



Historic Resources Board Staff Report

From: Planning and Development Services Director
Lead Department: Planning and Development Services

Meeting Date: July 11, 2024
Report #: 2407-3205

TITLE

Approval of Historic Resources Board Draft Minutes of May 9, 2024

RECOMMENDATION

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

BACKGROUND

Attached are minutes for the following meeting:

- May 9, 2024

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: HRB 5.09 Minutes

AUTHOR/TITLE:

Amy French, Chief Planning Official



HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING DRAFT MINUTES, May 9, 2024 Council Chamber & Virtual Zoom 8:30 A.M.

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Alisa Eagleston-Cieslewicz; Vice Chair Samantha Rohman; Board Members Caroline Willis and Margaret Wimmer

Absent: Board Members Gogo Heinrich, Michael Makinen and Christian Pease Margaret Wimmer

Public Comment

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

City Official Reports

1. Historic Resources Board Schedule of Meetings and Assignments

Chief Planning Official Amy French reported that on April 22, 2024, the City Council placed sixteen properties, including three City properties, on the City's local inventory. Two additional properties will be heading to the Council consent calendar in August with any other property owners who are interested in putting their properties in the inventory. Four members are present in the chamber, so the current meeting can continue. On May 13, the Council will be given the opportunity to decide whether or not to reduce the Board to five members from seven, and other modifications including reducing the meetings to one meeting per month. The goal is to attract candidates and not have to spend as many Staff resources on multiple recruitments. The open recruitment will close on June 2, 2024, and it is possible that the interviews of the candidates and placement would take place before the June 13, 2024, meeting. Ms. French thought that it would be appropriate to have the bylaws discussion on June 13, 2024, after Council action to allow for modifications to be made accordingly. The CLG Annual Report filing deadline and grant deadline was pushed to June 7, 2024. She introduced the new Historic Planner, Steven Switzer.

Board Member Willis inquired about the recommendation on the consent calendar concerning Council approval of meeting frequency and the composition of HRB members.

Ms. French stated that it was on the consent calendar, which means that the Council does not need to have a public hearing. People can speak to the public hearing if desired, but it would take three Council members to pull it off the consent calendar and hold a discussion.

Board Member Willis sought clarification that the action is to modify the ordinance in that way.

Ms. French explained that the packet contains a staff report detailing the changes, which include reducing the Board from seven to five members, adjusting the qualifications to align with CLG requirements, and reducing the meetings to once a month.

Board Member Willis expressed her disagreement with certain aspects of the proposal, particularly the lack of requirement for a board member to own a historic property. She emphasized the importance of accountability and questioned whether this point would be part of the Council's decision.

Ms. French suggested that the Council has the option to remove it from the consent calendar and schedule for a future public hearing for further discussion. However, she clarified that it cannot be removed from

the consent and discussed on the same night. She believed that this addition was intended to reduce obstacles for Board applicants.

Board Member Willis felt that it was somewhat of an overreaction. She questioned whether the Board could revisit the decision to meet only once a month after six months.

Ms. French responded that any element of the Municipal Code could potentially be modified. She explained that bylaws could include provisions beyond what the code stipulates, but any changes would require active Council involvement. She also mentioned that special meetings are always an option and can be scheduled at any month of the year, as per the current code, which states that it is at the Chair's discretion.

Vice Chair Rohman echoed Board Member Willis's concern about removing the code requirement. She inquired if it was possible to remove it from the Council's consent calendar to allow the Board to make changes.

Ms. French clarified that only the Council could decide to remove it. The HRB could advocate for the agenda removal, but there might be a lack of a quorum depending on the remaining members.

Chair Alisa Eagleston-Cieslewicz asked if the Board felt strongly about the requirement for a homeowner of a Category 1 or Category 2 property, whether it could be reintroduced as a separate item at a later date.

Ms. French confirmed that this was possible. If the Board wished to retain the piece about ownership of a Category 1 or 2 property, that could be considered either by the full Board or a less-than-full quorum.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz stated that if there was enough Board interest in the one fix-it item, they could revisit it and make the appropriate changes.

