



# HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING

## MINUTES: October 12, 2023

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

### Call to Order/Roll Call

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

Absent: Vice Chair Samantha Rohman

### Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

### Public Comment

### City Official Reports

#### 1. Historic Resources Board Schedule of Meetings and Assignments

Ms. French advised the Board about meetings for the remainder of 2023. There will be a special community meeting on Tuesday, October 24<sup>th</sup>, 6 p.m. It will be held in the Community Room and will be a presentation by the consultant and staff. If interested, HRB members may participate. Ms. French said she has had initial discussions with the Chair and Vice Chair regarding roles of the HRB members in the community meeting. She said it will be an opportunity to fully understand the Historic Reconnaissance Survey. Owners of the properties included in the survey will be receiving notice letters inviting them to the meeting.

Ms. French noted there will be meetings on November 9<sup>th</sup> and December 14<sup>th</sup>. These meetings will be focused on nominations of batches of properties. There will also be a regular meeting in January and a special community meeting at the end of January or early February, which will be another evening meeting.

Board Member Willis asked when the notices would be going out.

Ms. French replied that it will be soon.

Board Member Heinrich asked to whom the notices will be going.

Ms. French replied they will be going to the owners of the properties for every address that they have on record for the eligible properties. There will also be a notice in the newspaper regarding the community meeting.

Board Member Heinrich asked if this would be in the *Weekly*.

Ms. French responded that they will be advertised in the *Daily*.

Mayor Kou commented that she is glad the HRB members will be part of the community meeting and she hoped that they will have a bigger role than they did in the first meeting she attended. She hoped that there would be discussion about their involvement in the community meetings moving forward.

Ms. French noted that one of the goals will be quarterly evening meetings of the HRB as part of the outreach goal for the HRB work plan.

Board Member Willis asked if the DPR sheets associated with the properties will be sent out along with the letters.

Ms. French responded they could perhaps talk about that later, as she did not have that information on hand.

### **Study Session**

2. Study Session to Discuss Work Plan Goal 4, Including Timeline and Steps to Implement Comprehensive Plan Policy L7.1.2 to Reassess Palo Alto Municipal Code Chapter 16.49, Historic Preservation

Ms. French stated that the Board's mission for the meeting was to discuss Work Plan Goal 4. She noted that the HRB had requested that all of the DPR forms for each property on the City's inventory be uploaded. She reported that this has been done. Board members received a document containing the photos of the properties in batch format. The actual forms have been uploaded, but not the photos.

Ms. French noted that, as part of their outreach, quarterly evening meetings are planned, and if the Board wished to continue with these, it should be addressed in their bylaws. Regarding the review process *Bulletin*, she has made the changes discussed by the Board at the retreat. Another work plan item was to review incentives for rehabilitation. This is an item still to be completed. Another important item which has been brought up in discussions of the survey is how the existing Ordinance applies. The Board is tasked with reviewing the Ordinance with regard to its effectiveness, per Comprehensive Plan Policy L7.1.2.

Ms. French referenced the *Bulletin*, established in 2016, pointing out Group A and Group B as a group of properties that are reviewed through different processes. Group A processes are properties Categories 1 and 2, plus Categories 3 and 4 when they are in Downtown or a locally-designated historic district. After the HRB reviews modifications to properties, compliance with their recommendations is voluntary. The HRB also reviews other significant properties.

Ms. French noted that part of the discussion for the Board was to consider the timing of the task of Ordinance review as it relates to the upcoming survey meetings in addition to reviewing the Ordinance's deficiencies and considering outreach and the process for amending the Code. One situation recently encountered involved an application submitted to nominate someone else's property. The Code does not address a situation in which the owner does not want to be listed. She said the State has a policy on this, but Palo Alto does not have an explicitly stated policy. Ms. French said this is a question that Council will have to deal with as they review nominations of properties. This would be an example of one issue that should probably be changed and clarified in the Code.

