

## **Historic Preservation Board REGULAR MEETING AGENDA**

**Wednesday, January 22, 2020 | 5:00 PM**

**City Council Chambers, City Hall, 70 N First St., Campbell, California**

---

### **CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL**

### **AGENDA MODIFICATIONS OR POSTPONEMENTS**

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. **Approval of Minutes of December 16, 2019** (*Voice Vote*)
  - Meeting Minutes, 12/16/2019

### **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

This portion of the meeting is reserved for individuals wishing to address the Board on matters of community interest that are not listed on the agenda. In the interest of time, the Chair may limit speakers to three minutes. Please be aware that State law prohibits the Board from acting on non-agendized items, however, the Chair may refer matters to staff for follow-up.

### **BOARD/STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS**

2. **Certified Local Government (CLG) Annual Report – Resumes Required**

The Board will review the draft CLG 2018-2019 annual report at its February 26th meeting. Updated resumes are needed from all Board Members in order for the report to be submitted to the Department of Parks and Recreation.

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **NEW BUSINESS**

3. **Election of 2020 Chair and Vice Chair** (*Voice Vote*)

The Board will elect the Chair and Vice Chair for 2020.

- Staff Memorandum

4. **Mills Act *ad hoc* Subcommittee Formation and Appointment** (*Resolution/Roll Call Vote / Voice Vote*)

Discuss whether to form a Mills Act subcommittee and if so, appoint its members.

- Staff Memorandum

5. **2020 HPB Meeting Schedule** (*Resolution/Roll Call Vote*)

Review and approve the proposed 2020 meeting schedule.

- Staff Memorandum

**OLD BUSINESS**


**STUDY SESSION**

**ADJOURNMENT**

Adjourn to the next regularly scheduled Historic Preservation Board meeting of **February 26, 2020**, at 5:00 PM, in the City Hall Council Chambers, 70 North First Street, Campbell, California.

**Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)**

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, listening assistance devices are available for meetings held in the Council Chambers. If you require accommodation to participate in the meeting, please contact Corinne Shinn at the Community Development Department, at [corinnes@cityofcampbell.com](mailto:corinnes@cityofcampbell.com) or (408) 866-2140.



## **Historic Preservation Board REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

**Monday, December 16, 2019 | 5:00 PM**

**City Council Chambers, City Hall, 70 N First St., Campbell, California**

---

### **CALL TO ORDER**

The Historic Preservation Board meeting of December 16, 2019, was called to order at 5:00 p.m., in the Council Chambers, 70 North First Street, Campbell, California by Chair Foulkes, and the following proceedings were had to wit.

### **ROLL CALL**

**HPB Members Present:**

Michael Foulkes, Chair  
Susan Blake  
Laura Taylor Moore  
Todd Walter

**HPB Members Absent**

Yvonne Kendall, Vice Chair

**Staff Members Present:**

Daniel Fama, Senior Planner  
Corinne Shinn, Recording Secretary

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

#### **1. Approval of HPB Minutes of September 25, 2019**

**Motion: Upon motion of Board Member Walter, seconded by Board Member Moore, the Historic Preservation Board minutes of the meeting of September 25, 2019, were approved as submitted. (5-0)**

### **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS (ITEMS NOT AGENDIZED)**

None

### **BOARD/STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS, UPDATES AND REQUESTS**

Planner Daniel Fama informed the Historic Preservation Board that their former HPB Liaison, Senior Planner Cindy McCormick, has recently resigned.

Member Blake reported that in December "This Place Matters" will be posted. Thanks to Letysia Moresco, Campbell's Communications and Public Engagement Coordinator, it has been expanded to NextDoor. She suggested that it would be good to mention the availability of the HPB App on NextDoor as well.

Member Walter asked if there have been any additional historic plaques placed.

Member Blake replied no. She added that she has not applied for grant funds and needs suggestions about properties that would merit having one. Perhaps it could be incorporated with the Civic Improvement Commission's Beautification Project.

Member Moore reported that she volunteered and spent 10 days serving tea at the holiday events at the Ainsley House Carriage House. They did very well and made money to support the work of the Ainsley House and Historic Museum.

