

Agenda
City of Monona Landmarks Commission
Monona Public Library – Municipal Room
1000 Nichols Road, Monona, WI
Wednesday August 17, 2016
4:30 p.m.

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Minutes of July 20, 2016
4. Appearances
5. Unfinished Business
 - A. Commissioner Updates on Additions to the Wisconsin Historical Society Architectural Survey Database and WVMO Radio Recordings.
 - B. Consideration of Action to Hire Preservation Architect Regarding Springhaven Pagoda Condition Assessment and Identification of Treatment Alternatives.
 - C. Discussion of Potential Archaeological History Projects.
6. New Business
 - A. Discussion of Forms and Process for Landmark Site/Building Nomination.
 - B. Discussion of Items for Future Agenda.
7. Upcoming meetings – September 21, 2016 and October 19, 2016
 - a. Request to cancel September 21, 2016 meeting – City Staff conflict.
8. Adjournment

NOTE: Upon reasonable notice, the City of Monona will accommodate the needs of disabled individuals through auxiliary aids or services. For additional information or to request this service, contact Joan Andrusz at (608) 222-2525 (not a TDD telephone number), FAX: (608) 222-9225, or through the City Police Department TDD telephone number 441-0399. The public is notified that any final action taken at a previous meeting may be reconsidered pursuant to the City of Monona ordinances. A suspension of the rules may allow for final action to be taken on an item of New Business. It is possible that members of and a possible quorum of members of other governmental bodies of the municipality may be in attendance at the above stated meeting to gather information or speak about a subject, over which they have decision-making responsibility. Any governmental body at the above stated meeting will take no action other than the governmental body specifically referred to above in this notice.

Agenda Posted 8/9/2016 on the City Hall, Library, and Community Center bulletin boards and on the City of Monona's website, mymonona.com.

**Minutes
Landmarks Commission Meeting
July 20, 2016
4:30 pm**

Chair O'Connor called the meeting to order at 4:30pm.

Present: Chair Aldm. Mary O'Connor, Ms. Branda Weix, Ms. Rebecca Holmquist

Excused: Mr. Matt Aro, Mr. Rick Bernstein

Also present: City Planner and Economic Development Director Sonja Reichertz

Approval of Minutes: A motion was made by Ms. Weix, seconded by Ms. Holmquist, to approve the minutes of June 15, 2016. The motion carried with no changes.

Appearances: There were no appearances.

Unfinished Business

A. Commissioner Updates on Additions to the Wisconsin Historical Society Architectural Survey Database.

Staff reminded the Commission to complete updates to the spreadsheet. Chair O'Connor noted that she researched property at 1001 Femrite that does not appear to be a real parcel or address. The Commission will research further.

B. Commissioner Updates on WVMO Radio Recordings.

Staff reminded the Commission to work with Media Director Will Nimmow to schedule readings about Monona Landmarks. Chair O'Connor, Mr. Bernstein, and Ms. Weix have recorded or scheduled their segments to be recorded. Mr. Aro needs to schedule his segment.

C. Consideration of Action to Hire Preservation Architect Regarding Springhaven Pagoda Condition Assessment and Identification of Treatment Alternatives.

Chair O'Connor and Mr. Bernstein met on site with Architectural Preservationist Charles Quagliana and summarized the conversation. Mr. Quagliana did not see a problem with waiting to do the pagoda restoration along with the park project in 2019 particularly if we plan to replace the roof. If we wait until then, he suggests we continue to cover the pagoda with a tarp in the winter months. Mr. Quagliana agreed that temporary measures like filling cracks will not provide much benefit. Mr. Quagliana found the historic preservation plan beneficial, and suggested adding information that establishes how significant this is helps in determining if restoration or rehabilitation will be the appropriate treatment. Moving forward, he suggests a formal condition assessment by a qualified preservation person and structural engineer which would include careful excavation along one side of the basin to expose the stone walls/foundations. It may also include removing a small quarter size segment of the concrete roof edge for analysis. A written 5-6 page report would be provided with illustrative photos. This would be integrated into the Preservation Plan by City Staff. Second, the work provided would be an evaluation of treatments section. The condition assessment would cost \$1,500-1,800 if the city does the excavation work. The evaluation of treatments section would cost \$1,500-\$1,700.

