



MINUTES OF THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2020, 4:30 PM
Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

I. This item contains documents which provide call in information and instructions for the Zoom Meeting.

B. ROLL CALL.

I. Members: Paul Martzke, Susan Ley, Ald. Mark Steuer, Justin Balsley, Ron Dehn, Ian Griffiths, and David Siegel

Present: Ron Dehn, Ian Griffiths, David Siegel, Justin Balsley, Ald. Mark Steuer, Excused: Paul Martzke, Susan Ley.

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the September 16, 2020, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ian Griffiths to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Ron Dehn, Justin Balsley, Ald. Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

1. Approval of the minutes from the August 19, 2020, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ian Griffiths to approve the minutes. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Ron Dehn, Justin Balsley, Ald. Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. (COA 20-25) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a replacement fire escape located at 126 N. Oakland Avenue

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by David Siegel to approve COA 20-25 for a replacement fire escape located at 126 N. Oakland Avenue. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Ron Dehn, Justin Balsley, Ald. Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

2. (COA 20-26) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a door expansion and clerestory window addition at 110 S. Adams Street.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by David Siegel to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ron Dehn, Justin Balsley, Ald. Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- Ian Griffiths.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by David Siegel to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ron Dehn, Justin Balsley, Ald. Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- Ian Griffiths.

Moved by David Siegel, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to approve COA 20-26 for a door expansion and clerestory window addition at 110 S. Adams Street with the following conditions:

1) Door expansion project approved as presented

2) Clerestory installation is denied. Applicant is recommended to explore a low profile alternative

Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ron Dehn, Justin Balsley, Ald. Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- Ian Griffiths

3. Declaration of Demolition by Neglect at 711 Eliza Street.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ian Griffiths to approve the finding of demolition by Neglect at 711 Eliza Street. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Ron Dehn, Justin Balsley, Ald. Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Staff-Level COA Applications.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by David Siegel to receive and place on file the staff-level COA applications. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Justin Balsley, Ald. Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- Ron Dehn

2. Review City Raze/Repair Orders and Demolitions.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by David Siegel to receive and place on file the City's report of raze/repair orders and demolitions. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Ron Dehn, Justin Balsley, Ald. Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

3. Staff Update.

Stephanie Hummel presented the staff update.

4. Date of next meeting: Wednesday, October 21, 2020.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by David Siegel, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to adjourn. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Ron Dehn, Justin Balsley, Ald. Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Is excused today I see. Susan?

- [Susan] Also, excuse me, hop on later.

- Okay, got you. Mark Steuer?

- This one is here, .

- Justin?

- Yay. Okay, I'm here.

- Ian?

- Present.

- And David? Present, okay. So let it be known that Paul and Susan are absent, with Susan perhaps joining us later. The next role item of agenda is, approval of the agenda for tonight. The September 16th meeting of Landmarks Commission. Do we have a motion?

- Motion to approve?

- Second.

- Okay, all in favor? Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Do we have any nays? Okay, the ayes have it, unanimously. The next item D, approval of the minutes from the August 19th, 2020 meeting of the landmarks commission. I presume everybody's read through those.

- Yeah.

- And we do have a motion to approve.

- So moved.

- Second, anyone?

- Second.

- Okay, all in favor? Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any nays? Okay, the motion carries unanimously. Next we move on to E, regular business. Number one, certificate of appropriateness 20-25 consideration with possible action on a design review, for replacement fire escape, located at 126 North Oakland Avenue. Jason, I'm presuming that's you, but it could be wrong.

- Yeah, that's fine. There's a house. And, there it is. They have a fire escape on the backside that I never knew about, because frankly you just don't see it. And they've applied to change that fire escape a little bit. Which frankly, I wouldn't have known about, had they just gone ahead and done it. We're recommending approval. The neatest thing I can say about this house is that, it's one of Ian's Groups, homes designs, if you will. And there's an identical one in . But, here you see the pictures of the backside of the house as it exists with the current fire escape. And they'll just be making it a little bit bigger. But like I said before, it's mostly hidden from any public right away view.

- Okay, recommendations for approval. Do we have anyone who wants to open the floor for discussion? Okay, do we have a motion to...