Board Member Wimmer referred to the ordinance stating that the Board could be reduced from seven members to five. She asked whether an exception could be included stating that in an event where recruitment does not result in seven members, the Board could operate with five members temporarily until the full Board is recruited.

Ms. French responded by stating that this matter pertains to the Title 2 Administrative Code of the Palo Alto Municipal Code, and as such, the number of members likely needs to be either five or seven.

Action Items

2. 201 Alma Street, Tower Well Park: Park Name Discussion per City Council Direction

Staff: Amy French, Steven Switzer, Kristen O'Kane

Public comments: Herb Borock

Ms. French stated that Kristen O'Kane from the Community Services Department attended the Council meeting in March. The Council approved the name "Tower Well Park" and asked the HRB and Parks and Recreation Commission to consider renaming it to Frederick Eyerly Tower Well Park. The Council also proposed that the City nominate the park to the National and California Registers, given its eligibility status from the 1997-2001 survey and its Category 1 inventory placement. On November 8, 2023, the City of Palo Alto Historical Association (PAHA) suggested "Tower Well Park" as the new park's name, considering the significant historic landmark on the property. A speaker highlighted that the site was previously named after Fred Eyerly, based on HRB's recommendations. The HRB is now tasked to discuss this name.

Ms. O'Kane mentioned that the staff is open to any suitable name for the site, which will be presented to the Parks and Recreation Commission and then the Council for finalization. A formal dedication and ribbon-cutting ceremony will follow, marking the first new park dedication in Palo Alto in a long time.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz invited comments from the public.

Herb Borock stated that he provided a copy of his recommendation to Council for the March 4, 2024, meeting that appeared in the March agenda packet. He noted that the Council introduced the first name Frederick, but the former Mayor's name was Fred. He expressed concern about the Council's rule-breaking tendencies, which might discourage people from applying for boards and commissions.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz invited comments from the Board members.

Board Member Wimmer questioned the necessity of dedicating the site to a specific person.

Ms. O'Kane clarified that while many parks in the City are named after individuals, it is not a requirement. The current name is Tower Well Park, and the Council has initiated a conversation to possibly change it to Fred (or Frederick) Eyerly Tower Well Park.

Board Member Willis expressed her preference for a shorter name like 'Tower Well' and questioned the implications of renaming it to 'Fred Eyerly Tower Well Site'. She wondered if the change would affect signage, education, or other aspects.

Ms. O'Kane clarified that a sign matching the City's park signage would be installed at the park, which is designated as parkland in the Municipal code. The decision to name the park after Mr. Eyerly rests with the governing bodies.

Vice Chair Rohman inquired about the presence of any existing signage acknowledging Fred Eyerly.

Ms. O'Kane confirmed the existence of one such sign.

Vice Chair Rohman felt this was sufficient recognition for Mr. Eyerly and did not see the need to rename the entire park after him.

Board Member Willis suggested that the Board could recommend to the Council that the name change would be acceptable. However, she believed that retaining the name 'Tower Well Site' might better highlight the site's historical significance.

Board Member Wimmer concurred, adding that the naming suggestion seemed to originate from a single community member. She proposed that if the park were to be dedicated to an individual, the City should solicit suggestions from the wider community. She expressed concern that naming the park after Mr. Eyerly could potentially mislead people about his connection to the site or the tower.

Vice Chair Rohman agreed, noting that the suggestion of a male name, presumably of a cisgender white man, could perpetuate the 'great men of history' model. She suggested that the City should consider more inclusive options for its landmarks and names. While not opposed to naming the park after an individual, she felt that this warranted further discussion and exploration of alternatives.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz asked if the Board needed to make a formal motion.

Ms. French believed that the minutes adequately captured the Board's sentiment but sought Ms. O'Kane's opinion on whether a motion would facilitate the process.

Board Member Willis offered to make a motion for the Board to defer the decision to the Council.

