



CITY OF
**PALO
ALTO**

Historic Resources Board Staff Report

From: Jonathan Lait, Planning and Development Services Director
Lead Department: Planning and Development Services

Meeting Date: June 22, 2023
Report #: 2306-1662

TITLE

Approval of Historic Resources Board Draft Minutes of May 25, 2023

RECOMMENDATION

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

BACKGROUND

Attached are minutes for the following meeting(s):

- May 25, 2023

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: HRB 5.25 Minutes

AUTHOR/TITLE:

Veronica Dao, Administrative Associate



HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING

DRAFT MINUTES: May 25, 2023

Council Chamber & Virtual Zoom
8:30 A.M.

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Caroline Willis; Vice Chair Christian Pease; Board Members Samantha Rohman, Michael Makinen, Margaret Wimmer, Gogo Heinrich and Alisa Eagleston-Cieslewicz

Absent:

Oral Communications

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

City Official Reports

1. Historic Resources Board Schedule of Meetings and Assignments

Discussion of a date for the Board retreat was deferred until after the action item.

Action Items

2. 3200 Park Boulevard/340 Portage [22PLN-00287 and 22PLN-00288]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Planned Community Zoning application to Allow Redevelopment of a 14.65-acre site at 200-404 Portage Avenue, 3040-3250 Park Boulevard, 3201-3225 Ash Street and 278 Lambert. The Project also includes a Development Agreement, Comprehensive Plan Amendment, and Vesting Tentative Map. Environmental Assessment: A Draft EIR for the 200 Portage Townhome Development Project was Circulated September 16, 2022 through November 15, 2022; the Final EIR was Made Available for Public Review on May 15, 2023. The Proposed Development Agreement is Evaluated as Alternative 3 in the Draft EIR. Zoning District: RM-30 (Multi-Family Residential) and GM (General Manufacturing). For More Information Contact the Project Planner, Claire Raybould at Claire.Raybould@Cityofpaloalto.org.

Claire Raybould presented the project to the Board. Ms. Raybould described the five parcels which would be combined into a 14.6-acre site. That site would be subdivided into five separate parcels, one of which would be the Cannery parcel, one containing the existing Ash Office Building, one containing the existing Audi Building, one that is proposed for 74 new townhomes, and one 3.25-acre site to be dedicated to the City for purposes of an affordable housing project and a public park.

Ms. Raybould documented for the Board the process leading to this project. In 2019, Fry's vacated the site. There are ongoing research and development uses at the facility within the Cannery Building. The Ash office building and the Audi building also exist today. In September of 2020 Sobrato filed a request for a zoning text amendment to allow for reuse of the site with any ratio of the allowed nonconforming uses. There was no formal decision on the project, but the Director did indicate the intent to decline approval of that request. In November of 2020 Sobrato filed an S.B. 330 pre-application, which was followed by a formal Architectural Review application for a 91-unit townhome development on a portion of the site. In 2021, staff requested Council interpretation of the Code with respect to nonconforming uses. Council formed the Ad Hoc Committee in October of 2021. The Committee met from December of 2021 to May of

2022 to negotiate broad terms of the development agreement. In June of 2022 Council held a closed session and agreed to support the current concept being presented to the HRB. Council asked staff to do a pre-screening application for the planned community zonings that were proposed in the development agreement as required by the Code and to daylight the project to the public, kicking off the public process for the development agreement in August of 2022. At the same time staff was also directed to prepare a tolling agreement which put the 91-unit townhome development and the continued processing of the Architectural Review plans on hold while the agreement was processed. The right to continue is vested under S.B. 330 application if they are unable to complete it in the time allowed under the tolling agreement.

The draft EIR was released for the 91-unit townhome development. The development agreement before the HRB was analyzed as an alternative in the EIR. One of the key purposes of a Council Ad Hoc Committee was to look at alternatives, a negotiated alternative, between the City and the applicant. The final EIR which includes formal responses to comments received on the project was released on May 15, 2023.

Page and Turnbull prepared a Historic Resources Evaluation as part of the NVCAP (North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan) process to determine eligibility of the site for the California Register. This came before the HRB to confirm their agreement that it is eligible for the California Register. The Cannery building and the Ash building were identified as eligible under Criterion 1 for events. The site is not listed on the City's Local Register. The HRB held a study session in July of 2019 regarding that HRE.

Ms. Raybould summarized the Environmental Impact report and its findings. The demolition of a portion of the building was identified as a significant and unavoidable impact on a historic resource for the proposed 91-unit project as well as all build alternatives, including the proposed development agreement under consideration by the HRB. This requires that Council prepare and adopt overriding considerations for the project when it comes before them. Mitigation measures requiring an interpretive display as well as HABS Level III documentation are required in the EIR as. However it was found that mitigation measures to reduce impacts would not reduce the impact to less than a significant level, so it still results in a significant and unavoidable impact for the proposed project and the alternatives. [

Ms. Raybould refreshed the Board on some of the comments from the HRB study session, including comments related to the remaining Cannery building and its design. The Board felt the project should try to follow the Secretary of the Interior Standards where feasible and explain any reasons where the project deviates. There was interest from the Council Ad Hoc Committee as well as the Board members during the study session to prioritize the monitor roofs as a key character-defining feature to be preserved. There was interest in public views and access to the Cannery building from Park Blvd, with some concerns about how the townhomes block views of that. The proposed development agreement includes a public access easement over the whole connection from Portage to Park, opening up connection to the public as well as creating a public park across from the Cannery building.

Ms. Raybould shared some of the comments that were made about the area under the Cannery roofs being the primary focus. The Sanborn maps from 1925 and 1945 and the present-day visual of the site were presented. It is unclear which was the original building. The building is made up of a conglomerate of buildings put together over the years. All of the additions were done during the period of significance, when the Cannery was active, so are all important aspects and part of the whole of the site, so the conclusion of the Environmental Impact report was that demolition of 40 percent of the building is a significant and unavoidable impact. Regardless of retaining the building underneath the monitor roofs alone, it would still be identified as a significant and unavoidable impact that would not be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior standards.

Ms. Raybould reminded the Board members of questions that were raised by the HRB about proposed alternatives to the proposed project, including suggestions that the open space be redesigned and located around the remaining Cannery building and that the applicant consider repurposing it as an art center or a recreational center, and asking for further consideration of adaptive reuse of the site. There were a number of comments along this same line, and formal responses are in the final EIR as to why certain adaptive reuse, especially for uses other than housing, were not considered or evaluated further. The EIR concludes that there is no build alternative that would result in anything other than a significant and unavoidable impact, and there is no way to adaptively reuse the site for housing or any other use that could be done in

a manner that is consistent with Secretary of the Interior standards and could retain the integrity of the building.

