the 1998 was called a “dashboard survey.” She wondered if this same format would be used this time and whether they would revisit all of the those that were considered eligible and also incorporate some new properties that are not currently on the list. Chair Willis said her thought was that there is the list of potentially National Register eligible, and California Register eligible. She thought this team could be tasked with deciding on a process for working through this. She advocated starting slowly, with National Register Eligible properties. There are DPR sheets on all of them that are fairly extensive. Generally, she hoped this team would organize how they move forward. She added that she hoped all four of the teams would come back from the retreat and share plans on how to get from their current point A, to point B, to point C.

Board Member Bower asked how many DPR forms there are. Ms. French said she will be presenting on this later, but there were 165 properties deemed eligible for National Register as part of the 1998 to 2000 survey. Since the Comprehensive Plan in 2017, with Program 7.2, they have identified 10 additional properties that are California Register Eligible, and many that are not California Register Eligibles. These are more likely to be gone. She said the studies were done based on the “windshield survey” of potentially eligibles, which basically means unevaluated properties that dated before 1948. Chair Willis clarified that the windshield survey was more the California Register Eligible properties; however, on the 165, there is some substantial information out on those, so she assumed the work is already done. Ms. French said for all of the 165 that were sent to the State that are on the State record as eligible for National Register and California Register Eligible, those are the 165, and they have DPR forms for all of those. Also, she said they have DPR forms for the ineligible, which are those in the 1998 to 2000 survey period that were found ineligible for National Register and also newer, since 2018, DPR forms for those determined eligible for California Register and those that are deemed not eligible for California Register. She said this is quite a few more DPR forms since the Comprehensive Plan adoption of the 7.2 Policy at the end of 2017. Chair Willis noted that as a Certified Local Government, they are required to have a system for adding to and maintaining their inventory. She thought this could be part of Team Two’s tasks. Board Member Bower thought they were also supposed to routinely do the survey, which they have not done for 20-some years.

Board Member Wimmer asked about packet pages 38-40, the 3D, and wondered whether these were the 165 properties listed. Ms. French clarified on the survey from 2000 which pages showed the deemed eligible as one of the attachments. Ms. French said the sheet stating, “Evaluation Tables from 1998 to 200, Historic Inventory” are the ones that are deemed National Register eligible that are on file with the State as eligible for National and California listing. They are not on this list, so they are not protected in the event of a ministerial permit going through. They are only protected for CEQA purposes. Chair Willis said some of these were determined not to be National Register Eligible on the valuation tables from 1998 to 2000 Historic Survey. She believed there are DPR forms for all of the current. Ms. French said in addition to the 165 forms of those that were deemed eligible, they have many more DPR forms for the deemed ineligible from the survey in 2000.

Vice Chair Pease said it is easier to follow all of this in the PDF. He thought staff did a good job of dividing these long lists and highlighting them by category. The orange highlighted list is the ones they were referring to which are qualified but not moved to their list. Board Member Wimmer asked if there was a way to get DPR forms other than from staff, or if there was a way to upload the information so that a homeowner could extract it from the internet. Ms. French said they need to request this from staff. She explained that she looks at the eligible and ineligible lists, because sometimes the ineligible DPR forms have nuggets that prompt her to have the consultant look further, statements about some reason why they couldn’t finish the study, and it is incomplete. She said it is a painstaking process for her, and what is shown online is whether it is deemed eligible or only potentially eligible, or a historic resource category 1-4. Chair Willis said that she thought they were also in the historic files, but filed by address. Ms. French added that the library has copy of all of them, as well as City Hall. They were scanned at one point. Chair Willis thought they needed to go back and look at the ones that were deemed ineligible. One of them is her own house, which had an addition in the 50’s.