- Let's say motion to approve. Unless no motion to approve.
- Okay.
- I'll second that.
- Okay, all in favor? Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Okay, anyone nay? It's aye unanimous, once again. So the motion carries. Item number two, certificate of appropriateness 20-26, consideration with possible action on a design review for a door expansion and Clerestory. Is that how you pronounce that?
- Clerestory.
- Yup, window addition at 110 South Adams Street. Jason.
- Yeah, so I expected you to pronounce it more slowly for me cause I'm not entirely sure how that's pronounced.
- The clerestory.
- Clearstory?
- Mm-mmh.
- Okay, excellent. So, it's the initiative one building. You can see it in the photograph here. The request is to make a slightly larger door opening on the North side, towards the parking lot. You see under the sidelight window, there's a little four row high run of brick, right next to the door. They wanna get rid of the brick that's directly below that sidelight window. I have no objection to that, I recommend approval. The second item is this a clerestory window? This one I encourage you to think a little more carefully about. In general, to be a good rooftop addition, it should not be visible from any public right of way. This one is perhaps minimally visible. And, the building suffers somewhat from being so far away from the street, yet so visible to the street. Which one is that? From Walnuts across the streets, you know, there's a parking lot Walnut Street. And then across the street there, that's where you see it most prominently. But, there's nothing that says conclusively that you can't do it. There's nothing that says conclusively that you can do it. That's all written up in my staff report. What I didn't so much write about is that, this building was a very hard sell, for the State Historic Preservation Office to include in the district. The initial several go throughs, the SHPO office did not want this building to be considered contributing within the district. That having been said, I don't know that this change would, you know, trigger anybody to go through the effort, and heartache of delisting it. But, the anecdotal thing here is that a lot of people didn't want the building, and I managed to get it in, and this kind of change had it been there might have definitely kept it off. I can't say that conclusively. The only other thing here, if you approve it or not, or whatever you do approve tonight, the little isometric views that they put on this slide that you're looking at, show a drastically altered facade on Adams Street. I think that's just because they had isometric views

of convenience of a proposed change that they aren't pursuing. The COA does not call for this drastically altered facade, but-

- That that's correct. We are not changing the outside facade.
- Excellent. So, there you have it folks. I recommend approval of the door opening. I am punting to you, for your best opinions on the clerestory windows.
- And Wendy is here as a representative if you need to open the floor for any questions for her.
- Motion to open the floor.
- The clerestory, is it ?
- second.
- Second by Siegal.
- Okay, all in favor aye?
- Aye
- Okay, go ahead. I'm sorry.
- Oh, I just wanted to include the clerestory. It's only about four and a half feet, roughly four and a half feet tall.
- And that's on which side of the building? I'm sorry, which direction?
- Facing, it would be the North side.
- And that sounds a shorter part of the building, correct?
- Correct.
- Correct.
- Yeah, okay. I got you, I kind of see how that goes there, okay. All right.
- [Man] It is one bay back, per the requirements or whatever. So it is one bay back.
- Who's speaking?
- I'm sorry, I'm sorry this is from .
- I was hoping to listen to Ian on this as well. But I agree with the first part where Jason said, you know, to approve the first part, I have no problem with that. The second part, he was punting over to us a little bit. I do have maybe a little some tiny concerns, 'cause I know how difficult it was to get it listed, historically. And, I just would hate to lose any of that moving forward. So that's just my initial comment.

- I concur with Mark, and I feel much stronger about that. My initial reaction to this was it significantly alters the original architect's vision for this building. And, with this comment about how this barely got approved, I am even more reluctant to grant approval for this alteration.

- As I understand, that this is a four-sided clerestory with equal sized windows and openings, on all four sides. Is it needed for what purpose daylighting? Or height clearance?

- Daylight.

- For lighting.

- Has the owner looked at alternate methods of getting daylighting into that space? Like, from above as opposed to from the side and a clerestory application? Or potentially just having one side of it raised, and the remainder of the roof pitched back? If it's not for height clearance on the inside. I think there's an alternate way of trying to get daylight into that space, without having to elevate it quite so high on all sides.

- Those that are proposed in there because of what you need for the beam above and then getting above the roof though, the windows that are being posed are only two foot four high.

- Mm-hmm.