Ms. Raybould continued that there were comments from the HRB about the interpretive display and public art. The HRB had asked to maximize the conveyance of Thomas Foon Chew's life with respect to themes in the public art and/or interpretive display. Ms. Raybould reported that the applicant has held preliminary hearings with the Public Art Commission on January 19th and again on May 18th. The applicant has selected an artist who is highly qualified and has done a number of pieces of commissioned work for jurisdictions.

Ms. Raybould noted that there was interest from Board members to have staff analyze further whether the Ash Office Building would be individually eligible for the California Register. She pointed out that that analysis was included in the packet and indicated that the office building would not be individually eligible. There was also interest in nominating the remaining Cannery to the Local Register and whether the site would be eligible as a California Historic Landmark. A constraints analysis was prepared by Rincon Consultants to look into these possibilities. The indication was that the analysis evaluation of the site would need to be done following construction so that the nomination and determination could be made based on what is existing at the time of the nomination. Ms. Raybould advised that if there is interest in that they can explore how to include language in the development agreement that would require them to come back and do the evaluation and follow up. The applicant is amenable to working with the City to include the language in the development agreement if there is interest from the Historic Resources Board and Council's ultimate determination. Ms. Raybould noted that the recommendation before the Board was to consider the environmental impact report and mitigation measures and recommend approval of the project. This did not include the Planned Community Rezoning Development Agreement, Comprehensive Plan Amendment and subdivision map.

Ms. Raybould further explained what was being asked of the HRB. The project is not technically required to come before the HRB per the Code because it is not listed as a building, but it is a historic resource and the Council has expressed an interest in hearing the HRB's position on the project and ways in which the applicant could respect and integrate aspects of the historic character of the site, through public art, through the treatment of the remaining building and other aspects. Council desired comments in regard to treatment of the remaining building and help with meeting the findings for architectural review. Architectural Review Board finding number two is, "Preserve, respect and integrate existing natural features that contribute positively to the site and the historic character, including resource of the area when relevant."

Ms. Raybould conveyed that one key goal of the Council Ad Hoc was to preserve key aspects of the building and to recognize the site's historic significance through its treatment following development. Recommendations to Council regarding evaluation following completion of construction, such as if there is interest in having the evaluation done and nominating it to the Local Register or as a California Historic Landmark. Ms. Raybould noted that public art falls to the purview of the Public Arts Commission, but welcomed any feedback on the current direction that the applicant is going with the public art.

Chair Willis invited the applicant to speak to the Board.

Evan Sockalosky, Arc Tech, architect for the project, addressed the Board and stated that they had taken the feedback received from the HRB as well as City staff and the ARB, and he was excited to present the project to the Board. Matt Davis, Historic Consultant with ARG and Jennifer Eastman, Art Consultant, accompanied Mr. Sockalosky. Tim Steele and Robert Tersini with Sobrato were also available for specific questions. Mr. Sockalosky proceeded to present aspects of the project.

The project started as far back as 2011-2012 when Sobrato acquired the property. Five elements came out of the Ad Hoc Committee: The historic treatment of the Cannery building; the townhomes; providing public viewing access to the monitor roof structure; dedication of the land, giving the City an opportunity for affordable housing and a significant public park; and the public art.

Matthew Davis, Historian Principal with Architectural Resources Group (ARG), addressed the Board, stating that in mid-2022 the Sobrato organization asked ARG to develop a series of preservation design guidelines specifically focused on the portion of the Cannery building that they plan to retain. Sobrato was aware that since the building was a light-weight industrial warehouse, bringing it up to code would likely be more complicated than if they were working with a sturdier building. They also understood that the building had

been modified repeatedly over time. ARG was asked to help them understand the parameters with respect to the historic character. ARG representatives visited the site to view current conditions. The HRE report was reviewed in detail to understand the property's historic significance and extant character-defining features. Based on the review, they developed a series of guidelines in six categories.

Mr. Davis reported on ways in which the project has responded to those guidelines. With respect to height and bulk, maintaining the building's long linear massing was considered paramount. This meant that any new construction should remain below the height of the monitor roofs to preserve their prominence. Maintaining the monitor roofs was an essential driver of the entire approach. New construction, including new rooftop mechanical will remain at or below the top of the parapet walls along north and south elevations. The existing condition at the front of the building includes a double height projecting mass sitting in front of the monitor roof portion. The new construction at these locations is reflective of this historic condition. Much of the existing building is clad in corrugated metal panels. The west end is board form concrete which will remain as is, but incompatible cladding materials such as wood siding, brick, or ceramic tile were avoided in the new construction. Instead, the historic portions of the building will be reclad in corrugated metal matching the existing ones. New south entries and nearby parking garage will be clad in a corrugated metal different in color and dimension, to offset it from the historic.

The clerestory windows needing replacement will be replaced with windows similar in scale, profile and appearance to the original, and new fenestration throughout will be metal with simple surrounds befitting the industrial character of the property. New entries and canopies are clearly additive while being kept simple so that they are compatible with and not distracting from the historic portions of the building. There is an existing precedence for projecting masses at this location. The open character of the interior, including exposed roof truss and support columns is being carefully retained.

Mr. Davis reported that to satisfy the mitigation measure identified in the project EIR, they are completing HABS-like documentation for the property, which will include compiling formal photography, architectural drawings and a concise historical narrative which summarizes background historical information for the property. It will not be formally submitted to the Library of Congress; however, the documentation is being completed according to the federal program's standards. Also, they are in the process of distilling key historical themes and images, either identified in the HRE or collected through their own research at repositories including History San Jose and the Alviso Library. This content could serve as the focus of the interpretive displays being developed for the site. The effort has also included conducting an oral interview with Thomas Foon Chew's granddaughter, Gloria Hom, who has provided photos and supporting information.

Jennifer Easton, Art Consultant, introduced artist, Kyungmi Shin, whose work is characterized by a laying of both historic and cultural elements, with contemporary materials and thought processes to create blended ideas and vision regarding a site, it's people and its cultural importance. Ms. Easton said their selection of an artist focused on artists who had been looking at the immigration experience and Chinese/Asian history in the United States as part of their past practices. Kyungmi was the artist who rose, by her experience, materials, integration into architecture, as well as her thoughtful community outreach and engagement in her art implementation for public and studio practice.

