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In the staff report (copy attached) related to the use of district advisory committees to review proposed district ordinance revisions, there appears to be a fundamental misunderstanding as to what the Madison Alliance for Historic Preservation is proposing. The staff report suggests that we are asking LORC to take upon itself the authorization of district advisory committees, which would be legally inappropriate; but that is not what the Alliance is proposing. The Alliance is proposing amendments to Ch. 41, MGO (Historic Preservation), which would have to be enacted by the full Common Council. The revised ordinance (not LORC) would authorize the use of district advisory committees to provide input into district ordinance updates. We see no legal impediment to the Common Council authorizing such a process by ordinance.

I hope this addresses the apparent misunderstanding.
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