MOTION

Motion by Board Member Willis that the HRB defer to Council to name the Tower Well site in a way that commemorates the building, while also acknowledging that the Council has the discretion to dedicate it to any individual that they deem appropriate.

Ms. French suggested that the motion could be more assertive about what the site should not be named and what it does not require.

Board Member Willis argued for a small motion that would resonate with the Council, noting that detailed minutes of the HRB's discussion would be available if the Council wished to review them.

Board Member Wimmer proposed an amendment to the motion, stating that the HRB does not support the renaming of Tower Well Park as outlined in the agenda item.

Ms. French inquired if there was interest in referencing PAHA's process, as they had previously considered the name.

Vice Chair Rohman suggested that the motion could state that the HRB agrees with PAHA's recommendation and then forward that name to the Council.

Board Member Willis responded that she would second this motion.

MOTION AMENDED

Motion by Vice Chair Rohman that the HRB concurs with the PAHA recommended naming Tower Well Park and recommends that naming to Council.

Board Member Wimmer expressed concern that supporting the motion might imply endorsement of the entire proposal, including the suggested name, which the Board does not agree with.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz interpreted the motion as expressing the Board's preferred name for the site.

Ms. French asked if the Board wanted to add 'and forward this preference to Council' to the motion to emphasize it as a preference.

Board Member Willis felt the motion was sufficiently strong given the current circumstances. She noted that the Board might support a name change if more background information and name options were provided. She emphasized that the current name, 'Tower Well', honors the site's historical significance, which the Board finds most appropriate.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz suggested explicitly stating that the Board prefers 'Tower Well Park' over the proposed 'Fred or Frederick Eyerly Tower Well Park'.

Vice Chair Rohman clarified the motion under discussion: 'The HRB recommends naming the site 'Tower Well Park', not 'Fred Eyerly Tower Well Park'.'

MOTION AMENDED

Motion by Board Member Willis that the HRB concurs with the PAHA recommended Tower Well Park naming, as opposed to the proposed Fred Eyerly Tower Well Park.

Board Member Willis suggested that the motion be slightly modified because the way it was phrased makes Tower Well Park sound like a description. It should be stated that the name of the park should be Tower Well Park rather than having Mr. Eyerly's name associated with it.

Board Member Wimmer suggested stating that the HRB does not support renaming the park at this time.

Ms. French restated the friendly amendment under discussion – "The HRB recommends retaining the Tower Well Park name presented by Council, rather than adding Fred Eyerly to the name."

Board Member Willis said the "Fred" part might need to be left out because it is unclear whether it should be "Fred" or "Frederick."

Board Member Wimmer responded that the Board should go with what was presented, which was "Frederick."

Board Member Willis remarked that she does not like perpetrating inaccurate things.

Ms. French said she could see modifying to say that HRB recommends retaining the name Tower Well Park rather than adding Mr. Eyerly's name to that.

Ms. O'Kane advised that the PAHA Board supports adding Fred Eyerly rather than Frederick Eyerly to the name. It was not the original recommendation, but they would support it if that was the desired direction of the HRB.

Ms. French restated the friendly amendment under discussion – "HRB recommends retaining the name Tower Well Park rather than adding Mr. Eyerly's name to the park name."

MOTION AMENDED

Motion by Board Member Willis that the HRB recommend retaining the name Tower Well Park rather than adding Mr. Eyerly's name to the park name. Seconded by Vice Chair Rohman, the motion carried (4-0-3)