Ms. French presented details on incentives and the webpage which explains them. She noted that many in the community may not be aware of this page. The incentives are for rehabilitation of historic resources per the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. She suggested one approach for the HRB would be to consider a simpler, clearer process for voluntary listing of a property for owners who may want to place their property on the City's inventory. Other concepts could be discussed, such as workshops addressing how property owners can take advantage of the incentives, or exploring additional ones through use of a focus group. The tailored Mills Act program is also a potential incentive, including a financial benefit for owners of listed properties.

Ms. French shared the Ordinance in its current form, including its standards for review. She presented a slide detailing changes to the Ordinance made in the late 1990s. including a document provided by an HRB member, who asked that it be distributed. She suggested that it is helpful to understand what happened the last time there were changes to the City's Historic Preservation Code. She felt it would be good for the Board to discuss potential timelines for this goal, especially concerning outreach and community input on such things as procedures and criteria; what to do about National and California listed resources that are not called out in the Ordinance and may not be on the local inventory; and discussing pros and cons about enhancing protections. Currently, per the Code, Category 3 and 4 resources outside the Downtown and Professorville are not protected. Demolition delay is only for Category 1 and 2 resources. Ms. French suggested that the Board might want to talk about future surveys for older properties that become eligible and what the process would be to add them if the Ordinance was clarified.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz invited questions from the Board.

Board Member Heinrich asked to go back to the slide, "Late 1990s Ordinance Change Process."

Ms. French noted that Board Member Willis had provided this documentation from the past process.

Board Member Willis asked what the process is for amending the current Ordinance.

Ms. French responded that, ideally, the process would include outreach for public input. It would involve the HRB. It could include an environmental assessment, including an environmental impact report.

Board Member Willis wondered about piecemeal changes, such as amending or adding definitions of categories. She asked if minor changes would need approval and wondered if the process would require them to evaluate the entire Ordinance at once.

Ms. French said that there would be a range of options. The Code has been amended in bits and pieces over time. However, when it impacts property owners, she said she wouldn't advise piecemeal changes, but instead to be very transparent and clear as to changes and their impacts.

Board Member Willis wondered if changes such as adding definitions or redefining categories would be any different process. For example, Category 1's becoming "Landmark" or "Heritage," not involving any change in effect, but a change in name only.

Ms. French thought that may seem less impactful, but reiterated the importance of transparency and making sure the community understands why this was happening and whether it had any effect on any properties involved.

Board Member Pease wanted to understand what the product of their work plan was to be. His understanding was that they would be making a set of recommendations.

Ms. French agreed, stating that the HRB is a recommending body to the City Council.

Board Member Pease asked if they could address all of the questions in their set of recommendations.

Ms. French responded that the Board's latitude on recommendations is not constrained.

Board Member Pease asked what the next step would be after a document of recommendations was completed by the Board.

Ms. French said the HRB's recommended changes to the Ordinance would be annotated. The Council would review them. She added that the last time changes were made there was involvement with Title 18, and this required review by the Planning and Transportation Commission which has purview over changes to Title 18.

Board Member Pease wondered if they could make recommendations for new types of preservation incentives.

Ms. French replied that yes, any incentives recommended by the HRB could be discussed with respect to Chapter 16.49, the Historic Preservation Ordinance. However, if they have an effect on Title 18 with regard to what an owner can do with their property, this would involve the Planning and Transportation Commission.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz observed that any modification to the Ordinance is an extensive process involving multiple commissions and the City Council.

Ms. French agreed.

Board Member Pease asked if they are free to determine the scope of what the Board wants to recommend.

Ms. French said they were, but added that it is not a quick and easy process.

Board Member Pease remarked that no one is expecting it to be quick and easy. The history presented demonstrates that there is evidently no quick, easy process; however, being informed by that process may help in reducing the complexity of the task currently at hand.