- So the windows are not very high themselves. We did look at some skylights. But then to get one of size of the amount of daylighting that we would like to get in there. Of course, pose some additional roofing issues, and some snow issues. So, this was a design that we came up with. Is it something that we could, shorten the windows up a little bit? Just trying to compromise, I guess to not ruin the look, or of what you're trying to maintain.

- Mm-hmm, like a pyramidal roof light on top of that. So you don't have a roof at all, but all four windows essentially lean in, and you would need a lot less height. And, it would be visually a lot less intrusive, in a scenario like that. The YMCA, in the atrium space, there has a similar skylight, that may be more appropriate for this application.

- And they're gonna be doing a bunch of presenting in there. So, one of the things we're trying to look at too, how to get daylighting, but maintain not have glare issues. I mean, those are just some of design things that we were thinking about.

- I mean, certainly, vertical shades could be put on the windows as proposed. A horizontal element could be introduced to kind of diffuse the daylighting. I mean, it's a pretty large... It's 20 foot by 17 foot.

- Correct.

- Is the amount of daylight... No, the amount of window opening you need from above to daylight and space below, is probably only about 4 or 5% of the floor area that it's actually illuminating. So, in terms of the amount of glass that you'd need, and really would not need to be as glazed, as it's described here, if it's more of a horizontal application. So, I'm not sure what else was explored besides what we're seeing here, that's all.

- Like I said, we probably looked at four or five different options. And this is something that we liked. But, I understand where you're coming from. So, that's why I was asking, is there a way instead of, you know, making the glass two foot four, we took it down six inches? Or, trying to bring it even closer to the roof line.

- Mm-hmm.

- Doing the same.

- It would be interesting to do a section through there, and to see what incrementally dropping that six inches would do from a visual standpoint from the street. It's just enough in these images to protrude above that ridgeline, that facial line. Is this time sensitive by any chance? Can I just ask.

- Yeah.

- Yeah.

- Yeah, they would like us to start construction in late September. We had city building permits with this as being a stipulation to make sure that everything was all set before we proceeded.

- Anyone else? Any other ideas?

- I was kind of deferring to Ian on some of this stuff, you know, the intricacies of it, I don't know. I wish there was something that could be stated, besides that, with the time sensitivity of this, but, you know, if the owners are really looking at wanting to stay part of the historic district, and on the register, that always boils well down the road. And you'd hate to compromise that.

- I guess-

- So, yes.

- Our historic tax credit has been pursued as part of this application, or no?

- No, they're not.

- My guess is if there's any opportunity for that in the future will be gone.

- You know, on the subject of tax credits, for a commercial property, you have to spend an amount equal to the depreciate, or equal to the adjusted basis value of the building. And of course, for better or for worse within the last, seven or so years, the owners had invested a very substantial amount of money into this building.

- Yeah.

- Such that, this change is not equal to, or greater than the current adjusted basis value of the building. But of course this change will again, presumably increase that basis value of the building. So, I don't know that tax credits are, ever really going to be on the table in the next several decades for this building.

- Those are my two cents for this, I'm gonna abstain from the vote, because I'm aware of who's presenting here, and I'm not sure I can give an unbiased opinion, so. I can't really add nothing. This is not my area of expertise. I mean, as I look through it, I understand what it is, but I can't really add to that these drawings. I mean, I just don't have that expertise myself. Well, should we make a motion?

- Could I ask if, you know, like I said, this is time sensitive. We have a couple of committee members missing. I'm just wondering if we could, within a week, have an emergency meeting on this one point, and then just kind of hit it again. I'd be more comfortable with that. That if Paul, and Susan weigh in on this as well. That's just my two cents.

- There's always staff recommendation or something.

- A staff recommendation recommends careful consideration. If you want personal opinion, I lean towards no. But...

- I mean, certainly the removal of the brick, at that low level, that's not the issue. I think we've all agreed on a general consensus on that. It's the in question.

- Is there a larger picture of that? You know, I'm trying to see it. And it's hard for me to see it completely. I don't know, can we have a bigger view or not?

- You're asking a lot of it, and I don't know how to do most of them.

- Oh, yeah.

- How ?

- On sheet 22 of 45 in the PDF set, if you zoom in on that plan, it gives you a pretty good indication as to, yeah, what we're looking at. Nolan Carter sheet C 1.0, right there at the bottom if we can zoom in on the bottom, I don't know if we can.

