From: [redacted]
To: Rummel, Marsha; Bidar-Sielaff, Shiva; King, J Steven; Clear, Mark; Schmidt, Christopher; Zellers, Ledell; Scanlon, Amy; [redacted]
Subject: Budget Proposal for Comprehensive Survey and Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2014 9:23:14 PM

Dear Members of the LORC –

Please forgive me for sending this to you so late. I am preparing to leave on an extended vacation out of the country and cannot attend your meeting. I only found out that the proposed historical survey and preservation plan budget item was going to be on the LORC agenda a couple of days ago.

I hope you had time to read about the fact that a comprehensive survey of Madison has already been completed and the analysis of the history and architecture of Madison has already been developed. Not done (because it was outside of the National Register's 50-year rule) is the more recent history, from World War II to the 1960s, which now qualifies as potentially historic. Such a study could be done as part of this planning effort, but I submit that this more recent history, while important, may not be of sufficient merit to include in the current budget for next year, and would not address the more pressing issues you are working on right now.

A comprehensive preservation plan **does** merit inclusion in the budget. The problem is that the methodology and results outlined in the current budget proposal would not meet the goals of a decent preservation plan. The proposal does not meet the Secretary of Interior's methodology for a preservation plan and that is one of the requirements for grants awarded through the federal grant program. I want you to know that I agree with all of Mr. Mollenhoff's statements about the inventory and planning efforts proposed. Furthermore, the financial analysis is hopelessly flawed. A true comprehensive survey of the whole city with subsequent history and architecture analysis (which is already done anyway) could never be undertaken for a mere $295,000 and would take a much greater time than allotted in the proposal, even using modern techniques like an I-pad and a digital camera, as the LA survey is doing.

I have concerns that this proposal was intended to bypass the work of your committee, which so far has been careful and measured. The Landmarks ordinance deserves such deliberation, even if your work ends up taking more time than originally proposed.

For those of you who know me, I am typically a low-key person in a public setting. But in this case I must say that this proposal shows a total lack of understanding of

even the most basic preservation tenets.

I believe that the proposal is inadequate and needs to be completely rethought. I urge you to recommend deferral of the item to the next budget cycle.

Thank you for your consideration,

Kitty Rankin

--
Katherine Rankin
Preservation Consultant
[redacted] Ridge Road
Madison WI 53705
6[redacted]