Ms. Easton shared one of Ms. Shin's studio installations. The layering of her work illustrated blending of both European history as well as her own contemporary family history with iconographic Chinese history. Ms. Shin has started looking at the history of the site. A meeting with the Art Commission has occurred, and they were excited by the selection of the artist and the opportunities for the artwork at some of the sites. There was a particular mention of the idea of using mosaic, which they will be exploring. Next steps will include returning to the Art Commission in late summer/early fall with a conceptual design for their review and dialogue regarding direction for the project.

Mr. Sockalosky presented further detail on the architecture side of the project. Since last presenting to the HRB, there has been adjustment and refinement to the design in coordination with ARG, one of which was focusing on the design with the monitor roof as one of the priorities. Also, understanding the importance of the interior space and spatial relationships in terms of the historic importance of those structural elements. They have also further refined materials, making sure that the cladding is more of a replacement in kind, matching the original. Another key feature taken from comments received is in regard to the loading dock condition. That side of the project was adjusted to depress the parking and create more of a reference to the loading dock condition, which improves amenity space, separates it from vehicle parking and creates a reference back. Mr. Sockalosky conveyed that they are very excited about the artist and are excited about

integrating her work into the architecture at an early stage. He noted the importance to all parties involved of the visibility into the monitor roofs while still maintaining a viable R&D office building. To that end they have increased windows and doubled the size of the skylight views into the monitor roof area. The 380 Portage board form concrete building, will be left unchanged.

Mr. Sockalosky shared images of the project and what the project looked like when first presented. Through comments received, they have made significant changes to respond to the historic guidelines and feedback. The elevated entry references the loading dock condition. The window treatment has been significant adjusted, with smaller-scale panes of glass. The treatment of the clerestory monitor roof area windows are replaced in kind, and the form is much more reflective of what will be designed and installed. The south side of the building will be two-story as it is now, extending all across the south side of the building. The retail piece is a one-story added development, which was done to help create identity for the retail, and also to be able to reinforce the monitor roof form along this side which, as it exists now, is hidden by the two-story element. Transitioning down to a one-story element will give a viable identity for retail and also celebrate and give additional view into the monitor roof area for the public. A view of the garage panels illustrated the at-grade conditions with revisions to it including the depressed parking, elevating the entry, more variation on the garage and material refinements on the Cannery building. A much better amenity space at grade is created, separating the parking with a space between the buildings. An elevated entry and the elevated entry loading dock condition creates a transition and focus on the building itself. One key element was to try to create as much vision into the monitor roof, while respecting the need for a functional retail space. The square footage in the amount of view has been doubled with two skylights, still allowing space beyond giving opportunity for retail coming in to utilize the space. Two significantly sized skylights are angled, which is a reference to the sawtooth that would be common back in the original timeframe, giving a good view in to the wood truss. All of the wood trusses are existing. A proposed layout of the ductwork that would go into the space would be respectful of the space in its distribution. Many of the windows still have smaller openings, and many of these will be replaced in kind. Many were boarded up during the additions that occurred over the years, but they will be added back, creating an open space for future R&D space. A view near the office entry shows access to the mezzanine which currently exists and will be maintained. A view looking at the offices showed the one-story retail space at the end with above windows looking out at the monitor roof building which can be seen from the retail side, replacing the old skylights back in their original location while making sure all of the changes and additions are bringing the building up to Code. Mr. Sockalosky shared that this was one of the critical aspects needed, as well as respecting the historical nature of the treatment. Life safety, structural and other code issues need to be brought up to compliance in order to make this a development that can be occupied.

Chair Willis invited comments from the public.

Karen Holman spoke on behalf of herself and others. She acknowledged the difficulty of the HRB's task. She shared comments submitted by Monica Arima, whose family has lived in Professorville at 1052 Bryant, and rebuilt their historic house more than 20-plus years ago. She has been there since 1991 and her husband since the 1960s. Ms. Arima volunteers and supports historic programs at Stanford University, including but not limited to the Chinese Railroad Workers' History Project. She loves preserving history in any possible way, because history teaches empathy and tolerance and gives opportunity to learn about others' past mistakes. It helps us understand the many reason why people may behave the way they do, helping us become more impartial as decision-makers. With the good of the Chinese population in town, she feels it is important to include the Chinese-American history in town as much as possible to establish roots so that many of them can feel at home and accepted. Ms. Arima feels that the current design of the project destroys a big portion of the historic Cannery and that the structure should be maintained as an historic site. If not, she feels they should prohibit the project moving forward until the structure is preserved to qualify it as an historic site in the future. Her thought it that there is only one chance to do it right, and she urged the Board to support the preservation of the Cannery historic site.

Ms. Holman shared the comments of herself and the others with her. The proposal for the Cannery building is a nearly 40-percent demolition of a California Registry-eligible resource. She noted that what ought to be done with any of their resources is not to demolish, obliterate, remove, disregard. Quoting the architectural critic, Louis Huxtable, she said, "We will probably not be judged by the monuments we build, but by those we have destroyed." Ms. Holman suggested that the building and site is a monument to the accomplishment of Thomas Foon Chew, a Chinese man who was honored by 25,000 people, including elected officials, when he died in the '30's. Regarding the final EIR, Ms. Holman commented that not every possible alternative can be considered to eliminate a significant impact, but a feasible one must be evaluated, and