3. Tailored Mills Act Program Recommendation to City Council

Staff: Amy French

Public Comment: Herb Borock

Ms. French presented the staff report regarding the Tailored Mills Act Program. The staff recommended that the HRB resume discussions on a draft policy for processing requests for historic property preservation agreements under the State of California's Mills Act property tax abatement program. The approach could include a request for the City to present a primer on historic preservation, a letter to the Council requesting the establishment of a Tailored Mills Act program, and exploration of resource use, timelines, and administrative components such as audits. Ms. French provided a timeline of HRB efforts and work plans over the years and summarized the Mills Act, its establishment, importance, and the Council's understanding of its value for preservation. She noted that in May 2017, the Council decided to halt further Mills Act applications until appropriate policies and procedures were adopted. The Council was concerned that tax reductions under the Mills Act would impact PAUSD's income, which is derived from property taxes. The three key issues for properties were the property's significance to the community, development pressure on the site, and the need for rehabilitation. Discussions also touched on the concept of a pilot program limited to a few properties, with rules that could be modified based on program experience. This would involve training owners, gathering feedback, and adjusting the program. The draft program considered properties in Categories 1, 2, 3, or 4 of the City's Historic Inventory or those listed on the National Register, California Register, or contributing to one of the four historic districts: Professorville, Ramona Street, Green Gables, or Greenmeadow. Local contract requirements would include a ten-year rehabilitation and maintenance plan, property inspections every one to five years by a historic preservation planner, and input from Development Services staff. Owners would be required to fund and display an interpretive panel and allow exterior home tours. All contracts would need to provide a major public benefit with extensive restoration and perpetual maintenance. Ms. French identified potential tasks such as organizing a community primer on the Mills Act Program incentives, preparing a letter to the Council, consulting a tax advisor to address tax offset concerns, and meeting with PAUSD for input on the program.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz invited comments from the public.

Herb Borock highlighted several intertwined issues in determining the need for historic designation and benefits. He noted that community concerns about development changes could be addressed by designating certain properties as historic to prevent redevelopment. He also mentioned the trend of public office candidates identifying themselves as historic figures. Mr. Borock emphasized the benefits of development incentives for those involved in land development. He urged the Council and HRB to distinguish between the importance of preservation and the provision of incentives for it.

Board Member Willis clarified that the Hewlett-Packard house, where the Packard's resided when the garage was deemed historic, is the original house. While the garage holds more significance, the house itself is historic.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz invited comments from Board members.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz found it peculiar that the City of Palo Alto does not offer any Mills Act program, unlike many surrounding communities with comparable historic structures. She advocated for a study session with the Council to discuss the Mills Act Contracts, given that not everyone might be familiar with how they work.

Board Member Willis suggested the properties at Cowper Street and Chaucer Street as potential trial properties. She expressed interest in a legal department review to explore the possibility of a trial or conceptual trial on one or two properties. This would help analyze the tax implications and potential benefits that could be negotiated with the owner. She believed both properties were interested in historical preservation and would be open to collaboration, even if it was only conceptual. She also raised the question of whether grant money could be used to establish the Mills Act as a trial program.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz inquired whether the Board or the Council would be responsible for studying and providing resources for the Tailored Mills Act Program if it were to be considered by the Council.

Ms. French explained that every staff report sent to the Council includes a Resource Impact section, which requires staff work to determine variables such as time, resources, and the need for a tax or economic expert.

Board Member Wimmer stated that she was on the subcommittee with David Bower, and she mentioned their document included in the packet. They hoped to initiate a pilot program involving one or two properties, with the goal of learning from the process and gathering feedback. She suggested that approval for such a program might require forecasting staff cost and time impacts, and mentioned the Squire House's Mills Act program as a potential source of data.

Ms. French clarified that the City does not have a program, and the Squire House benefits from a State act. The Council had agreed to remove the interior tours requirement from the Mills Act contract for the Squire House, as the State deemed it excessive for private homes.

Vice Chair Rohman referred to David Bower's notes from January 27, 2022, about the pilot program's progress. She questioned whether the Board should conduct a study session on the pilot program with the Council before implementation or ask the Council to push through the pilot program first.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz believed that a study session demonstrating the principles of the Tailored Mills Act template would be beneficial, regardless of whether it's for a pilot program or full implementation. She suggested presenting options to the Council for their decision on proceeding with the program.

Ms. French indicated that the next step would be a letter request to the Council to consider the establishment of the program in their work plan. She noted that additional resources for audits might push the start of work to 2025.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz asked for a suitable future month, considering their work plan and budget cycle, to include this in their work plan.