- I'm trying my best, but it's not... I don't know if it's just cause Zoom is up, and it won't let me expand it.

- Bad .

- I'm trying to get it on my own...

- Pause.

- There's like six attachments. One, two, three, four, five, six. There's on building construction sub, on the bottom. Yeah, there you go Stephanie.

- this one here? Okay.

- It's basically that white area on the left, where it says I 10 along the street edge. Where the red lines are radiating from, that white space there. Yup, that's... The white space is the clerestory. That's where it's positioned. It is positioned back from the facade, which is appropriate on both sides. Both on the East side and on the North side. It's just sitting a little high, in my opinion.

- So, how much more glass is being added to that? I mean, it seems like quite a bit-

- Well, it's .

- square footage.

- If you look at, let's find the detail sheet.

- All the glass on the sidewalls is there, We're not adding any glass on Adam street or anything.
- It's purely up on top of the roof.
- Correct.
- Correct.
- Yep.
- The only thing we're doing is up on top of the roof.
- If you're on sheet 1.2, the clerestory section, that'd be 1.2, shows you how much glass is going in there.
- Is one of the issues that if you can see it or not, you know, appreciably from the streets, is that a part of. 'Cause I know we've looked at buildings in the past, or even on this first topic where we had a, fire escape in the back where you can't see it. This is, what kind of a percentage? Or is there a number you can put on as far as seeing the amount from someone you're standing in front of the building?
- [Smith] The primary consideration is that it is visible from most public points of view. Wisconsin State Historic Preservation Office is a little more stringent on this. They very specifically don't allow for any rooftop additions on buildings shorter than three storeys in height. Now, typically when we talk about rooftop additions, we're talking about additional living space, like an apartment. This isn't that. But, from the letter of the Wisconsin perspective, this is shorter than three storeys, so that's a firm strike. And, it's visible from all public rights away, which is a second strike.
- Well, I know a lot of time and effort, and money, was put into this building, years ago. And I mean, it's a beautiful building, that's not the issue. But I'm concerned about losing some of the intrinsic historic value of the building. David mentioned that as well. So, I'm kind of leaning against-
- out there, just further solidify my thoughts about altering the the historical integrity of the architect's original intentions. Unless anyone wants to discuss, I'm more than willing to make a motion right now.
- We will need to close the floor first.
- Okay, we have a motion to close the floor.
- Motion to close the floor.
- Okay, with a second?
- I'll second that.
- Okay, all in favor? Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.

- Any nays? Okay, the floor is closed. David?
- Make a motion that we do approve the first part about the brick and the doorway, but that we disapprove the second part with the almost unpronounceable name of that addition.
- I'll second that.
- Okay, all in favor?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Ian's gonna abstain .
- Yep.
- Well the ayes have it, there are no nays. So, the care is four to nothing.
- I would like to say to the people involved is, I would support an emergency meeting as Mark suggested, to address alterations that would take into account our concerns here, to move forward, to support your timeline. Do we need a motion for that, Stephanie?
- Ah, nope. The applicant could just follow up with me whenever they have something to bring back to us. And we'll just keep it on the same COA application.
- Okay, fair enough. Okay.
- Okay, I concur.
- Okay, thank you.
- I'd be happy to participate in that. My recommendation is that they look at a certain angle slope, clerestory, as opposed to a foresight that it will reduce the height, or do a clerestory from above, as opposed to from the side.
- Okay.
- If I can interject to Jason here. You know, as an engineer, I get into the structures. But, it would be interesting to if it was like twice as wide and a half as tall. I know the roof beams would have to be re-engineered for such a change, but ...
- Okay.
- Okay, so everybody agreed that they would participate in an emergency meeting, that we discuss this?
- Yeah, I'd be fine with that.

- Okay, likewise. Okay, so that's also unanimous. It wasn't a motion but everyone does agree, so. Okay, I'm sorry. The next item, I'm gonna move on to the next item. Fair with everybody? Okay, item number three. Declaration of demolition by neglect at 711 Eliza Street.

- Thank you, this is a -

- Who's taking this? So, Jason?

- No, me, it's my turn. I never get to do this stuff.