she did not see that one has been, in terms of retention of at least enough of the Cannery building to retain its historic character. The development agreement proposes 75 housing units, but the City burdens the Cannery building with 281 units. She asked, why not 91 as in the original proposal, or the 75 in the development agreement? She said the City will have to make a statement of overriding considerations to find the adequacy of the FEIR. The applicant's own architect was asked to conceive of an adaptive reuse of the Cannery building, imposing 281 units. Numerous times at the NVCAP meetings there were requests for the City to conduct a feasibility study, presumably independent, for reuse of the building. She knew of no evidence that that ever occurred. One of the project objectives was to develop cohesive development that respects historic uses at the site. Ms. Holman suggested this plan does not do that, but rather demolishes the history of the site. One of the comments that she submitted was that there could be a regional cumulative impact with the removal of the building and the site as a historic resource. The Page and Turnbull report noted that the building is a rare surviving example of Palo Alto's and Santa Clara County's agricultural past. yet the response in the FEIR was that the Valley of Hearts Delight is not a designated historic district, and the project area is not with an historic district. Overall, the project involves impacts to individual historic resources. There will be no significant cumulative impact to similar historic resources in the region. Ms. Holman said she was baffled by this response. The Page and Turnbull report states what qualifies as a California Register eligible property as the first, only, last, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic area or associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California. Ms. Homan said, to her, those are statements of why this project has a regional impact, not just a local impact. In comments regarding adding the street directly in front of the remnant building, adding a housing project directly in front of the building, responses included, "analysis unnecessary due to the significant impact that will already be happening on the Cannery building." She said this is important because whether or not the Cannery is saved as they are advocating, the remnant building will be compromised for listing locally due to impacts in response to the proximity of the proposed townhomes – the mass, scale, location of the affordable housing project near the historic building. She asked again how that is being analyzed in regard to impact on the remnant building. The response was that the proposed demolition would result in a significant and unavailable impact. Analysis of whether other elements of the project align with the Secretary of the Interior Standards is unnecessary because their conformance to the Standards would be rendered inapplicable due to the material impairment of an historic resource.

Ms. Holman indicated that they would like to save as much of the Cannery building as possible, but if talking about only the "remnant," she believes these are significant impacts to the remnant building, yet they are being dismissed as not relevant. Ms. Holman shared that at the August 1, 2022, Council presentation there were slides that presented the project to the community for the first time. One slide said that that remnant building would be subject to the Secretary of the Interior standards. Yet, at an ARB, not an HRB meeting, it was asked of the ARB, because the building is losing its historic integrity, should it be subject to the Secretary of the Interior standards? Slides she reviewed from August of 2022 promised the community that Secretary of the Interior standards would be applied to the remnant building, and comments were made regarding repairing, restoring, and replacing in-kind, but she didn't see that consideration was given to these things. Ms. Holman also had concerns regarding the PC zoning aspect of the project and lack of requirements or stipulations in the development agreement for compatibility with the remnant structure, which needs to satisfy Secretary of the Interior standards, including into the future upon expiration of the development agreement. Ms. Holman stated that she appreciated staff bringing the project to the HRB even though it isn't a requirement, but she wanted the Board to think into the future. If PCs are going to exist, they need to have stipulations to protect what they want to protect into the future.

Regarding the project's proposed view of the structural system through a hole in the roof of the retail space, Ms. Holman expressed her feeling that is somewhat like viewing the world through a hole in a fence. She mentioned the goal of not displacing people who have long been in a place with new opportunities and not erasing their culture, legacies, and important histories. She urged the Board to make their opinions clear to the Council, the ARB and to the staff about what should happen and what could happen with this property by taking a stand for the man who leaves a legacy in their hands and in the hands of Sobrato and the City. She concluded by stating that she and her companions mean no disrespect but believe there is a better way to accomplish the goals of the development agreement and Sobrato's goals while also respecting the history and giving it its rightful place in the future.

Jeff Levinsky addressed the Board, and unscored what others were saying, that the Cannery and office on Ash are extraordinary in terms of their significance to Palo Alto and the greater region. Page and Turnbull's

analysis indicates that demolishing almost 40 percent of the Cannery will be catastrophic and defeat the notion of historic preservation of the site. He said that there is a perception that the City and the Board have no choice, perhaps due to threat of a lawsuit from the property owner or new state laws. He said he asked about this, and the answers indicated that the City does have choices. One reason is that the proposed mix of uses does not comply with zoning laws which allow for no office or R&D use on the site without a lot of retail as well. If a proposed use is not legal or discretionary, the City does not have to agree to it. Mr. Levinsky said that neither does the proposal comply with the Comprehensive Plan. The FEIR's response to his questions claims that the Comprehensive Plan does not apply to this project but he has spoken to local experts who helped write that plan, and they emphasize that Comprehensive Plan policies about preservation, adaptive reuse and encouraging financial strategies to help fund those do apply to this project. He said the project does not comply with those policies and this is another reason to turn it down. Mr. Levinsky gave one more reason – there has been no look at creative ways to preserve the entire Cannery. One approach on page 64 of the FEIR suggests that instead of building a new parking structure north of the Cannery, put the cars in the 40 percent of the Cannery that was to be demolished. Where the parking structure was to be built, put more condominiums to make up for the ones that would have been atop the demolished portion, resulting in lots of condominiums, parking and the Cannery building completely remaining. He said the FEIR dismissed this, saying, "Modifying the Cannery building to convert it to a parking use could not be done without modifying the character-defining features of the building." Mr. Levinsky said only part of the building would be for parking, with only one opening on the north side large enough for cars to drive through, which possibly already exists, or once did. The current doors and windows would not need to change at all, and neither would the roofline, so it would preserve the existing building and also allow for condominiums. Mr. Levinsky suggested looking at how other cities have preserved buildings like this and encouraged the ARB, the PTC and the City Council to do this. His opinion was that there is an incredible, one-of-a-kind, amazing piece of history in their backyard and he hoped they would not bulldoze it.

Ms. Lotus Yee Fong spoke to the Board, sharing that she is a relocated grandmother from San Francisco, originally from Albuquerque, New Mexico. She shared of her interest in and journey into Railroad history and how buildings like the demolished Santa Fe Railroad Station, for example, also had important historical significance comparable to the historic argument before the HRB, that here are better alternatives. The railroad opened up the West and contributed to the whole of California history, specifically the Bay Area and Palo Alto. She referenced the Promontory in Salt Lake City and its historical importance, and quoted Native American, Floyd Red Crow Westerman's "We don't need happy history. We need real history," and a book by Palo Alto native, Malcolm Harris, "The History of California, Capitalism and the World." Ms. Yee Fong noted that there is a very active Chinese historical cultural project in San Jose, working on what used to be the Fairmont, and putting together a memorial in what will be called Heinlenville Park in San Jose Japan Town. Mr. Heinlein was known for helping the Chinese rebuild their history and Thomas Foon Chew was another contemporary with the Cannery. Ms. Yee Fong said her main point was that the timing is now, as more history is coming out. The Cannery building could be a very valuable resource, and they could get the resources to get more land and more housing.