Ms. French said there was another meeting within this work plan year, so if there is a desire to continue this item to June 13, 2024, to work on some kind of letter and then look toward calendars for a study session, and then start looking toward the Fall for an opportunity.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz stated that the Council would not consider anything without the Board sending anything, so it is just a question of timing regarding when to send this and ask for the study session.

Board Member Wimmer remarked that efforts to move the Mills Act forward have gone on for at least ten years. There is a need to get the community on board with historic preservation and the Mills Act is critical because it is the best incentive that the City can offer.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz said she saw no harm in asking the Council to consider adding this to their work plan, whether it is this year or in the next fiscal year.

Board Member Wimmer felt the Board should ask now rather than put it off until next year.

Ms. French said if there is an interest in preparing a draft letter to share with the Board, perhaps there is an interest in having this agenda item appear again with some movement forward on this request.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz asked if there was an interest in creating a draft letter.

Board Member Willis said she was interested in additional information before that discussion began, adding that she would like to see the Squire House contract.

Ms. French advised that she could send it to the HRB by email.

Board Member Willis said she would like for someone to reach out to Los Altos or another community that has had a Mills Act longer that could provide actual numbers on the tax consequences. Unless you are an accountant, it will be really hard to interpret from the written description what that actually means in terms of tax consequences. She inquired whether there was a need for committing to ten years or it was possible to do a shorter Mills Act.

Ms. French thought it would be worth consulting the Mills Act itself. The State sets forth a minimum period of ten years for the Mills Act.

Board Member Willis felt it might be worth a call to the State Office of Historic Preservation to find out if there is some ability to do a pilot program. It is a fair amount of work for the homeowners to do a ten-year Mills Act. She thought that the City committing to ten years when it is difficult to imagine what it really means, or asking someone to invest in a Mills Act application when there is no Mills Act, is asking a lot. It

is necessary to look at ways to move things forward and there may be a need for some alternatives to what was traditional twenty or thirty years ago.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz believed that this would eventually start with the Council taking a look at it.

Board Member Willis expressed support, but she thought it needed to be made understandable for the Council.

Board Member Wimmer suggested presenting it in its current form and having the Council help facilitate it. She was unsure whether the Board had the wherewithal to collect the information from other cities as it takes time and expertise.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz agreed, stating that the document would be presented as a suggestion and the Council could modify it as they see fit in response to staff recommendations and cost data that is unveiled as part of the process.

Vice Chair Rohman agreed with Board Member Willis regarding the suggestion for further investigation. She did not think it was necessary that every question be answered when presenting the document to Council. The Board could do the investigations into Pasadena, additional financial impact information, and resources information during the wait for Council to review the document.

Board Member Willis referred to a home selling for eight million dollars on the national register which needs a lot of work and inquired about the tax consequences.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz responded that the home is not eligible under this draft plan because it costs over five million dollars.

Board Member Wimmer said that when the document was completed, she thought the Board did try to present it to the Council. She inquired regarding what happened to that effort to move it forward.

Ms. French advised that it did not move forward. The Historic Planner left at that point in time and there was no bandwidth for staff to continue the efforts.

Board Member Willis said she interpreted the property value limitations on page 32 differently. She thought there could be a more expensive property, but the limitations for the contract would be limited to five million dollars or less. She sought clarification about what that means.

Vice Chair Rohman said she interpreted it the same way in that you could have an eight-million-dollar home but only up to five million dollars of it would be eligible for property tax rebates under the Mills Act.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz remarked that she took that as an overall capital property value.

Board Member Wimmer referred to the document and pointed out that everything in red were the tailored items subject to review. The document is five years old and needs to be revisited, and the tapered items may need to be reviewed.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz stated that the Council could make a call on what property value or percentage of assessed value is an appropriate limit for a Mills Act contract. She felt that if this were to go to Council, they would want to look at it and modify as needed.