Member Blake commended the efforts of the Museum in terms of their programs for kids. Their program is designed and presented to third graders and she said she is pleased at the outreach efforts by the Museum to reach Campbell kids. This gives them a sense of their community.

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

None

### **NEW BUSINESS**

None

### **OLD BUSINESS**

None

### **STUDY SESSION**

#### 1. Mills Act Program

Chair Foulkes gave a brief overview as follows:

- Admitted that this Board is not at a place to do a deep dive into expanding the Mills Act Program at this time.
- Suggested that the best option is for HPB to talk about where we should go.
- Added that Council wants HPB to ensure that the Mills Act Program is running well and that we have sufficient accountability that the tax savings are being used appropriately on the historic structure.
- Stated that having the ability to grant a Mills Act Contract to an owner of a historic property is such an asset for this community.
- Stated that we need to be more thoughtful about determining worthy recipients of a Mills Act Contract. Perhaps there is a better way to achieve that.
- Pointed out that current the Mills Act Contracts have no expiration date. They last forever at this time. Perhaps it may behoove us to establish term limits in the future.

Planner Daniel Fama advised that an intern has been selected who will be tasked with conducting with research on the existing Mills Act Program and contracts.

Member Walter asked if this intern is a student.

Planner Daniel Fama replied yes. He is in the Masters Program at San Jose State getting his Masters in Urban and Regional Planning. He added that the focus of the conversation about Mills Act is to reflect all comments.

Member Walters asked where they should start.

Chair Foulkes:

- Suggested that the first issue can be accountability.
- Said that there is the need for more oversight to make sure the money is being spent as it is intended, which is the restoration of a historic property.
- Added that there may need for more flexibility in the awarding of these contracts. Perhaps some form of recyclability after the owner of a home using a Mills Act Contract has completed all appropriate and compliant repairs.
- Pointed out that right now the contract just stays in place. That seems fairly inequitable to have the contract continue in perpetuity.
- Suggested that the HPB should work on a proposal to take to Council with its recommendations to improve the program. Perhaps to seek more or smaller monetary amounts assigned to a historic property.
- Reminded that there are homes in this community that could benefit from a Mills Act Contract.

Member Walters reminded that currently the Mills Act updates are submitted to the County. The City cannot get copies of the submitted information from the County directly per legal limitations.

Planner Daniel Fama:

- Said that the program should be set up so that the City can independently received annual reports from the Mills Act Contract property owners. This provision must be codified via the Ordinance in order to apply that provision retroactively to the current holders.
- Added that it is important to ensure that these owners are doing what they are supposed to be doing with their tax savings in regards to ongoing preservation of their respective historic homes.

Member Moore asked if the reporting is currently annual.

Planner Daniel Fama replied yes.

Member Moore agreed that HPB needs to write the provision to provide the City with annual reports into the contract.

Member Blake:

- Said that she sent a list to Chair Foulkes and asked what the HPB members can do in regard to overseeing the existing properties with a Mills Act Contract.
- Suggested having Planning staff visit each site each year and/or require these owners to report to the Community Development Director with receipts and written description of the scope of work accomplished with those expenditures.

Member Moore said that it is likely Planning would be aware of what has been done by tracking building permits issued.

Planner Daniel Fama said that he doesn't routinely follow these properties but it's possible to "tag" properties that have a Mills Contract.

Member Blake:

- Stated that the HPB should review and update the application form with added set criteria for qualifying to get a contract.
- Said that term limits could be redefined to allow for more flexibility and opportunity for inclusion of other properties.
- Suggested researching what other cities do.
- Reported that she personally did some research that included State, Santa Clara County, Town of Los Gatos, City of Santa Clara and San Luis Obispo and has some data to share on how cities provide oversight and inspects for proof of work in a yearly report.
- Supported the concept of term limits and creation of a list of criteria on what qualifies as applicable repairs to a historic structure.
- Admitted that she is not sure about a 10-year limitation.
- Said that a State staffer suggested Campbell look at what any other city with a strong Mills Act Program is doing.
- Reported that she spoke with a Senior Planner at the City of Santa Clara. They have no set criteria and make no site visits. They do perform periodic checks on building permits and if there are any code violations on a Mills property. City of Santa Clara doesn't require reports on work currently in progress. Santa Clara in 2017/18 had 121 Mills Act contracts. Of those properties only seven (7) might be out of compliance regarding upkeep and maintenance. The Santa Clara Mills contracts run with the title on the home. According to this planner, they could limit their Mills contracts to 10-years only.

