

**From:** [Scanlon, Amy](#)  
**To:** [Scanlon, Amy](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Holy Redeemer School and LMC meeting of 3/11/2013 -- clarifications  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 13, 2013 8:31:42 AM

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Bonomo  
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2013 11:45 PM  
To: Landmarks Commissioners; Scanlon, Amy; Fruhling, William  
Cc: Verveer, Mike; G.D. Geib; Gail Jaeger; Milton L Pozo; Mercedes Pozo; David martineau; Doug Erickson  
Subject: Holy Redeemer School and LMC meeting of 3/11/2013 -- clarifications

Dear Members of the Landmarks Commission,

I received word from those in attendance that you approved the application made by the "Cathedral Parish." I am not surprised, given that you deal with specific statutory issues, but I am, of course, somewhat disappointed that issues I or someone else raised did not lead to a delay in consideration. I was surprised, pleasantly, to hear that the subdivision needs to go before the Planning Commission and the Common Council.

I am planning to write an open letter to the principal individuals involved to express my opinions about matters, and, along the way, to bring up my questions about procedures and titles in the hopes of having those -- in any case -- clarified or rectified, if need be.

Those to whom I spoke made reference to two "memes" that were expressed in the meeting that I would like to address after the fact, as these will likely arise again and again, and out of simple respect for you, and for the truth.

1. The "Cathedral Parish" does not have money to repair the school roof.

I would classify this as FALSE. Prior to the forced merger of the 3 parishes into the "Cathedral Parish of St. Raphael" (or just "Cathedral Parish"), all of the parishes had money in the bank. Holy Redeemer Parish had about \$500,000 which was a consequence of good money management and a heavy reliance on parish volunteers to get things done (there was very little paid staff, and none full time, aside from the pastor). To this was added about \$1.1 million in bequests a few years before the forced merger. Holy Redeemer had NO debt (not true of the other two parishes, if I understand correctly).

All assets were, as far as I know, transferred from Holy Redeemer to the "Cathedral Parish." The money SHOULD still be there. A new school roof would cost between \$150,000 to \$200,000, done well. We can afford that. The fact is that Msgr. Kevin Holmes does not want to spend money on the school building because he is looking forward to the construction of a new cathedral church and auxiliary facilities at the site of the old St. Raphael Cathedral. He views the Holy Redeemer school building as superfluous, and spending any of the merged parish's funds on it as being a waste. (This view, as you may have guessed, is not generally shared by those who worship at Holy Redeemer, and certainly not by those in the know about such things, or by those of us who were using and still hope to use our school building.) He would like to see it disappear, either literally or at least from the merged parish books. The supposed lack of money to replace the roof is a policy matter, not a matter of fact. (I heard that the only folks with any connection to Holy Redeemer whatsoever who expressed support at the meeting were the Gansers -- who will make money from eventually replacing the roof --, in addition to Mark Landgraf, who belongs to a different parish entirely -- and whose construction company will presumably be making money on the project.

2. The plan developed by Mark Landgraf and the Development Team is the ONLY way to save the school building.

I would have to classify this as PROBABLY FALSE. The fact is, after the repair of the school roof, there would be plenty of time to have a fund-raising effort to at least try to raise the necessary funds to RENEW the school building, and at a far smaller cost than for what the team is presenting. Also, as had been demonstrated before, we have many parishioners who have the capacity and willingness to donate much labor to a renewal of the building for church use. Monsignor Kevin Holmes does not wish to acknowledge this option. This a policy issue (and an issue of prudent judgement) not a matter of fact. There are other ways.

I will also note that I had personally warned Msgr. Kevin Holmes of a major leak in the school roof many months before the "crisis" occurred last Fall. We did not have a crisis earlier simply because we were in drought. Nothing was done in response to my warning. My offer to see to the matter myself (which would have been the norm just a few years ago -- before and for a time after the forced merger was implemented) was also ignored. The "crisis" was completely avoidable and had been, in fact, foreseen.

I am sorry and embarrassed that you are witnessing this sort of absurd behavior on the part of those who are supposed to be shepherds of souls and examples of Christian virtue. The Church, however, has the challenge of being made up of, and its day-to-day operations run by, admittedly imperfect human beings.

I would not normally be discussing these things in a public forum like this, but, as statements are being made that are incorrect in one way or another, I feel somewhat obligated to set the record straight.

Thank you for your attention.

Richard Bonomo  
member of Holy Redeemer Congregation since approximately 1980