Ms. French agreed. She said one of the cautionary tales provided by the history was that multiple processes were happening at the same time. People were being told their property was historic. Additionally, they did not know which Ordinance was being referenced or what would be the effect. There was too much change

all at once. An advantage of having a “stale” Ordinance was that they know what it is. It is when the Ordinance is changed that people get confused as to what it means for them.

Board Member Pease commented regarding going through the inventory review process at the same time as reviewing the Ordinance and wondered how to do it in an efficient way so that the inventory process doesn’t turn out to be irrelevant.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz asked for clarification of the State’s position about listing a property against a property owner’s wishes.

Ms. French responded that the when there is a nomination to the State register, the property will not actually be listed over the objections of the property owner. She said that would be the model for Board and for the City Council when they consider nominations, although it is not stated in their Code.

Board Member Pease asked how a property owner is notified by the State that their property has been nominated.

Ms. French said she didn’t know but imagined it would be similar to what the Palo Alto does.

Board Member Heinrich if they would be breaking down into subcommittees to address the work plan tasks.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz thought they could, potentially, but the current item was to begin the discussion, particularly within the context of the inventory update.

Board Member Heinrich said at the PAST meeting the previous evening they identified volunteers who would be willing to work with the HRB on some of the work plan tasks.

Mayor Kou commented that as the Board worked on the Ordinance, they might want to engage with some of the insurance agents, because many of the historical properties, based on their designation, may impact insurance.

Hearing no further comments from the Board, Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz invited comments from the public.

John Bard [phonetic spelling], Palo Alto resident, says his wife, Maureen and he own one of the properties on the eligible list. They are excited about living in an historic home and have put a lot of work into preserving the character of the home. They purchased it from the previous owner, who had renovated it and made improvements that were recognized as outstanding restoration work. They have been pleased to live in the historic property for 23 years. They are concerned that being on the designated list may cause a decrease in the value of their property because of the restrictions for potential future buyers who may want to make alterations to the property and don’t understand the complexities of the process and the potential impact it might have on their flexibility to add new features or to upgrade the property. He said there were many deficiencies in the design of their house in 1904. Some were addressed in the previous renovation, but not all have been addressed. They want to make sure they have the flexibility to do those. He said he felt the Board is headed in the right directions. The topics he is hearing about in the discussion are the right ones to be considering. He felt it was important to look at the history, and it would be important to have the public outreach, but to make sure that it is clear what the process is, what the impact could be to the value of property owner’s home going forward, and to also make sure they have good communication of the incentives. He said he has been following this in the *Weekly* and also attended the previous workshop, and it is still not clear to him what the incentives are for a homeowner to say, “Yes, I want to be on the list.” He realized this is the central issue the Board is trying to address. He said he and his wife live on a very mixed block. Their home and the home next door would be on the list, but all of the surrounding properties would not. Many of them are multifamily apartment buildings, with newer construction. Some are older construction and would not be protected and could then be torn down. Some of the new designs that have been approved encroach on setbacks and are too big, so he wanted to make sure that the policy affects homeowners evenly.

Darlene Yaplee addressed the Board and said she attended the original meeting. She said there has not been any outreach since the first meeting, so people have not been aware of the reconnaissance survey results pertaining to their homes. She said they have not received a letter regarding the October meeting, and if the letter went out that day, there would be less than 10 days for people to find out that their house is on the results of the survey and to do some research in order to ask formal questions. She agreed with

the previous speaker that it is important to answer some of the questions that were not answered at the first meeting, as well as the current questions, such as what the incentives really are, what the implications would be if the current Ordinance is changed and whether that would impact the current eligible or TBD eligible houses. She has offered to help in the process, and she has not been taken up on her offer. She said her offer is still available because she feels they should try to reduce the gap between what is shared and what residents want to know. As an example, she referred to the slide regarding the Palo Alto Register of Historical homes and said the register was initially intended to list no new properties until interested owners began to nominate their properties. She asked how that intent relates to the process that will be before the Board and how it should be interpreted.