The Commission discussed using existing Landmarks Commission funds now to cover these costs rather than wait another winter until capital budget funds would become available. There was consensus.

A motion was made by Ms. Holmquist, seconded by Ms. Weix to spend up to \$3,500 from the Landmarks Commission budget to hire a preservation architect regarding Springhaven Pagoda Condition Assessment and Identification of Treatment Alternatives with a formal scope of work to return to the Landmarks Commission for review.

The motion carried.

D. Discussion of Potential Archaeological History Projects.

City Planner Reichertz will work with the City Attorney to draft a memo regarding the use, benefit, and process regarding preservation covenants for a city owned archaeological site.

New Business

A. Discussion of Forms and Process for Landmark Site/Building Nomination.

This information will be forwarded to a future agenda.

B. Discussion of Items for Future Agenda

Discussion of major projects including the pagoda and burial mounds will continue, as well as nomination forms.

Adjournment

A motion was made by Ms. Weix and seconded by Ms. Weix Holmquist to adjourn. Motion carried. (5:10 pm)

Respectfully submitted by:
Sonja Reichertz
City Planner

LANDMARKS RADIO READINGS

1. Ernie's Trading Post (218 words) - Possin

Monona's existence as a separate village originated in a little commercial building on Winnequah Road, known today as Monona Motors. It was in the back room of a grocery store once located there – Ernie's Trading Post – where talks began to incorporate Monona and secede from the Blooming Grove Township. The building was originally intended as a garage in 1925, but its first use, even though a warranty deed disallowed it, was as a "speakeasy" of the prohibition era. It was later purchased in 1932 for \$2,300 by Ernie Ferchland who established a neighborhood store there. Notices of meetings and maps showing the proposed new village were posted in the store for concerned citizens to study before voting on the secession in 1938. "Some of the meetings were hilarious," recalled Ernie Ferchland. At one of the meetings, one of the organizers, Professor Ray Owen said, "what are we going to name the Village?" Owen came up with Tonyawatha, and somebody said Winnequah. The opinion seemed to be they wanted an Indian Name. Ernie said jokingly to Owen, "spell Tonyawatha." After difficulty and a few laughs, Ernie said, "Well, I'd make it simple. My choice would be Monona." "And the five of us took a vote on it, and we agreed to call it Monona, which made me feel good."

2. Frank Allis Home / San Damiano (293 words) – O'Connor

The Frank Allis estate, a prominent early home in Monona is located at 4123 Monona Drive. Frank Allis was the son of the founder of the Allis-Chalmers farm machinery company in Milwaukee. His father was "among the greatest of manufacturers this state has produced." Frank Allis came to Madison in 1893 and gradually acquired land until he had assembled a beautiful tract of some 600 acres with extensive lake frontage on which he established a farm. The Allis' were recognized by their neighbors as of the aristocratic type. The Frank Allis home was a center of much hospitality with a sizable ballroom, 14 rooms for family and guests, and 7 fireplaces. Frank Custer of the Capital Times newspaper collected descriptions of Frank Allis, including that, "he was a pretty rotund, round-faced guy, who was not particularly a prosperous farmer. He had a problem, drink. The family figured a farm would keep him away from it." Frank Allis died at age 50 in 1915. In 1916, Mrs. Allis donated 2 acres of land to the new School District Number 10, to build the Frank Allis School as a memorial to her late husband.

In 1924, the Mahoney sisters purchased the property, and later transferred it to the Norbertines for “\$1.00 and other good and valuable considerations.” The home was operated as a novitiate until 1959 for young men who desired to join the Order of St. Norbert either as priests or brothers, who spent one year at the novitiate without leaving the grounds. Starting in 1975, the Norbertines rented the premises to six Capuchin friars of the Franciscan Order as a House of Prayer. The property then became known as San Damiano, which comes from the Church in Assisi, Italy where St. Francis received his call to become a priest.