Member Walter asked if the contracts can be cancelled.

Member Moore asked if anyone has done a 10-year limit for Mills Act contracts.

Member Blake:

- Said she didn't get an answer to whether another jurisdiction has used a 10-year time limit.
- Continued with her report from Santa Clara County. She learned from them that there are 92 cities in the State with a Mills Act Program and provided that list to her.
- Reported that she spoke with the State Office of Historic Preservation who told her that no two programs are alike. They can't recommend one as the model. She has offered to come to Campbell to meet with staff if desired. As to the proposed 10-year limit or whether an existing contract can be modified she would suggest we speak with our Council and/or City Attorney.

Member Walter said that this State staffer would be a good resource. He thanked Member Blake for her research and outreach.

Member Blake:

- Continued her report saying that Saratoga did not respond to her inquiries and Los Gatos doesn't have a Mills Act Program. San Luis Obispo didn't respond either.

Member Moore:

- Said that the important question is "what is our goal?" What are we trying to do? Are we trying to reduce the number of Mills Act Contracts or get more of them assigned?

Member Blake said the Board is looking to review its Mills Act Program and develop a better level of accountability. The new Intern will carefully evaluate the seven contracts we currently have. This step is a big deal all by itself.

Member Walter asked what it is that Council wants to see.

Planner Daniel Fama replied, "Accountability."

Member Blake said another Mills Act submittal was submitted and stalled due to the existing concerns about the Program itself.

Planner Daniel Fama:

- Said that moving forward eligibility criteria needs to be developed. Once developed, we will forward it on to Council for formal approval and adoption.
- Stated that there is concern about fiscal impact and important to have Council approve the criteria to give it legitimacy.
- Pointed out that on the existing list of acceptable projects on the current list include crazy stuff on it including skylights. Skylights?

Member Walter said that replacement skylights might be supportable but adding new skylights would be less so.

Member Foulkes:

- Said that a lot of the interior work may be questionable.
- Questioned whether HPB might want to focus on exteriors rather than interiors.
- Stated that floors are less important than are windows and the exterior elevations of a historic structure as seen from the public right-of-way.
- Said the question is, "What is important? Nice to have versus must do?"

Member Moore said that the goal is the preservation of historic homes as much as can be done with resources available.

Planner Daniel Fama:

- Said the distinction may be between the goals of simple preservation versus restoration.
- Added that is a policy questions as to who gets more priority.
- Concluded that currently there is no codified criteria.

Member Walter:

- Said that the emphasis is on exteriors although we still look at interiors.

- Suggested we need both balance and flexibility. A Mills Act Contract can be a “carrot” used to entice a property owner of a historic structure to retain and maintain their home rather than sell it and move on.

Member Moore said she wants these homes maintained.

Member Walter pointed out that many of the historic homes have old plumbing, electrical and other features including foundations that need work.

Member Blake added that there is likely the need for modern energy-efficient heating in many historic homes.

Member Walter:

- Reiterated that eligibility criteria will help us decide what we should change in the future. He pointed out that despite having Mills Act Contracts available for eight years, we have just seven Mills Act Contracts currently in place.
- Reminded that we are not comparing between a large number of potential Mills Act sites.

Chair Foulkes:

- Said that there is not a lot of information currently on the website.
- Added that the application fee for a Mills Act Contract seems high at \$2,000.
- Stated that there may be more interest if this program is better understood and help homeowners figure out the value to them.

Member Walter:

- Suggested developing some examples demonstrating home values versus property taxes and then incorporate the savings that come with a Mills Act Contract.