Board Member Willis said she would like to go to Council with the strongest and clearest packet possible. She thought the Board should focus really strongly on a future deadline and present something that is very comprehensible. She asked if there was a way to take more money from the real estate taxes out of the City's portion and less out of the school district's portion

Board Member Wimmer felt that it was more about presenting incentives than the dollar amount. She said the reason for doing the pilot program is to better understand if this amounts to any kind of loss to the City. Projections have already been done indicating that it would be a miniscule amount of money that would be lost by the school board. The school board seems to have such ample amounts of money in donations that it did not feel like the Mills Act was going to make the schools go broke. The plan was to do one or two properties just to start and learn, and after doing one or two properties if it seemed like it would be a real threat to the school system, the necessary changes would be made.

Board Member Willis remarked that she has been there a long time, and the conversation when the Mills Act was eliminated was all about money.

Board Member Wimmer suggested leading not with how much this would cost the City, but with this is an incentive and the City needs to have these incentives in place because the community will not support historic programs without incentives.

Vice Chair Rohman agreed, stating that these are all of the details that go in the cover letter on the program that will be sent to Council. If needed, the Board can state in the letter that it is known that this was an issue with the school board in the past, the calculations have been done, this is a tailored program and so it is a miniscule amount, and address that further down.

Board Member Wimmer said that if the Council feels like this is a threat to an economic system already in place, then let them ask those questions. That is the time when the Board could explain that while it may take a small incremental amount from the City benefits, the gain is still much greater. She thought the loss of the property taxes that these historic homeowners are paying was not the biggest topic of discussion that should be focused on.

Board Member Willis suggested lay language for the packet so Council could look over the Mills Act and understand what it actually might mean. The more clarity, the better chance of moving it forward.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz stated that the financial analysis would be included in the staff report, but the Board cannot modify State Tax Code.

Ms. French remarked that this is a lack of full understanding on the part of staff and the Board. To get a study, it is necessary to figure out the costs and obtain approval to spend the money. It is always connected to resources and how it can be worked in.

Board Member Willis said she did not ever see the Mills Act affecting a majority the historic property owners. She supported the idea of the educational component of what is available for different types of properties. She felt the City needs a Mills Act, but she also thought that it behooves them not to create any ill will when they do put it out to the community. It is easy to misinterpret how people will respond to things and education will be the only savior. The Board needs something strong enough to bring to Council that indicates that we have invested in this, and it is time to move forward. She said the more information that can be gathered, the better.

Board Member Wimmer thought the Board should present it as is. Let the Council ask the questions and maybe they will have the resources to answer those questions. It is not the HRB's responsibility to be experts at all of this and explain everything to the Council. She felt the Board was spending too much time trying to perfect it.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz asked if the request for consideration or inclusion of this on the Council's work plan could include mention of a joint study session, and then also a mention of collaborating on obtaining the data and answering the questions. Part of this process would be a concerted effort, ideally with some funding associated, to get tax impact numbers and potentially work with a consultant to see what the experience of other communities has been.

Board Member Willis asked about the potential for the Board to have a study session with Council focusing on the Mills Act and preservation education as a first step.

Ms. French responded that if the HRB wanting to consider doing that, it would require getting permission because all of that is coordinating with agenda planning. She said if it was put forward, she would pursue it.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz said she would want to see the Council's initial responses to the tailored program. She felt it would be a mistake to not include some mention of the draft plan because a lot would be learned. She supported Ms. French's suggestion that the HRB continue this to the next meeting, and she thought it would be great to have a draft of the letter to Council that incorporates some of these points. There could be some discussion regarding making the initial request for the Council to incorporate this into their plan.

Board Member Wimmer inquired about the Board speaking with the Council Liaison.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz advised that she has spoken with the Council Liaison, who is very supportive of the study session idea. She asked if Council Member Kou would like to speak.

Council Member Kou stated that she was very supportive of a joint study session. She said the Mills Act may need to be further vetted and with this particular subject just being the only one, then the Council can concentrate on it more and can ask questions and also help with the development. She said that she was not speaking for her colleagues, she is supportive of a study session and felt it was long overdue.