Becky Sanders, Ventura resident, stated that the Cannery is a few blocks from her home, and she has been active in the movement to explore adaptive reuse of the Cannery to preserve it. She opposed demolishing any part of the building which would ruin its qualification as a historic site. Ms. Sanders said that several Venturans were part of the North Venture Coordinated Area Plan working group and there was considerable interest in adaptive reuse of the building. The group brought forward several scenarios for retention and reuse of the building, none of which were seriously entertained. She said the project proposal is not what residents of the community were working toward. The NVCAP working group repeatedly asked the City to commission an independent feasibility study of adaptive reuse of the Cannery, but their requests went unanswered. She pointed out that any models for retaining the Cannery building in full have never been explored. She was shocked and saddened to realize that the independent architect featured in the FEIR to weigh in on retention of the building is in fact the applicant's own architect and not one retained by the City. The work of the applicant and the City staff has been co-mingled, making it difficult to distinguish discreet boundaries between the two. An independent assessment would help separate the two. She said she is also the co-author of a letter to the HRB from Palo Alto Neighborhoods, and she was troubled that the letter was not included in the packet, although she was assured that it was circulated to the Board members. The preservation of the Cannery is of citywide concern which is why PAN membership voted to send the letter. Their opinion is that the Cannery is as important to the history of agriculture in the Valley of the Hearts Delight as David and Lucile's Packard garage is to the history of Silicon Valley. She said her understanding

is that the HRB has discretion, power and authority to advise as they see fit and urged the Board, rather than supporting demolition, to request an independent feasibility study for protecting the Cannery and its rich history. She asked that they give due consideration to the Cannery's significance and afford to it the protection and respect that Thomas Foon Chew's canning empire deserves. She affirmed the comment that history is happening now and they are uncovering new ways of approaching and dealing with troubled, confusing, passionate and beautiful history. She was excited to think that this could be part of a next page in Palo Alto's history.

Yugen Lockhart, 405 Olive Avenue, addressed the Board. He noted that his brother's house at 411 Olive Avenue was the sole house on the undeveloped property on Olive behind the Cannery. He has been in the neighborhood for 45 years and was born in the house he lives in now. His backyard faces the air conditioners on top of the Cannery building. He affirmed the comments of the previous speakers and felt they gave good sentiments to the history of the structure. However, he said, much of the structure they are trying to preserve is pretty ugly. He liked the monitor roof aspect and the idea of keeping that. He thought it interesting how nebulous the documentation is of what part is historical, what was made originally and what was made additionally. He wasn't sure how the original study had taken place to qualify the percentage of what should be kept. Since the documentation is so undefined, he wondered if they could reassess it perhaps it could be reduced to a quantity that could maintain the historical aspect, while allowing for removing some of the more unsightly extensions. He agreed with keeping some of the building, including the monitor buildings and the old house on Portage. We would like to see the neighborhood develop cohesively. The NVCAP process is going on, and that was a good start, but even they have not come up with an ideal plan for the neighborhood. He said individuals along Olive and Pepper are getting inundated with all of the projects – low-income projects, medium-income projects. Their 25 or so houses will be joined by two to three thousand residents moving into their two- to three-block radius. Regardless of how much of the building is kept, the residents are being overwhelmed by the quantities of people and businesses. He said that the residents understand that things are going to change in their neighborhood. He maintains six bungalow houses that are all falling apart so he needs to think of his own plans of how to keep them standing or what he should do with them. The building behind them is in the same state – a rickety old shed. He does not mind if they put new cladding on the side of it if it matches what is currently there, so that it can be a habitable structure.

Ms. French interjected into the hearing to announce that a Board member had submitted a just cause exemption for the meeting. State law on the topic of remote participation for just cause requires that the Board vote to allow the member to participate for the just cause which, in this case, involved the Board member being a caretaker.

The vote was taken to allow the remote participation, and the motion carried unanimously.

Chair Willis opened the discussion to Board Member questions.

Board Member Heinrich stated she has not followed the project since its inception since she is new to the Board. She wondered what kind of adaptive reuse studies were done.

Ms. Raybould said she could not speak to the full NVCAP that was referred to, but for the project before the Board there were two build alternatives analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report, as well as the proposed 91-unit townhome development. So three total development project and alternatives. The 91-unit townhome development included 91 units in the area of the 74 units before the Board today, as well as the full public park and affordable housing area City dedication land. There was also an alternative study in the EIR. The NVCAP looked at a much larger area than just this sight, so they took the preferred alternative that Council was looking at and studied what that would mean for the site and looked at an adaptive reuse of a three-story alternative. It included a small townhome development in the area of the public park. They asked the applicant to provide as part of the final EIR, in response to some of the comments, was to show what it would look like if they were looking at a single story alternative as well. What they showed made it clear that any alternative for adaptive reuse of the site for housing will require significant changes to the building, to provide property light and air, fire safety, building code upgrades, green building code compliance and that any adaptive reuse of the site for housing is going to result in impacts that would likely be significant and unavoidable. CEQA does not require looking at every feasible alternative; nor does it require completion of a plan set for every alternative being explored for the project. They did not look at alternatives that did not include housing, because they don't meet most of the basic project objectives.

Chair Willis said there was mention of doing a HABS-like survey. She wondered, why not submit it to the State? This applies to the recent San Antonio one, too.

Board Member Eagleston-Cieslewicz asked, in addition, where the HABS-style survey information would end up.

Board Member Rohman asked why it won't be submitted to the Library of Congress if it follows the HABS-like detailing.

Ms. Raybould referred the question to JulieAnn Murphy, the City's Historic Consultant.

Ms. Murphy responded that she worked on the EIR and helped develop the EIR mitigations. They recommended the HABS-like documentation. She noted that there is considerable cost and effort with preparing a submission to the Library of Congress. Making the materials locally available to the local library and historic organizations is often seen as more meaningful than those submitted to the Library of Congress. They also require an intense amount of detail in preparation and creation of measured drawings in addition to photographs, so they have found that a HABS-like documentation is more meaningful for the local community than something that meets the requirements of a Library of Congress submission.

Vice Chair Pease divulged that in early March he asked Doria Suma to be introduced to Tim Steele at Sobrato Corporation. She had met him and worked with him in the NVCAP process. He and Doria were able to go to Sobrato on March 27th and meet with Tim and Robert Tersini. His objective in meeting with them was to ask them if the project was approved largely as proposed that there be a much more intensive documentation of the site than even a HABS-like one as just described, which he felt was completely inadequate. He felt the need for this document goes well beyond being meaningful for the local community. He felt that the site and its story are more important than any Birge Clark building in the town, particularly in the context of what is happening now in history and the re-emergence of history. He said he was asking them specifically to consider new and emerging and current techniques and technologies that are all coming from the building industry itself. To make much more comprehensive documentation of this building he would prefer in its entirety, as it stands now, but at a minimum of the part that is going to be torn down. It would include using as-built photography techniques as "as-demolished" or "as-constructed" documentation and also doing the measures previously referred to as too expensive and onerous, by applying LIDAR technology to measure the spaces inside and out at a high level of accuracy.