3. Springhaven Pagoda (151 words) - Bernstein

A graceful pagoda on the southeast shore of Lake Monona was built to protect the clear water that flowed from a natural spring. It stands today as a reminder of the peaceful pastoral setting that was once part of a farm owned by the prominent Attorney General, Postmaster, and Judge E.W. Keyes. The spring was so treasured by Keyes that he not only built this concrete structure for it, but also named his farm Springhaven. In the early 1900s the farm was eventually divided into tracts for summer homes, but the Stonebridge Park ravine in which the pagoda is located was kept as public property. Through the years many have enjoyed the serenity of the setting, the wild flowers there, and the water from the spring. In earlier years the children from Nichols School held their end-of-the-year picnics at the site and used the cool clear spring water to make their lemonade.

4. Effigy Mounds (292 words) - Aro

Wisconsin is considered to be the center of what is referred to as “effigy mound culture” because of the especially dense concentration of Native American burial mounds and ceremonial sites. The Wisconsin Historical Society documents that at least 234 mounds once existed at twenty-seven locations on the shores of Lake Monona or surrounding area. Today, about ten mounds remain in Monona.

Since 1944, the Outlet Mound has held a prominent position overlooking both Lake Monona and the Yahara River, near today’s Midwood and Ridgewood Avenues. The outlet mound group was the earliest dated mound group in the four lakes area, having been established as a ceremonial and burial place by the Woodland people around two thousand years ago. It was discovered

during planning and surveying for roads and residential development in south Monona. The outlet mound group was undoubtedly both a burial and ceremonial site. The conical mound is recognized as a significant prehistoric site because it contains human remains.

The Tompkins-Brindler Mounds are located on the northwest slope of a high glacial drumlin in Woodland Park. This mound group was originally part of a larger group that included the Nichols Mounds. Together, these groups contained as least fourteen linear mounds and one conical mound. Some mounds had already been destroyed by 1913 due to the construction of what is now Monona Drive. The Nichols Group was lost entirely to subdivision development after that time. New water tower construction in the late twentieth century disturbed two graves, probably from former mounds. The mounds were named for the Tompkins and Brindler families, early farmers of the land.

The Outlet Mounds and the Tompkins-Brindler Mounds are listed on both the State and National Register of Historic Places, and are recognized as City of Monona Landmarks.

5. Nichols School (173 words) – Weix

Monona's Nichols School stands on the same corner where the area's children have attended classes since 1869. Situated on farm land previously owned by George M. Nichols, for whom the school is named, it has undergone several building replacements and many additions. For the early settlers of the area, the establishment of a school district was of prime importance. In 1851 the first meeting of the School District was held, followed by the building of a modest wooden structure in 1852 at a cost of \$100. In 1869 a new one-room school was built at a cost of \$750 on the present site. It served the area through the rest of the century and into the 1900s. By 1922 there were 48 children enrolled. During 1935, the first part of the current brick building was constructed. Numerous other additions occurred from 1946 to 1957. Today, the Nichols School is one of six schools in the Monona Grove school district. It houses the High School Charter Program and the Monona Grove School District Offices.

Springhaven Pagoda

Historic Preservation Plan

City of Monona Landmarks Commission

6/15/2016



This document is to serve as a decision making guide for the City of Monona Landmarks Commission, and other City of Monona elected and appointed decision makers to evaluate future preservation options for the Springhaven Pagoda, a City of Monona Landmark.

Table of Contents

1. Purpose of the Preservation Plan	Page 2
2. Brief History of the Springhaven Pagoda	Page
3. Current Conditions	Page
4. Evaluation of Treatment Approaches	Page
5. Recommended Treatment Approach	Page
6. Future Areas of Research	Page
7. Sources	Page
8. Attachments	Page

Acknowledgements

Landmarks Commission

Mary O'Connor, Alder - Chair
Rebecca Holmquist
Branda Weix
Matthew Aro
Richard Bernstein
Sonja Reichertz, City Planner &
Economic Development Director