Chair Willis discussed Team Three, stating she wants the Mills Act situation to either be nailed or just not go there. She thought they should get ready to go to Council, hopefully in the first half of next week, with some proposal to at least have a trial period of four or five. Board Member Bower thought the work that Board Member Wimmer and Brandon Corey did moves them fairly far along. He thought the Council would probably adopt a Mills Act program, but whether or not they would spend the money was a different question; however he did think the Chair’s goals were within reach.

Chair Willis invited the Board Members to share their preference for which team. Board Member Bower volunteered for the Mills Act team since he has some knowledge of it. Board Member Pease indicated he would participate on Team One. Board Member Wimmer said she preferred to be on the Mills Act Team since she was previously on the preliminary committee. Board Member Makinen volunteered for Team One, along with Chair Willis. Regarding Team Two, Board Member Wimmer indicated she would help Chair Willis on this team as well. Chair Willis said she may also call on members for help on this team if needed.

Ms. French announced that the HRB position that was vacated will need to be filled, and it is an active recruitment program. The deadline is imminent; however, the person does not need to live in a historic inventory property 1 or 2, or in Professorville or a historic district, because they have that person in Board Member Heinrich, who lives in Professorville. Chair Willis asked if there were any applicants, and Ms. French advised she has not received a list. She felt the date for closing of recruitment was this week.

Action Items

3. Update on Recent State Housing Legislation and Housing Opportunity Sites Selection Process and HRB Discussion of Potential Amendments to the Historic Resources Board Work Plan

Ms. French presented an update on housing legislation and topics related to that legislation. There were four notable bills in the legislative session. The most notable and impactful bill for unlisted historic resources is SB 9, which goes into effect in January. SB 9 will enable ministerial lot splits and duplex development in non-historic single residential zones, including those properties that are not listed on any register or inventory.

Housing Legislation SB 8, 9, 10 and 478 impact Palo Alto's policies on streamlining and housing production. Ms. French said she learned that HCD is adding enforcement staff for oversight of SB 9. However, there is some capacity for the City to develop objective standards and lay down some basic rules which implement State law in a way in which they can have some level of control. This will go to the Council on December 6th as an Urgency Ordinance. She said that the changes are unavoidable, so it is a good time for the HRB to learn about them and weigh in.

Regarding historic resources, Ms. French read from the law's description of exempt properties, which states, "A site located within a historic or landmark district or a site that has a historic property or landmark under state or local law as specified." Regarding urban lot split requirements and duplex provisions, the Urgency Ordinance cannot call these "projects" under CEQA with a ministerial review. Historic resources individually listed on the local inventory and California and National Historic Registers, as well as Professorville, Greenmeadow and Green Gables are protected. Resources deemed eligible but not listed on any register or local inventory are not protected. The Urgency Ordinance will deal with a "deconstruction loophole" created in 2020 which has caused some problems for staff in trying to retain homes in a process of rehabilitation when they want to deconstruct the home.

Board Member Bower clarified that this means demolition. Ms. French said it is no longer called demolition, but a mandatory deconstruction. She explained that because of the way Title 18 code is written, which was not amended when Chapter 5.24 was amended, it leaves them in a bind because previously an applicant had to get their building permit for a single story home before a demolition permit was issued. Now, because of the way the code is written, people are doing the demolition before they get an approved one-story home. Board Member Bower said it is a semantic difference but with the same result. It leaves staff without the ability to slow down the process in order to determine whether the property is California Register eligible.

Regarding the 6th cycle of the Housing Element Update, Ms. French reported that the Housing Element Working Group is in the process of identifying sites which might support the development of up to 6,086 units. An appeal on this number was turned down by the ABAG group, so the City is in the process of trying to find sites to enable developers to come forward and develop housing units. This is proceeding through an Ad Hoc Committee involving Council Members who will meet on November 9th. The Planning Commission will be receiving an update on the site selection process on November 10th, and on November 4th there will be a Housing Element Working Group meeting.