Simon Firth, homeowner, commented he has a house that will potentially be listed as historic. He said he sent a message to the Board the previous evening with some questions. He agreed with the previous speakers. He said he was somewhat agnostic at present as to whether he would want his house listed, but he would like to be asked. He said in their particular situation their house is listed as potentially unable to be registered, because on the last survey it was listed as potential under the "historic persons" category in the National Register, but not in the California Register. He explained that it was listed because of the man who married one of the sisters who built the house – Jack Alby [phonetic spelling] – who was the local constable. His wife, who built the house, was a local schoolteacher in Mayfield. Mr. Firth remarked that he didn't understand why he gets privileged over her. He encouraged the Board to explore the historic persons category and study who the people are and why they are picked out, whether it's just because they happen to know about them. He gave another example – the house across the street from him and built by the same builder as his own house. It is not listed either currently or as proposed, and it was built for a Stanford professor. He said in his opinion a Stanford professor would be "as cool as a constable". He said one street away from them is the house where Birge Clark's father lived, another Stanford professor, and thought to be where Birge Clark grew up. It is not listed under either existing or proposed. He wondered if this is because it was not known that he lived there, or some other reason. He felt that the "persons" category is somewhat arbitrary and he wondered what the rules are for deciding why someone is important. He felt they should eliminate that category and designate on architectural merit only, which would be more straightforward. He suggested that one alternative would be to say that every building built before 1945, for example, is bound to have had someone who was important in some way. His question was why register some peoples' houses and not others under the "historic persons" category.

Ms. French informed the Board members that the email sent by Mr. Firth was sent to them the previous day, close to 9:00.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz opened the conversation for discussion. She commented that, based on what they just heard, and touching on a subject discussed with the consultants, the "historic persons" category needs some clean-up. She agreed with the previous speaker that there may be some variability in how people of importance have been selected. She thought since the time of the last historic survey that there has been some evolution in the thinking of who may qualify. She felt it is important to re-evaluate that particular type of designation both in terms of how it interacts with the Ordinance in formalizing the place, but also in terms of how they view who is historically significant. She acknowledged that there is a move to telling a diversity of stories that was perhaps not present in previous surveys that is an active part of the discussion now.

Board Member Heinrich felt that the historic persons category is arbitrary, and she felt that unless something significant happened in a building with the significant person, then that would qualify the building to be registered. For example, the HP Garage. She said just because someone lived there, is too arbitrary. Someone could have simply visited a friend, or composed a song while they were there. She asked, would that make the building significant? She did not believe it would.

Board Member Willis said in regard to historic persons, part of what came up in the comments was one building over another building. She said there is a house on the Stanford campus, an A.B. Clark house, and it is the representation of his house. She said that they tend to pick the most significant house associated with that person, so because someone lived there, there might be another property associated with them that is more worthy of recognition. She felt that they should remember that the buildings are about their history and stories and not repeating past mistakes. They should be about where they've been and how far they've come. She said people that lived there are very much a part of that fabric. Most of them were

not well-known, significant people, but were ordinary people, the kind that make the world go around. She said in Palo Alto they are privileged to have had a lot of people who pushed the world pretty fast, more than most communities. They have had some strong players in their history, and she felt it is important to maintain those buildings as symbols of their past. They may not be architecturally significant but are definitely historically significant.

