

**From:** [Bailey, Heather](#)  
**To:** [Heiser-Ertel, Lauren](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Landmarks Ordinance; District Advisory Committees  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 11, 2020 4:30:11 PM

---

**From:** Jim Murphy <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 11, 2020 4:26 PM  
**To:** Katherine Rankin <[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** James Matson <[REDACTED]>; Furman, Keith <district19@cityofmadison.com>; Albouras, Christian <district20@cityofmadison.com>; Martin, Arvina <district11@cityofmadison.com>; Abbas, Syed <district12@cityofmadison.com>; Rummel, Marsha <district6@cityofmadison.com>; Bailey, Heather <HBailey@cityofmadison.com>; Scanlon, Amy <AScanlon@cityofmadison.com>; Fruhling, William <WFruhling@cityofmadison.com>; Strange, John <JStrange@cityofmadison.com>; David Mollenhoff <[REDACTED]>; Frances Ingebritson <[REDACTED]>; Linda Lehnertz <[REDACTED]>; John Martens <[REDACTED]>; Fred Mohs <[REDACTED]>; Peter Ostlind <[REDACTED]>; Jim Skrentny <[REDACTED]>; kurt stege <[REDACTED]>; Gary Tipler <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Re: Landmarks Ordinance; District Advisory Committees

I may be missing something but it seems to me there were “district advisory committees” for the development of the current 5 districts under current ordinance.

I am too inexperienced to see where that was allowed but now would need Council ordinance change to accomplish the same thing.

I would appreciate info on what I am missing.

Thank you,

Jim Murphy

My wireless bird in the sky sent you this message.

On Feb 11, 2020, at 3:02 PM, Katherine Rankin <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Thank you!

On Tue, Feb 11, 2020 at 2:49 PM James Matson <[REDACTED]> wrote:

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.

James Matson  
Madison Alliance for Historic Preservation

--

Katherine Rankin  
Preservation Consultant  
[REDACTED]  
Madison WI 53705  
[REDACTED]