Vice Chair Pease also divulged that he was given the report for a separate project – 788 San Antonio Road. He requested that the HABS-like product be distributed to the Board in advance of the meeting. It was a blueprint and a precedent for what he was trying to describe. The site was the California Chrysanthemum Grower's Association built in the early 50's. The association is a mutual benefit business group of Japanese-American immigrants started in the 20's. The San Antonio project as a site mirrors the Fry's site – the Chew site – in many ways, being almost parallel to it but on a much smaller scale. It involves an underrepresented history and community, a community that, like the Chinese-American community, immigrants were discriminated in practice and in law, the Japanese Exclusion Act of the 20's, the Chinese exclusion acts. They banded together and built an industry which was significant to the entire Bay Area. They were entrepreneurial like Mr. Chew. They found ways to address the discrimination against them, such as the inability of their immigrant parents land to grow farming, cultivation products, similar to the Cannery. To do that, they had to put the names in the titles of the American-born children. They got together to buy and deal with the American local business community in a fairer way by sourcing things at scale.

Vice Chair Pease said he was referred to a planner to ask questions about why the decision was made to include the use of laser measurements, which is a first that he knows of. Vice Chair Pease showed the drawings of the inside, outside, top and bottom done by laser scans. He noted that the building on San Antonio was also California Register-eligible, but not listed, in another parallel. He wondered why they could not go beyond as-found photography and measures not defined by the architectural consultant in any detail. In the original HABS world it was done with tape measures, pencils, and paper. Now it would be possible to create point clouds of the entire structure so that if and when its integrity is destroyed and 40 percent of it is demolished from this point forward if that data is protected and made appropriately available to all users it could be used to create, for example, an interactive interpretive display, of what the building was like, how massive, it's features. He also suggested that this site and its history is potentially of national interest, and education in Palo Alto should include some curriculum around this. Vice Chair Pease shared that growing up Palo Alto schools, they heard all about many things – Father Serra, David Packard – but he never heard a word about this. He was in the Cannery building multiple times with his father as a boy and had no idea

what it was or where it came from and why it was built and the man that was responsible for it. He suggested that, beyond HABS-like documentation, if you want younger generations, digital natives, to be interested in any of it the way it's being proposed in his understanding will not be particularly interesting. However, if the data is generated and simple works are created out of it in the near term and is made available to the creative community and the historic community, someone might be able to build a virtual tour of it, which would be far more interesting to those audiences.

Vice Chair Pease affirmed the public artwork and the artist selected, but felt they should think ahead to audiences to Palo Alto, in California and beyond, who are part of another generation and who consume information, data and concepts in a much different way. He noted his request did end up in the document, in the matrix, in the staff report where it says, "Documentation prior to demolition, at least one Board member noted that proper documentation of the existing building is a critical part of it being done before its demolished." It says that the applicant is considering looking at these technologies, and he would like to understand more about how that process of consideration is going to work. He felt that should come back to the Board at some time if it is serious work that is taking place. The process of consideration and looking into it should be outlined before a decision is made about it.

Chair Willis invited the applicant to address this comment.

Ms. Raybould explained that if this is the interest of the Board then as part of their recommendations to Council, they can ask for additional things that they think should be included as part of the project. To the extent that it is agreed upon and moves forward, then it would go before the Council as part of the wording of the development agreement that any additional specific things that they ask for that they're agreeing to, Council in their discretion can reinforce the recommendation of what they would like to see.

Vice Chair Pease said he still didn't understand why what he was talking about was in the staff report, but it was not mentioned in the presentation or in the architect's presentation but was left out entirely. He said some will do this individually or as a Board, but he wanted this to be discussed.

Mr. Davis responded that since Vice Chair Pease met with Tim and Robert in March, they had been in touch with him to discuss different alternative ways of capturing data regarding the building in a digital format, looking at possibilities based on things they have been involved in with other historic properties either directly with ARG, or through engaging an expert sub-consultant. He mentioned Matterport which is used on realty websites to do virtual tours of a given property and said there is a Matterport model for a part of the building already that addresses virtual tour capabilities, so he felt that one option would be to expand that model to encapsulate the whole building, but there are also other, more technical options as well, which they are in the process of discussing with Sobrato.

Vice Chair Pease asked how long that process would take.

Mr. Davis responded that the initial priority is to satisfy the requirements of the EIR, so the HABS documentation takes precedence but the digital documentation once the pathway is agreed upon is not a time-consuming process. It is a matter of getting whatever cameras are needed onsite for 1 to 3 days of documentation. Much of the time after that is spent on processing the data that's been collected.

Vice Chair Pease asked if they would entertain conversations with experts on the current state of the technology. He said Matterport is one of the early players, but there are a number of others which have very different capabilities in terms of resolution and all sorts of interesting things happening about standards in this regard. He felt that if they were going to explore, it would be useful to reach out beyond their own firm's expertise and to not assume that what they have is the best available technology and method for capturing this at the highest level of resolution available today.

Mr. Davis agreed and said that one of the trickiest aspects in this part of the field is that technology is always changing and advancing so it's important to stay in the loop.

Vice Chair Pease asked how they would determine whether what they had was adequate or was the highest level available.

Mr. Davis said he felt they were taking too much time on the issue. He said they have engaged consultants in the past on very complex digital documentation undertakings at very high-profile historic properties, so there were other things to focus on today, but he will be in touch with Tim and Robert and in whatever way is appropriate with Vice Chair Pease directly to make sure they are headed in the right direction. He said that they are not ingenués in those aspects of document.

Vice Chair Pease responded that he didn't think it was too much detail when talking about taking the building down. Even if it's not listed it will not be eligible according to all that was said, so he felt it was an important aspect of the discussion.

Chair Willis agreed it was an important aspect, but felt they needed to make a recommendation to Council and thought they could incorporate this subject in their recommendations. She asked for discussion on other aspects of the project they want to bring forward to Council.

Board Member Eagleston-Cieslewicz said she was interested in seeing the post construction evaluation put into the development agreement as was proposed in the presentation. She felt it was important to evaluate the building post construction for Local listing or California Landmark status.