Planner Daniel Fama said that should be possible. A Mills Act Contract is likely to be more advantageous to new property owners versus longer-standing owners who enjoy the benefits of Proposition 13.

Member Walter pointed out that staff resources would be strained if they are required to perform annual site visits to Mills properties.

Member Blake suggested a yearly report be submitted to the Community Development Director that provides some sort of accountability.

Member Walter suggested/questioned whether HPB members could do the annual site assessments.

Planner Daniel Fama said the HPB is working to create structures for the Mills Program to do these things – report and/or site visits – each year.

Member Moore said she'd like to see HPB members do these inspections.

Member Blake said she has done site visits before.

Member Moore asked how City of Santa Clara got up to more than one-hundred Mills Act Contracts. We're not even getting inquiries.

Member Blake replied that Santa Clara has a lot of historic properties and resources.

Member Walter expressed support for establishing duration term-limits for Mills Act Contracts. They should not last forever. He would support a limit of between five and 10 years in duration.

Member Moore asked why consider a limit for the duration of a Mills Act Contract.

Chair Foulkes:

- Said that if a property owner is received a rather large tax break, say \$30,000 that may take care of a lot of one-time things/projects such as floors, windows, etc.
- Added that if they no longer really need that break to retain the historic structure why should they continue to receive "cheap taxes" just because you have an old well-maintained house.
- Stated he prefers to see these tax breaks used to provide restoration to historic homes that are in decay.

Member Moore:

- Said that those owners could already have applied. Some never will.
- Added that the Board has had no issue with holding back crowds of property owners wanting this tax break. Rather we need to draw these people in to the program.
- Stated that it's not about money but rather preserving historic homes.
- Reminded that there is a very limited inventory of "potentials" in Campbell.

Chair Foulkes:

- Said he was surprised that HPB was supportive of the last submittal.
- Reiterated the need for better criteria.
- Added that it is a relative thing. It's not currently clear in the existing documents what the intent is for this program.

Planner Daniel Fama:

- Agreed that it is quite concerning that such a fundamental point wasn't done yet for these existing contracts.
- Stated that a more thorough process approved by Council will help.
- Added that he's not sure what appetite there might be for consideration of the termination of some Mills Contracts early.

Member Blake said it is important to look at the agreement again.

Member Moore said she doesn't like the spirit of that.

Member Walter said that we are just looking at those properties and making sure an appropriate accountability is being followed so we can better assess how they are doing. There must be "teeth" to the need for accountability within the contract.

Member Blake pointed out that there are “Breach of Agreement” remedies included requiring a public hearing per Government Code. However, the existing application is not real clear.

Member Walter asked when we will change that contract.

Member Blake questioned why. She suggested reviewing and deciding on a case-by-case basis.

Chair Foulkes said that those holders who are duly submitting their required annual paperwork are probably okay. If there are no filings provided within a prescribed period, those contracts may need reconsideration.

Member Walter said after a current reassessment of the Mills Act Program, it may turn out that the majority are doing well. With that we may all be a whole lot more comfortable with this program.

Chair Foulkes agreed that if holders are doing the right thing(s) that there is no problem. If they are not, their contracts may need to be reconsidered.

Planner Daniel Fama pointed out that the newer ones have not been reporting annually to staff.

Member Moore asked why staff does not ask them for the reporting.

Planner Daniel Fama replied that it is their responsibility to submit their reports. It’s their contract. It’s not his responsibility to chase that information down.

Member Walter asked if the Board can assist with that outreach to the holders. Perhaps by preparing letters to send to these owners soliciting the required documentation be property submitted annually.

Planner Daniel Fama said that the program restructuring should help improve these processes.

Member Walter said it will likely take about six months to get this revision to Council.

Member Moore said it will help to have the new intern although she doesn’t want to rely solely on the intern.

Planner Daniel Fama said if HPB wants to do inspections there’s no reason they cannot.

Member Walter suggested establishing a Mills Act Subcommittee.

Planner Daniel Fama said he would add that to the January meeting agenda.

Member Walter reminded that Member Kendall, as a holder of a Mills Act Contract, will not be able to participate on the discussions and work on updating the Program.

Planner Daniel Fama said that is correct.