Regarding the HRB, she said when the lists are generated the age of a property does factor into putting it on the list, but not in a good way for preservation, but rather in the sense that it is older, possibly not well-maintained, making it subject to being redeveloped in the near future. The process involves trying to catch the ones that show up which are on the deemed eligible list and get them removed from the list of sites.

She said the unevaluated, potentially eligible from the parcel reports dating earlier than 1948 will be kept on the list of sites, because they have not been found eligible and are not on the inventory.

Ms. French said the work plan submitted by the HRB back in June may need a request to Council to adjust it in order to implement the new Comprehensive Plan policy, L7.1.1 She said when the Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 2017 the Council had noted this as a “routine” task, but it is not routine to nominate deemed-eligible properties to the local inventory. She felt the Ad Hoc committee could be helpful, along with their consultant, to recommend whether properties that are National Register Eligible and California Register Eligible are Category 1 or Category 2. Under Chapter 16.49 there is a process for the HRB to nominate and Council to review a package of nominated properties. Outreach to the property owners would be necessary, and they would then be subject to the Historic Preservation Ordinance. That outreach is not currently resourced, so the Ad Hoc Committee would be needed to help with this.

Ms. French suggested talking about future work plans at the retreat. She said there is a medium-term priority of re-assessing the Historic Preservation Ordinance which is old and does not protect Category 3’s or 4’s outside of Professorville or downtown. There is also no section in the Ordinance which asks to remove resources from the inventory, and there is no recognition of properties deemed eligible. She said looking at what medium-term means, it would be five to ten years from the date of the Comprehensive Plan. Between 2022 and 2027 would the timeframe when the Council thought this would occur.

Ms. French reiterated the question of “What is routine implementation?” She said updating the inventory to include resources that are eligible is a Comprehensive Plan program. Since it is identified as routine, they provide updates on their Comprehensive Plan implementation as an annual requirement of the State. The effort to update the inventory has not been started, but SB 9 necessitates that work begin on this program soon, though it is not routine work.

Ms. French explained that Chapter 5.24, which changed in 2020, makes Category 3 and 4 resources more vulnerable, because the property owners say they are going to do deconstruction, and the loophole in the Code allows them to take out a demolition permit and not have an approved single family home. Currently, before 5.24 was changed, the only thing that had to happen for people to remove Category 3 or 4 outside of Professorville was to come in with a one-story home plan, building permit, which is not a discretionary process. Now with SB 9, they are faced with people coming in with ministerial permits for duplexes and lot splits. Again, in that case the Category 3’s and 4’s are protected because they are on the local inventory list. She shared that 345 Coleridge, a Category 3 property, will be coming down.

Board Member Bower asked Ms. French in regard to lot splits and duplexes – two different activities – if the SB 9 ordinance would allow any lot to be split into two separate lots. Also, he wondered if this suggested that without splitting the lot, two different residences could be built. Ms. French responded that of the two aspects of SB, one is to allow lot splits into equal-sized frontages and lots in order to increase housing. The other is to develop duplexes on R-1 properties. All R-1 and RE properties in Palo Alto will be subject to the new law in January. Board Member Bower asked if any size lots, for example, a 3000-square foot lot – could be subdivided. Ms. French said there is a minimum lot size, but it is very small. Board Member Bower was curious what the threshold is. He thought the bill might be an incentive for a number of people who are uncomfortable about historic designations to rethink that, because it would help them preserve at least their property although, they would probably not develop their property, so it might be a moot point if what they really want is for the people next to them to protect their property so they don’t end up living next to a four-unit building or a duplex. Ms. French acknowledged it’s a little scary but there are some additional conditions that apply. One is that it prohibits demolition of more the 25 percent of exterior walls of an existing structure unless the local ordinance allows greater demolition, or if the site has not been occupied by a tenant in the last three years. So, there are things related to tenancy and ownership that do make a difference.