Professional Input

Simon Levertt, Henry Frerk & Sons
Mark Elmer, A&M Masonry
Charles Quagliana
Jim Sewell
Casey Concrete
Strand Associates

Purpose

The need for a Historic Preservation Plan is based on the understanding that each historic property represents a unique and irreplaceable resource. Even well intended restoration efforts can obscure the historic character of these unique resources. Preservation plans provide a framework with which to address potential changes to a historic resource during the planning process, explore alternative plans of action, and minimize loss, damage, or irreversible adverse effects on the resource. The Preservation Plan briefly outlines historical background and existing conditions. This background is not intended to be all-inclusive, but rather is limited to provide enough information to guide future treatment decisions. Ultimately, the Preservation Plan is a tool to guide decision making on the fate of this historic resource.

Various treatment options are available and should be considered. These options can include preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or reconstruction. Definitions are provided below.¹

Preservation is defined as the act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of a historic property, generally focuses upon the ongoing maintenance and repair of historic materials and features rather than extensive replacement and new construction.

- *This includes crack-filling the original pagoda concrete*

Rehabilitation is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, and architectural values.

Restoration is defined as the act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and characteristics of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period.

- *This includes fixing the pagoda roof*

Reconstruction is defined as the act or process of depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features, and detailing of a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure, or object for the purpose of *replicating* its appearance at a specific period of time and in its historic location.

- *This includes replacing the pagoda roof*

¹ Definitions provided by: Historic Structure Reports and Preservation Plans: A Preparation Guide by the New Jersey Office of Historic Preservation. <http://www.nj.gov/dep/hpo/4sustain/preparehsr.pdf>

Brief History of Springhaven Pagoda

This section describes the history of the Pagoda's construction, alterations, owners, and significant events at the property based on physical and documentary evidence.

A graceful pagoda on the southeast shore of Lake Monona was built to protect the clear water that flowed from a natural spring. It stands today as a reminder of the peaceful pastoral setting that was once part of a farm owned by Judge Elisha Williams Keyes. The spring was so treasured by Keyes that he not only built this housing for it, but also named his farm Springhaven, or Keyes Springs.²

The Keyes' farm was adjacent to the southern end of the Frank Allis property. In the early 1900s the farm was eventually divided into tracts for summer homes, but the Stonebridge Park ravine where the pagoda is located was kept as public property.²

Keyes served as the Mayor of Madison in 1865 and again in 1886. He continued a life in politics as the chairman of the Republican State Central Committee and a member of the State Assembly. Nicknamed "Boss", Keyes is noted as one of the most pivotal Wisconsin political figures of the 19th century.³

Throughout the years many have enjoyed the serenity of the pagoda setting, with the surrounding wild flowers and fresh water from the spring. In earlier years, the children from Nichols School held their end-of-the-year picnics at the site and used the cool clear spring water to make their lemonade.²

Springhaven Pagoda has managed to survive all these years and the natural spring water occasionally flows. Although the Pagoda shows the wear of both time and vandalism, it is hoped that this landmark can be restored to its original graceful charm.²

In accordance with City Ordinance No. 1-16-673, the purpose and intent of historic conservation is to: "Protect enhance and perpetuate improvements and districts which represent the city's cultural, social, economic, political and architectural history". Given Keyes' contribution to both local and state politics and the pastoral cultural legacy associated with the pagoda, the site can be considered a Monona landmark.

² From the 2011 City of Monona Landmarks Commission Publication

³ From the City of Madison Landmarks and Landmark Sites Nomination Form



1899 plat map of the west side of the Town of Blooming Grove.



Photos taken 1951 - Cite

Current Conditions

Current conditions; Remaining significant and character defining features.

The pagoda still stands in Stone Bridge Park and although it is no longer a fully functioning water resource feature, it can still flow if Monona experiences record breaking precipitation.⁴

Stone Bridge Park is a quaint green space located on Winnequah Road overlooking beautiful Lake Monona. It is home to the Lake Monona Sailing Club, and in the past it has been proposed that the Club be responsible for pagoda maintenance and upkeep.⁵

For almost 20 years, the pagoda's deteriorating condition has been discussed at Landmarks Commission Meetings.⁶

A restored and well landscaped pagoda is central to the Stonebridge Park Concept Development Plan (see Figure 1). If restored, the pagoda will contribute to the overall beauty of the park. Currently, the cistern is filled with junk and leaves and there is no barrier in place to discourage people from jumping on the roof.