Member Walter suggested putting that item either at the top or bottom of any future HPB meeting agenda so she could participate in everything else and leave when this topic must be discussed.

Member Blake pointed out that as Member Kendall is currently the Vice-Chair, if she's Chair in 2020, she will have to recuse and depart. It could be difficult.

Chair Foulkes suggested trying to determine how long this project might take.

Member Walter added that it is not likely the issue will be discussed at every HPB monthly meeting. We can have separate study sessions and/or discuss this issue apart from regular meetings. Suggested a discussion in January and then table to March.

Member Moore suggested sending the letters to the existing holders in January as discussed earlier.

Planner Daniel Fama stated that this letter can come from staff.

Member Walter told Planner Daniel Fama that if he needs any help the Board is willing to provide it.

Member Blake agreed saying that this is a working board that is available to help out as needed.

Planner Daniel Fama said that he wants this update to be done right. However, he currently has a lot of heavy items on his plate. Hopefully a replacement planner will be in place soon.

Member Blake stated, "Ask for help! We will help you!"

**ADJOURNMENT**

Adjourned at 6 p.m. to the next Historic Preservation Board meeting scheduled for **January 22, 2020**, at 5:00 PM, in the City Hall Council Chambers, 70 North First Street, Campbell, California.

PREPARED BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
Corinne Shinn, Recording Secretary

APPROVED BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Foulkes, Chair

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel Fama, HPB Staff Liaison



**CITY OF CAMPBELL · HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD**  
**Staff Report · January 22, 2020**

**City Action** Election of 2020 Chair and Vice Chair of the Historic Preservation Board.  
(Voice Vote)

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the Historic Preservation Board take the following action:

1. **Make a Motion**, to appointment the 2020 Chair and Vice Chair of the Historic Preservation Board.

**DISCUSSION**

Pursuant to Campbell Municipal Code Section 2.38.030 the Board “shall elect the chair from among its members on an annual basis at the first meeting of the calendar year.” As such, this is the time and place for the Board to elect its Chair and Vice Chair for the year.

Prepared by:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Daniel Fama". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "D" and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

---

Daniel Fama, Senior Planner



**CITY OF CAMPBELL · HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
Staff Report · January 22, 2020**

**City Action** Mills Act *ad hoc* Subcommittee Formation and Appointment (Resolution/Roll Call Vote / Voice Vote)

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the Historic Preservation Board take the following action:

1. **Adopt a Resolution**, forming a Mills Act *ad hoc* subcommittee; and
2. **Make a Motion**, to appointment two (2) Board Members to serve on the *ad hoc* subcommittee.

**DISCUSSION**

At its meeting of December 16, 2019, the Board held a general discussion on the Mills Act program. The Board expressed an interest in forming an *ad hoc* subcommittee to assist staff in a review and update to the City's Mills Act program.

To form the Mills Act *ad hoc* Subcommittee, the Board may adopt the attached resolution. The resolution will provide the Subcommittee wide latitude to review, research, and audit the Mills Act Program. The resolution would also require that the Subcommittee provide verbal reports on its activities to the Board at every meeting.

Upon passage of the resolution, the Board should appointment two Members to the subcommittee by a voice vote.

Attachments

1. Draft Resolution

Prepared by:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Daniel Fama".

---

Daniel Fama, Senior Planner

## RESOLUTION NO. 2020-02

### BEING A RESOLUTION OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD OF THE CITY OF CAMPBELL FORMING A MILLS ACT *AD HOC* SUBCOMMITTEE.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Campbell Municipal Code Section 21.33.030 (Reviewing authority), the reviewing authority for matters of historic preservation shall be the Historic Preservation Board ("Board"), the Planning Commission, and the City Council; and

WHEREAS, at its meeting of October 4, 2011, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 11334 establishing a Mills Act program to foster the preservation and rehabilitation of the City's historic properties; and

WHEREAS, at its meeting of December 4, 2018, the City Council provided direction to City staff regarding review and update of the Mills Act Program; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to expand and strengthen the existing Mills Act Program by implementing the Council's direction in an expedient manner; and