- Yeah, yeah.

- So, this came before us from our inspection department. This currently has a condemnation order on it, and it was evacuated today or yesterday. So, it is currently vacant and condemned. There was also a RazeRepair order that will be filed this week on this property, which is why we are intervening to declare a finding of demolition by neglect. The idea with this is to stop the property from being demolished. So the RazeRepair orders, which is also in your staff report lists, all the updates that are required, for this house to come back into compliance. Our standard RazeRepair orders have the option to fix it, or we will demo it. The demolition by neglect gives the Landmarks Commission that opportunity to intervene. To either stabilize the property, find funds to fix the property, or in this case help the property owner sell the property. So I've already spoken to the property owner, he is willing to sell. In the absence of that, we can do anything that we find necessary to help this property. So, the idea is that we can do fundraisers, find grant funding, find loans, find a new owner, use whatever funding we have available, to stabilize this property. So we need a finding by the Landmarks Commission to move forward with that. And that language from this demolition by neglect clause will also be in the RazeRepair order that they receive this week.

- I have a question, Stephanie, We have photos of the outside. Is the inside equally neglected?

- From what I have heard and seen from some of the inspection photos, there's a lot of clutter, and just general disregard. So, not as bad as the exterior. The exterior is the main reason why it was condemned.

- How long has it been vacant Stephanie? One day.

- That's it? Cause there were people in it-

- They were tenants in there.

- Of all sorts, okay.

- They actually finished walking the people out today. Oh, yeah, I happened to drive by.

- Has this been going on for some time having folks live in there?

- Oh, yeah.

- This has been an occupied property for a long time. But there has been years worth of inspection going back and forth with the property owner to try to bring this back into compliance. He's just over his head and he's admitted to that. So he really wants some help with getting, making sure this property stays. He believes in preservation the way that we do. So, .

- Is there any idea, I mean, just a minimal, you know, how much it would cost you, and just bring it back to basic standards if we could? Anybody have an idea on something like that. I haven't seen all the photos, so.

- I don't know.

- You don't know, okay.

- They've discussed ... Like the RazeRepair orders give everything that is needed to get back into compliance with our building codes. So with that, there's the estimation of rebuilding their front porch, and not necessarily taking it off. You know, there are different options that don't get explored with that. So we don't have a cost estimate associated with this, because that's not really how the RazeRepair process works. It more comes into effect when we try to figure out if it needs to be demolished or not. And we hope that that doesn't come to in this property.

- In the writeup, there was a comparison to 1039 South Jackson Street. And, not on this sheet right here. But I remember looking through that, they said it was the same builder, the same style, so on and so forth. I went to look at it, it's not really 1039, it's 1038 South Jackson is on the even side of the road. But, if anybody's interested drive by, and you can see what this place looks like in beautiful shape. So, it gives you a comparison to see exact same house, same builder, everything. It's just interesting.

- Would that be in ?

- This has been kind of ripped apart over time.

- Yeah, Ron, do you remember a 619 ? You remember that building?

- Yeah. That was, you know, I took a view of that. They took that down finally. But that was definitely in that same vain, or it just is falling apart, and it was a beautiful building, but it just got to the point of no return. Personally, I would like to see, if there was something that could be done here. You know, at least take some steps to see if we could shore that up. And, if it means finally get some grants in that, I think that's important that we look at something like that. I was trying to look at the year that the building was built, I didn't quite see it. So I don't know if anybody knew what year it was built.

- 1913, I'm sorry.

- 1913, okay.

- I believe.

- That's my take. I like to at least see if there was a process where we could just start start the process to, some of the things that Stephanie mentioned, to see if there's some way that we can, maintain or preserve this building.

- So, if I read this correctly, a confirmation of a finding of demolition by neglect would start that process. In turn, then we would begin that process to find out how deep the damages and where it goes from there.

- Yes.

- Correct?

- It basically gives our staff permission to stabilize the property if needed, and then also find funding for this property.

- Okay.

- I would make a motion to effect. If, I'll make that motion.

- Okay. Do we have a second?

- I second that motion.

- Okay, all in favor? Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Okay, any nays? Okay, I'm going to say a unanimous vote. So let's issue the finding of demolition by neglect, and move forward with what we can do to see if we can stabilize it, and perhaps get it sold, or repaired, or whatever needs to be done.