Board Member Rohman referred to a point raised by several of the speakers, that it does not appear that the independent analysis of the adaptive reuse was done by an uninterested third party architect. It sounded like the Sobrato architect evaluated the structure for adaptive reuse and found that for residential it would need considerable revisions that would make it ineligible for historic register listing.

Ms. Raybould said this was not the case. She said they asked the applicant to prepare a visual of realistically what a single story might look like to get a sense of what kind of changes might need to occur. The City prepared the Environmental Impact Report and the analysis with an independent contractor – Rincon Consultants – to evaluate adaptive use of the site.

Board Member Rohman asked if Rincon is in any way affiliated with Sobrato.

Ms. Raybould stated that they are not and said the City receives payment from Sobrato and hires independently a third-party contractor.

Chair Willis commented that all are familiar with the need for housing, and she was thankful that they were getting some. She wished it was responsive to the site in some way, rather than looking like it was cut out of a set of different plans, but it would be good to have housing. She thought that the parkland would be a lovely addition, especially in that part of town, and noted that agreeing to do the document was very much appreciated. She liked many of the changes that were made to the plans. The window adjustment, getting rid of the angled windows was a great change. She liked the way the back of the building, the parking garage side, reads with the changes. She wished that the additions on the front of the monitor roof portion of the building were not so prominent because they read as modern and not as original to any stage of the building, of which there were many. She said the one-story part doesn't bother her much but if there was some way to adjust the two-story section, she finds it very distracting. She said that they need to acknowledge that their initial historic analysis looked at the whole building, which is a composite of buildings, but she strongly supported doing a new historic evaluation after the demolition. She felt the monitor roof portion did not look like it was there on the 1925 survey, but it was definitely there in 1940 before the 1945 survey. It happened within the period of significance and is the strongest visual symbol of the Cannery. She felt it would be eligible for the National Register and that it provides a strong, symbolic image of what was there. She would personally prefer if they could mark the boundaries of the original Cannery building, as it would be an interesting graphic to be able to see the extent to which it did grow.

Chair Willis reiterated that they would get more housing, and she didn't really see expecting that the whole composite of building stand as worth dying on the sword for. She thought if they could have one strong historic element which was obviously a unique, separate entity, it would be a fitting token. She asked the Board to put together a motion for their recommendation to Council. She suggested that they all agree on documentation that would be HABS-like, that would be the entire building. She felt they needed to discuss the park and how to make it accessible. She wondered if they should, as a group, focus more on historic files as a resource. A second item to focus on would be the monitor roof building portions being added to the National Register after the demolition and also the post construction analysis and documentation being done. She felt the HRB could support portions of how they are treating the historic building and could also support some requests.

Board Member Rohman felt it was an interesting opportunity, considering the project did not have to be brought before them and thought although a tough issue, it does signify an option for partnership with developers in the area. She felt they acted in good faith to preserve the integrity of part of the demolition although she was not happy with the demolition of the other 40 percent. She noted that as a Board they have to decide if they are preserving the building itself, or the history of the community that it represents. She felt there is an opportunity with the status applications after the development to recognize the story of

Thomas Chew and the Cannery and pay homage to that, because adding resources to the State register, the National Register, does not have any interpretation or interpretive benefit. It simply adds them so they are protected. With this, there is an opportunity to tell that story within the community and make that story known. If the building was preserved as is and added to the Register, it will go on in perpetuity being not a community landmark and not really having an effective use. She didn't love the proposition but felt there were some opportunities.

Board Member Wimmer agreed with Board Member Rohman regarding the spirit of keeping the historic recognition of the site as what had occurred there. They have looked at the project before and talked at length about the existing buildings and tried to define what the character-defining features are that lends it to being a historic site. She also wanted to respect the speakers at the hearing. It is a difficult project in that sense because their whole spirit of being on the Board is to preserve anything historic in their city. There is a gray area, and hearing what the speaker had to say, she appreciated all that they represent and how they feel. But as a Board they are in a hard spot because they are asked by staff to pass the project. Knowing that, technically, it didn't even have to come to them, they respect the fact that it was brought to them, so that the Board can at least contribute their thoughts. Her thought was that the historic process and how things are reviewed and classified as historic is troubled because the ordinance is not tight enough, not protective enough. She feels that Board members struggle with this on the projects they review. Ms. Raybould's references to "significant and unavoidable impact" are accurate in that there will be those in this project.

Board Member Wimmer said she relies upon the historic consultants and staff and feels that when a project gets to this level and to a point where the Board is asked to comment and potentially approve, it's an 11th hour moment. People are still speaking against the Board approving it because it doesn't follow the ordinance, but if that is the case, then the ordinance is broken and more of a grassroots effort is needed. Also, it takes a city and an owner like Sobrato trying to be respectful of the historic nature of the site. However, it also involves development and development rights and the need for housing with many boxes to check in what the City will allow and what eventually makes financial sense for them. She was glad they had the chance to discuss this length. Since she is in the architectural field and does historic preservation projects it's a very tough building itself because it is a lightweight commercial industrial building and the nature of the building was always supposed to be a Cannery, industrial. It was not meant for a high quality level of use. It was more of an industrial workspace, so taking such a building and making it into a Class A office space or a retail space is a big change of use. She summarized that these projects are difficult, and they don't want to lose their resources, but that is the challenge. Her view is that they need to strengthen their process and their ordinance needs to protect their resources better.

Chair Willis said she wanted to attempt to craft a recommendation to Council. She said, 'In reviewing this project the HRB would like to advise Council to request of the applicant HABS-like documentation be performed for the whole building for the entire structure. An appropriate repository should be established, and post construction analysis should be conducted of the remaining structure in order to add the monitor roof building section to the National Register; and the applicant look at additions to and separation from the monitor roof building in order to enable eligibility for the National Register.'

Vice Chair Pease commented that Sobrato has done a good job and he is impressed by their work with Thomas Foon Chew's granddaughter. He felt that they have an opportunity to begin to set a standard for situations like this, that would be valuable to the community going forward. Whatever their exploratory work is around their final plan he advocated for them seeking out the most current information and expertise available, including industry groups that are working on such things, a comprehensive request for proposal.

Board Member Eagleston-Cieslewicz wanted to add that the post construction be evaluated for the Local listing, California Landmark status and also California Point of Historical Interest status.

Ms. Murphy clarified that the building has not been evaluated for the National Register, only the California Register. She distinguished the qualifications for National Register and California Register. The criteria mirror each other, being basically identical. Something can be nominated for just the California Register. When things are nominated and entered into the National Register, they are also automatically added to the California Register. So the evaluative framework is essentially the same, except the question of integrity is a little different between them. The listing processes are distinct.