WHEREAS, the Board believes creation of an *ad hoc* subcommittee to assist City staff in the conducting a review of the Mills Act Program would further implement the Council's direction;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD hereby forms the Mills Act *ad hoc* Subcommittee, which shall abide by the following:

- The Mills Act *ad hoc* Subcommittee shall consist of two (2) members of the Board, appointed by majority vote of the Board.
- The Mills Act *ad hoc* Subcommittee may be reconstituted or terminated at any time by majority vote of the Board.
- The Mills Act *ad hoc* Subcommittee may develop a work plan and schedule, conduct research on Mills Act programs, review and audit City records pertaining to approved Mills Act contracts, conduct site inspections on behalf of the City, hold meetings on City property, coordinate with City staff as necessary to conduct its work, prepare recommendations for consideration by the Board, and take other actions as may be necessary carry out its role.
- The Mills Act *ad hoc* Subcommittee shall provide a verbal report of its activities to the Board during each regularly scheduled meeting.
- The Mills Act *ad hoc* Subcommittee's records shall be provided to City staff on an ongoing and regular basis and shall be considered City property.
- The Mills Act *ad hoc* Subcommittee shall not have a continuing subject matter jurisdiction. Once completion of the review and update to the Mills Act Program has been completed, the Mills Act *ad hoc* Subcommittee shall be considered dissolved.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 22nd day of January, 2020, by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Board Members:  
NOES: Board Members:  
ABSENT: Board Members:  
ABSTAIN: Board Members:

APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Foulkes, Chair

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel Fama, Secretary



CITY OF CAMPBELL • HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
Staff Report • January 22, 2020

**City Action** 2020 Historic Preservation Board Meeting Schedule. (Resolution/ Roll Call Vote)

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the Historic Preservation Board take the following action:

1. **Adopt a resolution**, approving the recommended 2020 meeting schedule.

**DISCUSSION**

As specified by Historic Preservation Board Resolution No. 2017-02, adopted on June 28, 2017, the Board meets every fourth Wednesday at 5:00 PM. However, since the regular meeting date tends to conflict with the holidays during November and December, the Board may consider adopting a 2020 schedule that accommodates the holidays. Staff recommends that the November meeting (day before Thanksgiving) be canceled and that the December meeting be rescheduled from the 23rd to the 9th (Wednesday):

- January 22, 2020
- February 26, 2020
- March 25, 2020
- April 22, 2020
- May 27, 2020
- June 24, 2020
- July 22, 2020
- August 26, 2020
- September 23, 2020
- October 28, 2020
- November 25, 2020 – **Canceled**
- December 9, 2020 – **Rescheduled**

Attachments:

1. Draft Resolution

Prepared by:

Daniel Fama, Senior Planner

**RESOLUTION NO. 2020**

BEING A RESOLUTION OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD OF THE CITY OF CAMPBELL APPROVING THE 2020 BOARD MEETING SCHEDULE.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Campbell Municipal Code Section 21.33.030 (Reviewing authority), the reviewing authority for matters of historic preservation shall be the Historic Preservation Board ("Board"), the Planning Commission, and the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the Board shall hold public hearings and meetings as necessary to conform to the requirements of the Campbell Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Board Resolution No. 2017-02, adopted on June 28, 2017, the Board shall meet every fourth Wednesday at 5:00 PM; and

WHEREAS, the November and December Board meetings conflict with nationally recognized holidays; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to cancel the November meeting and reschedule the December meeting; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD hereby adopts the 2020 Board Meeting Schedule (Exhibit A).

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 22nd day of January, 2020, by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Board Members:  
NOES: Board Members:  
ABSENT: Board Members:  
ABSTAIN: Board Members:

APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Foulkes, Chair

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel Fama, Secretary

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
2020 MEETING SCHEDULE**

- January 22, 2020
- February 26, 2020
- March 25, 2020
- April 22, 2020
- May 27, 2020
- June 24, 2020
- July 22, 2020
- August 26, 2020
- September 23, 2020
- October 28, 2020
- November 25, 2020 – **Canceled**
- December 9, 2020 – **Rescheduled**