Vice Chair Pease asked what the maximum number of units would be that could be built on a split lot, including ADUs and junior ADUs. Ms. French said her understanding was if the lot is split then a duplex can be built on each of those lots. Her understanding was that if a lot was split, there could be a duplex or an ADU, although the question is if there is a single family home and an ADU, if a junior ADU could be added, and she thought this was the case, with the caveat that she is not an expert on the subject and all the information on this. Vice Chair Pease acknowledged he has been trying to follow this, and it is difficult, but at minimum if a person was willing to tear down an existing home, the lot could be split into two, and four units – two duplexes – could be built. Ms. French felt this was correct.

Board Member Wimmer thought there was a rule from years ago in which Palo Alto would no longer allow flag lots. So this would create all sorts of flag lots by dividing one property into two, because of need for access to the back house by a ten-foot driveway. She asked if there was any way to increase the need for parking so that those trying to divide 150-foot-deep lot by 50, with setbacks of 20 feet, along with the lot depth, she figured the buildable area depth for each property would be 35 feet, making tiny houses if they have to have parking and access to the back one. Ms. French said new flag lots are not allowed in the R1 zone, so SB 9 would call for equal frontage lots, so not forcing them to have flag lots. Board Member Wimmer said then two 25-foot lots would result, of which there are many in College Terrace – a nightmare for designing suitable housing, resulting in units that look like trailers.

Ms. French said item 12 of SB 9 – in the Planning Commission staff report for October 13th – specifies that both newly-created parcels must be at least 1,200 square feet unless the City adopts a small minimum lot size by ordinance. Board Member Wimmer thought one thing they had going for them was that maybe dividing these lots up would render them very challenging to design and maybe that is when their IR process kicks in. “Just say no to single wides.” Ms. French replied that the IR process is a discretionary process, and they are not allowed to have a discretionary process with an SB 9 project. This is why part of the extreme effort right now is to figure out how to make objective standards that are basically zoning development standards that do not require discretionary review.

Board Member Wimmer wondered about increasing the ability for neighbors to comment, as there is always a neighbor in the neighborhood who objects to a project. She admitted this idea may not make sense, but she advocated finding some way to avoid these units. Ms. French responded that the lot splits under SB 9 are not allowed to be discretionary or CEQA processes. So the requirement for neighbor notification would have to be a local requirement and it would not be part of a discretionary review process. Notification certainly, and people could object, but she didn’t know what effect that would have because it’s not an appealable discretionary process. She reiterated it is a very complex situation that couldn’t be solved there. She just wanted them to be aware and that the HRB could consider putting this request onto the work plan and having Council see the readiness of the HRB to at least try to protect these deemed-eligible properties and see what they are trying to create for objective standards.

Board Member Bower asked if his understanding was correct that with this complex bill, the HRB could recommend to the Council, at least initially, to capture Category 3 and 4 buildings into the ordinance, which is what she was recommending. Ms. French replied that, ironically, SB 9 projects are not allowed on any property listed, so since Category 3’s and 4’s are listed on their inventory, they are protected from SB 9 projects. What they are not protected from is new single family, single story homes that wish to demolish the Category 3 or 4 buildings. Board Member Bower responded that in that sense, that is not changed. It has always been the case. Ms. French replied to it has always been the case, but it has become more apparent because of the deconstruction loophole that does not allow time to evaluate them. Board Member Bower said then that is what the HRB could recommend to the Council, Ms. French said this is the rationale for asking Council to amend the HRB work plan to have an Ad Hoc Committee working to come back to the HRB with all deemed-eligible properties and assign them a Category 1 or 2 inventory status, which would go to Council as a package, so the Council could decide whether to put them on the inventory or not. This is why she would like to see the HRB make this a priority on their work plan.

Chair Willis thought people would start doing some educational programs, and she asked if those come by Ms. French, that she would alert the HRB so they could become more educated on what this all might mean. Ms. French reported that there is now something called Planning Collaborative, which is like San Mateo County’s 21 Elements, a firm that is analyzing the bills and will be issuing some documents which will help cities. The Urgency Ordinance will be followed by a more in-depth ordinance for which they can take some time to work with other Boards and Commissions. Currently, the Urgency Ordinance is on a path to go straight to the Council because of the timeline.