Board Member Wimmer inquired about including specific bullet points regarding things that need to be worked on to perfect the documents already prepared.

Council Member Kou suggested having as many points as possible for consideration. She thought that some of the public comments from some of the residents willing to proceed with putting their house on a Mills Act, but they need incentives, so maybe take some of those into consideration and put it on the list for Council to consider.

Board Member Wimmer recommended the Board have a study session to identify things to include in the preliminary document and list what additional information is needed to get the documents to a point that it can be presented to Council in a way that they would understand. She questioned what the additional information is that the Board needs to work on to supplement the documents already prepared.

Ms. French presented a slide on potential tasks regarding the Tailored Mills Act Program, including a primer on historic preservation which could take the form of an evening outreach meeting where Council is invited, or could take the form of a study session with Council at one of their meetings. Other tasks include preparing a letter of request and tasks related to what else is missing, the money side of things, and the school district side of things.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz felt that everything on the slide made sense. She expressed interest in seeing the letter of request and she wondered if the last three bullet points could be incorporated into the letter. She was unsure if a funding request was appropriate or if that was something that could be funded as part of ongoing City operations currently, but it would be good to let Council know that these are areas where the Board is seeking more information as part of the request to begin a dialogue about establishing this type of program.

Ms. French asked if there was a motion to continue the item to June 13, 2024.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz asked if the Board would be able to see a draft letter.

Vice Chair Rohman said she would be happy to put a document together that starts the letter and if she could be sent ideas, additions, or work that is ongoing, she can put something together.

Ms. French stated that if Vice Chair Rohman wanted to take a first draft and communicate with her on that, then they could think about the next steps as far as how to engage the rest of the Board.

Vice Chair Rohman said she was happy to begin working through it with Ms. French.

Board Member Willis asked Ms. French if she had a vision of the primer on historic preservation.

Ms. French responded yes, the on-call Historic Preservation Consultant has done educational sessions in the past. There could be some work done at staff level to do a package for one of the evening meetings, look towards a date for that, and invite the community, Council, and HRB. There is a study session specifically that could happen on the Mills Act.

Board Member Willis asked if the consultant would have something they put together for a different City format-wise that she could start formatting that might work for Palo Alto.

Ms. French was unsure the answer to the question, but she said that they would not have done that for Palo Alto.

Board Member Willis clarified that she was just looking for how other cities have presented it so she could interpret it for Palo Alto.

Ms. French advised that one of things that the Council directed staff to do as part of the April 22, 2024, action was to look at what can be done about the parcel reports that state potentially eligible. Every

property that is fifty years or older in Palo Alto is potentially eligible for listing on the California Register. She said that one approach would be to put a label on every property older than fifty years to say maybe eligible and would require evaluation for historic status if a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document is required for discretionary review, and then there would have to be a monitoring system. Another approach is to remove that 'potentially eligible' which would not then flag those 1948 or earlier properties for staff as they are looking at individual review homes that come through the process.

Board Member Willis clarified that she was talking about trying to make it more obvious what the advantages are if you already have a historic home.

Ms. French felt worried that the conversation was going out of scope from the current item regarding the Mills Act.

MOTION

Motion by Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz that the item be moved to the June meeting so the Board can look at a potential letter to Council and raise any additional questions regarding the Tailored Mills Act Program to be proposed. Seconded by Vice Chair Rohman, the motion carried (4-0-3)

Approval of Minutes

4. Approval of Historic Resources Board Draft Minutes of March 28, 2024

MOTION

Motion by Board Member Wimmer to approve the minutes of March 28, 2024. Seconded by Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz, the motion passed (4-0-3) by voice vote.

5. Approval of Historic Resources Board Draft Minutes of April 11, 2024

MOTION

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz advised that the item would be continued to the next meeting as Wimmer was absent for the April 11, 2024 meeting and had to abstain and there was no quorum to vote.

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

None.

Adjournment

MOTION

Motion by Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz to adjourn. Seconded by Board Member Vice Chair Rohman, the motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:21 a.m.