Board Member Wimmer expressed appreciation for the members of the public who commented. She said people being willing to speak to them is valuable to them, because it is direct feedback from people who are impacted by what the Board is discussing. Hearing about their experience is very valuable. She noted that they are collecting information from a subgroup, and she wondered if they could refer back to them to continue the dialogue, which is what public outreach is all about. She wondered about having a specific group of people who are willing to interact with them to share their responses and thoughts about how they will be impacted. She observed that some have a more positive outlook on this, although there is still a lot of negative input on the impacts. However, she felt this would be an important subgroup of people that they could collect feedback from, if they are willing. Board Member Wimmer also commented on the continued struggle with the incentives. She said they just don't have many. There may be better incentives for owners of commercial buildings, but that does not apply to the homeowners that the Board is specifically targeting in their current efforts. She said, for people who have a house that's on the potentially-eligible list, before they are able to move forward with any permitting for architectural remodeling projects they have to have an Environmental Impact Report done, which can cost around \$7,000, because they have to hire Page and Turnbull to do a report. She suggested that that could be an incentive – to eliminate the owner having to absorb the cost of having their house looked at by a professional firm like Page and Turnbull. Her thought was to have someone internal, like a specifically historic planning staff member who could assist in assessing some of the properties. The incentive to the property owner would be avoiding the high fees for getting more information about their property.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz thought this also spoke to the idea of making it easy for people who wish to list their properties voluntarily. Currently the process is challenging and expensive. Finding a way to mitigate the cost and the process for those who are raising their hand saying, "I would like to preserve my home," making it an easy and affordable process for them as well.

Board Member Wimmer said they did have a prior member, Debbie Shepherd, who owned a Category 2 historic home. Debbie had wanted to put her house on the register, but the cost was somewhere around \$15,000, and she didn't want to have to pay that much to go through the process. She said it's not so much about getting something like a reduction on property taxes, but is more about being able to go through the process without the exorbitant fees. She said that would be an incentive unto itself.

Board Member Willis wanted to clarify that the example Board Member Wimmer spoke of was to list the property on the National Register, not the local inventory. It was a Category 2 on the local inventory.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz asked, when the City had a staff member in the Historic Preservation position, was this process was something that they had been able to assist with.

Ms. French remarked that fees charged by private consulting firms with expertise, as noted by Board Member Wimmer, is in the range of \$4,000 to \$7,000, because it is intensive work, requiring time to research, prepare and review. The historic planner that the City previously employed would take a cursory look at things, but did not have the ability to develop an entire report that following all of the Secretary of the Interior Standards guidelines. The historic planner had qualifications to look at certain things, like Mid-Century Modern buildings or others not requiring as much research, and somewhat easier tasks than some of the older buildings having more history and more associated persons and events.

Mayor Kou asked if the conversation about buildings included residential as well as commercial. She pointed out that one of the public commentators said that they are willing to engage in helping review the Ordinance. She agreed with Board Member Wimmer that it would be good to reach out to them. She said the Council is coming up to a mid-year budget review in January or February. She thought it was perhaps a good time to make a request for the costs associated with hiring a staff member dedicated to looking at the Historic Ordinance and helping the Board in reviewing it. This could be proposed to Council for their review.

Ms. French responded that they did have an ad posted to find a senior level historic planner, someone with actual qualifications. So there will be staff if they are able to find them and hire and keep them.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz asked if the position requisition was open currently.

Ms. French thought it was about to be posted, but wasn't sure. She has not seen any results of the posting. She said she will check on it and report back to the Board.

Board Member Wimmer thought that now is the time to have such a person, when embarking on this possibly game-changing endeavor. She added that Ms. French has been doing an amazing job in the meantime. In the absence of an actual historic planner, Ms. French has stepped for a number of years.

Ms. French noted that the last historic planner left in March of 2018.

Board Member Wimmer reiterated her appreciation for Ms. French's efforts in the meantime.

Board Member Pease remembered that when he was first on the Board the only thing he experienced was very specific questions about very specific projects passed to the HRB from the Architectural Review Board. He said it seems to him that the Historic Resources Board, and historic resources, includes a lot of things. For example, they now have a museum in development. Also, there are other ways of preserving things without physically preserving them. There are ways to create a historic record which is much more detailed than they would otherwise have been, and this should be also part of what they consider an incentive. Allowing such things in a way that is not as costly and is acceptable in terms of privacy and where they wish to take their property.