- Great, thank you.

- Okay, let's see here I got. Right, I'm on an old computer, so it takes me a second. Next item of business, staff level COA applications.

- We had one for new storm windows, and they expect to have some pretty decent storm windows. Flush-mount types, probably won't even notice that they've done anything. So we approved it.

- Okay, motion to approve.

- We just would need that received in place on file.

- They'll just receive and place on file, okay.

- Okay. Motion to receive in place on file.

- Oh, okay.

- I make that motion.

- Second.

- Okay, all in favor?

- Aye.

- Everyone? Is it all ayes? I have to abstain from this one because it's my son and his wife's house, so.
- It is very beautiful. It's a beautiful house.
- They've done a marvelous job with it. It was beautiful when they bought it.
- Yeah.
- And they've done so much beautiful work to it. Okay, let's see. Number two, review city RazeRepair orders and demolitions, agenda and report. Go ahead, I'm sorry Stephanie.
- We have the single RazeRepair at 1156. Is it Vanderbraack?
- Correct.
- . Okay. That's a picture I took of it this morning. It looks like a flip project that has flopped. It's entirely clad and stucco. So it's kind of what I would refer to as an onion house. They've added so many layers, and stucco is usually the very last layer on anything like that. So you hide all the sins. But, the interior is gutted, the walls are open, they don't have the electrical or the plumbing done. That's really the heart of the RazeRepair order.
- Was there a picture? Do you have a picture of that?
- I don't have any interior pictures, no.
- Or, the exterior?
- I'm looking at it. Are you not seeing it?
- Oh, I'm sorry. Yeah, okay.
- Ta-da, here it is. I really couldn't tell you when it was built. It's obviously been kind of added to, and tinkered with quite a bit.
- Tinkered with . So, what, do we need a motion to place this on file? Is that correct?
- Yes.
- Okay.
- Motion to receive and place on file.
- Okay, and a seconder somewhere?
- Second.
- Okay, all in favor? Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.

- Are there any nays? Okay, the ayes have it. Next in order of business, I got to get back there one second. Yeah, staff updates.

- I think our biggest update is that we got our RFP window has closed, and we got three responses for the update to our historic survey, which I emailed you all about.

- Right.

- We are going to be setting up that interview for not next week, but the following week. I've heard from everyone on this screen. So thank you for responding. We have established so far three questions, that we wanna propose to the groups before they come to the interview, just to make sure that they hit those points for us. This is what I have so far. I'm not sure if we need to go very specific. Most of these people are professional organizations, so they'll come with a good presentation I hope. And then we'll have an open Q and A section. But the first three questions we have are, what is your company's and staff capacity to work on a multi-year multi-phase project? What is your proposed course of action concerning prioritizing areas of the city to be surveyed? And what is your capacity and willingness to city staff, our commission, and volunteers for this project? Like those were the three main things that we had discussed last time.

- That last point was good, Stephanie. 'Cause I think a neighborhood associations or volunteers, people, could go around and maybe take photographs, or do some research, or do a few things ahead of time to give these folks some added material. And they could utilize that accordingly. And so I don't know to set up parameters for that, but I would like to see a neighborhood associations possibly, or volunteers, to go out. I mean, I would do that even in my own neighborhoods. You know, take some pictures and at least bring that information to the contractor.

- Okay.

- But, that's my point.

- I think that's a middle staff update. I'm looking at Jason, and he's sitting down. So I'm guessing that he's good to go.

- I'm on Facebook.

- Oh. So if you guys found any more questions, I'm gonna compile these and send them out on Monday, along with the interview times, once I have those solidified. So if you get any thoughts or inspirations prior to that, please let me know.

- I think I'll do.

- Anyone have anything else to add? Okay, the date of the next meeting will be Wednesday, October 21st, 2020. Unless we have that emergency meeting in between.

- Yeah.

- So, yeah, okay. Meeting is adjourned.

- Motion-

- Oh, yeah, we haven't adjourned.

- Motion to adjourn.
- Okay.
- Second.
- Okay, all in favor? Aye.
- Aye.
- Okay, any nays?
- Nay.
- Okay, meeting adjourned. Oh, well it's four to one, so.