Vice Chair Pease asked if anyone knows if SB 9 addresses protected species of trees or the recent decision of the Council to protect some of the canopy on lots, based on the size of the trees. His understanding was they cannot just remove some of these from properties. Ms. French said she watched that Council meeting, and that is not yet a law, but rather an indication by Council of what they want to do. The ordinance will be coming back in the spring of next year. Vice Chair Pease thought native trees were currently protected. Ms. French said only Redwoods, Coast Live Oaks and Valley Oaks are protected over a certain size. Vice Chair Pease asked if that would be nullified by the new law. Ms. French was not sure on this. She did not remember seeing anything about trees. She reiterated that they all have a lot of unanswered questions.

Attorneys would be working on the ordinance and they have been focusing free time on trying to understand and develop ways to help the City with this.

Chair Willis invited further comments and questions on the presentation. Hearing none, she closed the item.

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements

Chair Willis said she hoped all of the committees would take their tasks seriously and come to the retreat with concrete knowledge when they get together, and can move forward next year.

Board Member Wimmer asked if Vice Chair Pease wanted to talk about his part on the agenda. Vice Chair Pease said his one comment would be to urge people to consider virtual preservation. Based on these laws, he thought they may be looking at a stochastic level of change in the community over the next decade, and it would be nice to document that. He remembered as a child being driven to the Western Addition in what was the Fillmore District in Japantown in San Francisco, where they tore down block after block of some of the most interesting Victorian buildings for what was then redevelopment, and none of that was captured. He said there are many good things that they need resources for that they don't have. He felt that if a couple thousand places were to be torn down over the next decade that it would be nice to not just entirely lose what was there in terms of the history. Board Member Wimmer suggested maybe implementing a requirement to photo document and/or do an architectural drawing of existing buildings. Vice Chair Pease said for all he knew that was illegal under these bills if it imposes a cost upon the owner or developer. He thought it was an incredible opportunity to document a huge change for the historic record and to not lose everything because some of the blocks in these areas may look entirely different a decade from now. He would like to find a practical, low-cost and consistent way to do that.

Board Member Bower shared that when he came on the Board in 2007, that was a discussion that the Board had and did not move forward with, partly because one of the members who had relationships with the developers, said one had commented that all he had to do was document the building, and then he could tear it down. It was seen by some members as an incentive or a facilitator to developers who wanted to get rid of properties so they could develop them. He thought Vice Chair Pease had a good idea but he wondered whether it might in some way have that perverse impact. Vice Chair Pease felt that that logic flies in the face of what they are hearing, and have been hearing, about these bills, because there is not going to be any choice. Board Member Bower agreed but was wondering how it would be done. Vice Chair Pease said that is the question he was trying to address. He referenced the old Secretary of the Interior's standard for this type of documentation, which was too complicated and expensive and overkill for what he was trying to describe. He thought that, since that conversation took place, the logic has completely turned on its head now by this new reality, and it is another reason to look at this potential process.

Chair Willis wondered if they could go to the Historic Association and see if they could form a team that might help them develop the idea further and help with the project. Ms. French added it would be nice for someone with more than an iPhone which is what she uses to take photos. Vice Chair Pease said the trick would be finding a reasonable standard, bigger than an iPhone – although in a decade an iPhone may take a very good photo. He advocated coming up with something simple and consistent in which people could be certified easily with an information sheet, before the historic properties are all gone and they're left with archives of Google street views as the only record of what those neighborhoods looked like prior to these changes taking place. He said if there is time at the retreat, he would like to discuss this further. Chair Willis thought as they went through the three elements, they could see how this would fit in.

Adjournment

Vice Chair Pease moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Board Member Heinrich, the motion carried, 6-0, by voice vote.