Board Member Willis felt that it would be important to rephrase the incentives and put them in a better context for people to be able to pick out which ones apply to them. They are in so many different locations that it becomes a sort of puzzle. She thought they could save people time and frustration by rephrasing and putting some of them in a different place on the webpage. She suggested grouping them more according to who they apply to, while still referencing their location in the Code. Also in regard to the webpage, she said she was disappointed to find the DPR sheets all grouped together. She said that scrolling through them to find one you're interested in is not a great experience. She hoped it was not the end result. She thought they could possibly apply for a state grant to help in such an endeavor, but she would like to see them individually listed, with the ability to search for a property.

Board Member Heinrich said in regard to the incentives list that the PAST members are willing to help. They already have their own document, but would be willing to make it more user-friendly and to post it on their site if it can't be placed on the City's site in a timely manner.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz said she has heard that people have questions about what their responsibilities are as an owner of a historic home on the registry. She said it is hard to pin down when searching the website. Part of it is because it is situational, and also in some cases it is entirely voluntary. It is important to conveying to people the fact that it doesn't impact their ability to renovate their kitchen or bathroom, that improvement of their property is possible. Finding a way to make that very clear in the context of a home that has a historic designation is important.

Ms. French acknowledged the labyrinth of webpages. She shared her screen and guided the group through the steps in finding historic preservation information and incentives on the City's website. The initial path is through Departments/Planning & Development/Historic Preservation. The Historic Preservation page has numerous links under "Areas of Work." These links lead to entry points and details regarding the various incentives and can further link to where they are found in the Municipal Code.

Ms. French commented that the question is how best to promote these and expand these incentives. She agreed that people tend to get lost in the web pages despite efforts to help, including workshops, community meetings, pamphlets, and using partners such as PAST. She offered the suggestion of a potential subcommittee to focus on visibility and how and where to present things on the web pages, and how to best partner with PAST.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz felt that outreach would be a good subcommittee. She added that this is an interest of Vice Chair Rohman, so perhaps they could discuss it when she is in attendance. Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz also mentioned the Mills Act and noted that the Board has done a lot of work in developing that

proposal, and it is something that could be of interest to homeowners and something that could be offered. She wondered if it could simply go to Council without entailing a change to the Ordinance.

Ms. French responded that there is no Mills Act referenced in the Ordinance.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz wondered if Council could grant a Mills Act contract if they approved a Mills Act program.

Ms. French pointed out that there is one Mills Act contract in the City, which they granted, extended, and changed, in the past. She thought it could happen, but ideally they would have a more structured program within a Code, or referred to in a Code, such as Chapter 16.49 or Title 18, although perhaps it could happen without a Code amendment.

Board Member Heinrich wondered about getting started with subcommittees to get things rolling. She envisioned one for outreach, one for developing the incentives list, perhaps one for the Mills Act.

Board Member Pease agreed but thought they should wait until the Vice Chair is in attendance.

Ms. French said they will plan to put formation of subcommittees for Mills Act, outreach and incentive development on the agenda for the next meeting.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz asked if there were any other areas of interest that Board members wanted to address.

Board Member Willis was interested in the Ordinance updates. She asked if there would be a problem with her reaching out to some community members to start setting up an ad hoc committee.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz deferred to Ms. French as to whether such communications with the public is permitted.

Ms. French thought that any member of the public could communicate to other members of the public. The caution would be to not get ahead of themselves. Nominations would be brought forward at the very next HRB meeting, so a buzz about changes to the Ordinance may be detrimental to the process they are in.

Board Member Willis said she thought the changes would evolve out of a conversation, as opposed to being instantly obvious. She felt it was going to be a big project, and getting some input from the community as well as some understanding of where they are presently would be a plus. She said she was not looking to decide where the Ordinance goes in the next couple of months, but more looking at getting people to start thinking about where they are and what they might want.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz commented that they do have the two public meetings coming up, focusing on the inventory update, but they might be a great place to try to actively engage the community on what they would like to see regarding any sort of changes to the Ordinance. She advocated at the public meeting having people come and tell them what they think.