Chair Willis wanted to try for the National Register and said it needed to be re-analyzed anyway following the demolition and construction.

Ms. Raybould asked for clarification from the attorney, Albert Yang, whether the HRB needed to actually recommend, as the motion doesn't make a recommendation to approve or deny the project, and she was unsure it is required to do so. Mr. Yang didn't believe a recommendation on the project was needed.

The draft of the motion was read:

The HRB advises Council to require HABS-like documentation for the entire Cannery structure and an appropriate repository be established. A post-construction analysis shall be conducted of the remaining structure in order to add the monitor roof building section to the National Register, evaluate for Local listing, California Landmark status, State status and Historic Point of Interest status. The applicant shall look at additions to and separations from the monitor roof building in order to enable eligibility for the National Register of Historical Places.

Chair Willis asked if "monitor roof building" is clear because that building, the 340 building as noted on the plans, is also a compilation of bldgs. She wondered if they needed to be clearer about that. She said she really only cared about the monitor roof section.

Board Member Rohman remarked that it is Parcel 3 that encompasses the monitor roof section.

Chair Willis said she did not feel the same about the section that does not have the monitor roofs as the section that does. She wondered about stating "the section of the building with the monitor roofs" instead of "the monitor roof building."

Board Member Rohman thought they should take which specific parcel out of the five since that's the way it's drawn up in the plans.

Chair Willis wanted to state that it could be separated right after the monitor roofs in the middle of the building.

Board Member Rohman said in that case it might not be ultimately not split up for their uses in that way. The one picture of just the two buildings with the monitor roofs was in the staff report as well as the Sobrato presentation.

Chair Willis asked that the wording be changed to "the monitor roof section."

Ms. Raybould noted that the entire Environmental Impact Report concludes that is no longer eligible for the California Register.

Chair Willis said they are concluding that the entire building is no longer eligible. Since a third of it will be gone, she agreed with them. However, it has not been analyzed as a separate element.

Ms. Murphy noted that in undertaking an evaluation of a historic resource, they look at the whole building. She understood the interest in wanting an evaluation of just the portion of the building, but the way that evaluations are undertaken as guided by National Park Service and the Office of Historic Preservation is that they look at the whole building. They cannot do an evaluation of just one piece of a building.

Motion by Chair Willis that the HRB advise Council to require HABS-like documentation for the entire Cannery structure and establish an appropriate repository. Post-construction analysis shall be conducted of the remaining structure in order to add the monitor roof building section to the National Register, evaluate for Local listing, California Landmark status, and Historical Point of Interest status. The applicant shall look at additions to and separations from the monitor roof section of the building in order to enable eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places.

Vice Chair Pease felt that saying "HABS-like," doesn't go far enough. They are already doing that. It needs to be augmented by the best technology available and practical.

Chair Willis suggested, "HABS-like documentation augmented by the best current documentation.

Ms. French noted this is an amendment suggestion to the motion to state "augmented by the best current technology available."

Board Member Rohman suggested that they recommend to Council that they require the developer to submit it to Library of Congress through the HABS process, instead of HABS-like.

Ms. French asked for second and then there could be tweaking and proposals to the verbiage of the motion and then the maker of the motion can accept them or not.

Vice Chair Pease seconded the motion.

Chair Willis said that there are better ways of documenting things now, and HABS is labor intensive and not necessarily advantageous.

Vice Chair Pease said the proposal is to use HABS as guidance. It will not qualify for HABS as is, he didn't believe, because that is behind the curve of what is going on. He was fine with using the guidelines, but it needs to be augmented with what is now available.

Chair Willis accepted the motion with the addition of "augmented documentation."

Board Member Eagleston-Cieslewicz suggested on part two, discussing post-construction evaluation, rather than to say, "add it to the National Register," to "Evaluate it for inclusion on the National Register."

Ms. Raybould added, "Evaluate and nominate."

Ms. French clarified the amendment and to change wording to, "Post-construction analysis to be conducted of the remaining structure in order to evaluate it for inclusion and nomination on the monitor roof building section to the National Register and the other listings.

Chair Willis thought this was fine.

The final motion as amended:

Motion by Chair Willis, seconded by Vice Chair Pease, that the HRB advise Council to require HABS-like documentation augmented by the best current technology available, using HABS as guidance, for the entire Cannery structure, and establish an appropriate repository for the information. Two, post construction analysis to be conducted of the remaining structure in order to evaluate it for inclusion and nomination of the monitor roof [2:20:04 gap] status. Three, the applicant shall look at additions to and separations from the monitor roof section of the building in order to enable eligibility for the National Register of Historical Places.

The motion passed (7-0) by roll call vote.

3. Election of Chair and Vice Chair and Modification of HRB Bylaws with regard to Elections.

Vice Chair Pease moved to nominate Board Member Eagleston-Cieslewicz for Chair. Seconded by Chair Willis, the motion carried by voice vote.

Board Member Wimmer moved to nominate Board Member Rohman for Vice Chair. Seconded by Vice Chair Pease, the motion carried by voice vote.

The Board discussed aligning the Bylaws to align the election cycle with Council's appointment of new Board members. The existing bylaws read: "The offices of Chairperson and Vice Chairperson shall be elected from among the appointed members of the Board, and the person so elected shall serve for a term of one year or until a successor is elected. Elections shall be held at the first meeting in January of each year or as soon thereafter as possible." The proposed change to the HRB bylaws read: "Elections shall be held in the first regular meeting in April of each year, or as soon thereafter as possible."

The Board voted on the modification. The motion carried (7-0) by voice vote.

Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements or Future Meetings and Agendas

Board Member Heinrich reported that there is a PAST walking tour of Professorville on Saturday at 10:00. They will meet at Cowper and Melville. More information can be found at the PAST website.

The Board discussed a date for the retreat and whether to aim for a Saturday or a Thursday. It was decided that Board members will check their calendars and email Mr. French their availability on Saturdays.

The Board members briefly discussed content of the conversations for the retreat, including Mills Act and community outreach.

The location of the retreat was discussed as well. Ms. French will investigate options for this. Chair Willis wondered about the possibility of Cubberley.

The possibility of early September was discussed as well.

Adjournment

Motion by Vice Chair Pease to adjourn. Seconded by Board Member Heinrich, the motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:05 a.m.