

**From:** [Bailey, Heather](#)  
**To:** [Heiser-Ertel, Lauren](#)  
**Subject:** Termination of Alliance work on the CHPP  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 02, 2019 2:56:01 PM

---

**From:** Dave Mollenhoff <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 02, 2019 9:08 AM  
**To:** Fruhling, William <WFruhling@cityofmadison.com>; Scanlon, Amy <AScanlon@cityofmadison.com>; Bailey, Heather <HBailey@cityofmadison.com>  
**Subject:** Termination of Alliance work on the CHPP

Bill, Amy, and Heather,

I am writing to acknowledge receipt of your “Staff and Consultant Response to the Madison Alliance...” report (Legistar #57047) and wish to make the following points:

1. Our Alliance group attempted to assist the Advisory Committee by doing extensive national research on state-of-the-art comprehensive historic preservation plans (CHPPs) and then summarizing that research in a report entitled “The Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan: An Analysis of Best Practice Qualities.”
2. We submitted that report to you on February 26, 2019 with the request that you forward it to the Committee, although you did not do so until five months later. Unfortunately, we sent our report to you *after* the Advisory Committee had endorsed the draft strategies and goals at your meetings in October and December 2018.
3. It was very clear when I appeared before the Committee on August 21 that no members of the Committee nor staff have any appetite to make the substantial changes we proposed to our report and in a memo dated August 19 entitled “Observations and Suggestions for the Legacy CHPP Draft.” As one member of the Committee put it at the August 21 meeting, “it would do a disservice to the work the committee has done if they were to try to restructure the entire document...” And in your “Staff and Consultant Response to the Madison Alliance for Historic Preservation” (Legistar File #57047), you said “a comprehensive rewriting of the goals and objectives a year after the Committee endorsed them seems unproductive.” Further, your “Staff and Consultant Response...” concluded that staff had in fact included nearly all of our suggestions in the draft report.
4. I want to emphasize that it was not our intent to disrupt or delay the work of the Committee but rather to make suggestions that would strengthen Madison’s first CHPP. However, we understand that the Committee is eager to wrap up its two years of work and we would therefore suggest that you do this expeditiously.
5. I must tell you, there is one other factor that causes us to cease our efforts to influence the Advisory Committee on the CHPP. Our small group of dedicated and experienced preservationists—all citizen-volunteers—is *also* actively involved in preparing a full redraft of the city’s preservation ordinance (Chapter 41) and is working with LORC to do this. In fact, we have already completed a full draft of 80% of the ordinance and are now completing a detailed draft of standards for each of Madison’s five historic districts. Because this is very demanding, time-consuming, and important work, we believe it is imperative that we concentrate *all* of our time on the new draft ordinance rather than on the CHPP.

Please share this with the members of the Advisory Committee.

Thank you.