Board Member Heinrich noted that in regard to the meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup>, if PAST and the HRB could come up with a simplified incentives list for the homeowners, handing it out at the meeting would be very beneficial for people to understand what it will mean for them. She stated that going through the resources herself, she couldn't figure out the process. She said the PAST members also have their list of what they tell people. She suggested coming come up with one comprehensive page to hand to everyone explaining the process currently to be on the list.

Ms. French suggested starting with the message, "It's okay to modify your house" – definitely anything inside is not subject to review other than building permits. She thought the handout was a good idea. She said she thought the plan was to send the notices for the October 24<sup>th</sup> meeting out 12 days in advance, which is not well in advance, but they do expect to receive a lot of comments in the 10 to 12 days after the notices go out.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz thought it was a great idea to have a handout available for attendees to be able to look at that is a bit more condensed with everything in one place.

Board Member Willis thought, due to the short timeframe, it could just come from PAST. She said she would be willing to help work on it.



Ms. French asked Board Member Heinrich to reach out to her, and she could provide links to more details that could be presented in a more general, FAQ-type, approach.

Board Member Pease thanked Ms. French for passing along Mr. Firth's letter the previous night and added that he was sorry she was working at 9:00 until midnight. He said in the past he has used the general list for communicating to the City Council and it seemed to pass directly through to them, because he sometimes got responses. He wondered if there was a way if someone addresses the Board if it could just be forwarded to their emails rather than having to have someone, Ms. French, make an intervention to pass it along.

Ms. French said they could look into that and find out how it's done for other boards and commissions. She said Mr. Firth sent his message in the evening, so it was forwarded right away, but it is a good question whether those emails could go directly to the HRB members rather than to the staff, who then forwards it.

Board Member Wimmer referred to the community outreach meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup>. She asked if it was to be in the same format as the first meeting and if the Board needed to do anything in preparation for the meeting or in anticipation of what might occur. She wondered if Page and Turnbull would be there to field questions. She wondered if it would be similar in format to the first meeting's question-and-answer, open-to-the-public format.

Ms. French replied that they are developing an agenda for the meeting. It will be a combination of her presenting, the consultant presenting, and being available for questions, and then having a role for HRB members. She has communicated the agenda to the Chair and Vice Chair for discussion about roles of at least the Chair and Vice Chair.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz invited all members who wished to come to be there. If there are those that are interested in participating, whether simply to listen or to potentially respond to questions where they have knowledge, she asked that they let her know. She said participation is encouraged.

Board Member Pease wondered how many people on the Board were planning to attend.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz thought most were.

Board Member Wimmer recalled at the last meeting she attended by Zoom, which was fine because there was nothing for her to respond to, no direct questions to the Board. But she was at least informed as to what happened during the meeting, so that is also an option.

Ms. French noted that because it is a full Board invite and likely a quorum of members will be present, it will be considered an HRB meeting as well as a community meeting. It will be held in the Community Room which has the option to open up into the larger lobby area in the event of a large group.

### **Approval of Minutes**

3. Approval of Historic Resources Board Draft Minutes of July 28, 2023

Motion by Board Member Willis to approve the minutes of the July 28, 2023, HRB meeting as amended. Seconded by Board Member Pease, the motion carried (6-0-1) by voice vote.

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

Board Member Heinrich reported on PAST activities. She noted that the HRB had talked about PAST expanding their tours to reach all of the community, and she said they are more than willing to do that. They do have a walking tour of Barron Park of historic homes. They will also look at doing the Mid-Century Modern tours again. The Boyce Ashby tour will take place On Saturday, October 14<sup>th</sup>, meeting at 1001 Forest Avenue at 10:00. The College Terrace tour will be held On Saturday, October 21<sup>st</sup>, meeting at 2310 Yale, at 10:00. Board Member Heinrich reported that PAST is also willing to collaborate with the HRB on whatever is needed, such as web pages, the inventory, outreach and the welcome packet for new homeowners.

### **Adjournment**

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