Figure 1: Preferred Pagoda Concept

However, without access to the historic building prints (which do not exist) engineers cannot determine the stability of the footings for a new roof. Since exact composition of the concrete is unknown, and testing is too expensive for a project this size, and concrete preservation specialist Charles Quagliana recommends relying on traditional concrete mix ratios typically used in the late 1880s.

Additionally, the pillars have been sandblasted causing water absorption and require protective film to avoid further degradation. Given the cold and snowy Wisconsin winters, there is concern that if the City waits for the proposed park improvements to be implemented, there may be no pagoda left to protect. There is currently a tarp over the roof as a temporary measure to protect it from further damage and degradation.⁷

The consensus of the Commission is that the Pagoda should be restored in its current location.⁷ Once restored and landscaped according to the park improvement plan, the pagoda will better reflect Monona's cherished pastoral past and tribute to Keyes as a pivotal Wisconsin figure.

⁴ "Long-dormant spring starts flowing". Wisconsin State Journal. Tuesday, April 29, 2008

⁵ Monona Landmarks Commission. Meeting Minutes. Tuesday, August 15, 2006

⁶ Monona Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes. Tuesday, August 11, 1998

⁷ Monona Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes. Wednesday, June 15, 2016



Cite photos

Evaluation of Treatment Approaches

The Landmarks Commission has been reviewing options for restoration of the Springhaven Pagoda in order to identify the most cost-effective method that will either preserve the historic resource in its current form or restore it to its original form.

Most of the opinions solicited to date are specifically regarding work needed on the Pagoda's deteriorating roof. Some conversations have involved more of the Pagoda's structure (columns and base). We have solicited information and quotes from various contractors and specialists including the following:

- Casey Concrete & Construction (John Wedekind)
- Concrete preservation specialist Charles Quagliana
- A&M Masonry (Mark Elmer) and Henry Frerk and Sons (Simon Leverett)
- Retired State Preservation Architect Jim Sewell
- Strand Associates (Josh Straka)

Masonry Crack Injection

Commission Chair Mary O'Connor and City Planner Sonja Reichertz met on site with Mark Elmer of A&M Masonry and Simon Leverett of Henry Frerk Sons on 1/29/2016. This visit and inspection revealed that there has been significant deterioration in the roof. Attached is a summary of this site visit. Following the visit, Mr. Elmer supplied the Commission with an estimate for services (dated February 16, 2016) for crack injections to prevent further damage to the pagoda roof in the amount of \$1,500. The proposed product for filling the roof cracks was Jahn M30 Micro Injection Grout. The estimate from A&M Masonry and the product specifications are attached. The material would be applied through a syringe-like instrument to fill the crack. It will not strengthen the crack, but will prevent additional water from getting in and cracking it even more.

Effectiveness of Masonry Crack Injection Questioned

Retired State Preservation Architect Jim Sewell provided input on the crack injection method on February 29, 2016 in an email to Commissioner Rick Bernstein. Mr. Sewell wrote:

"I just inspected the pagoda and I am skeptical that the injection process that is being proposed will do much good... It seems clear to me that, given the loss of much of the overhang, as well as the porosity and delamination at the edges, the roof will continue to deteriorate to the point where the overhangs will eventually fail, at which time the underlying perimeter beam will begin to deteriorate... The big problem is that, in its existing condition, with no discernible drip edge or water control, water will continue to seep into the concrete where it will freeze and thaw and

eventually destroy the pagoda's overhangs. This pains me to have to say but, if the pagoda is important as part of the park's cultural landscape, the best and most durable solution may be to replace the roof with an identical new roof. By identical, I mean both in a design sense and with concrete that matches that of the original, including its original aggregate. Contemporary concrete would not be appropriate. If there wasn't one originally, there should be a drip edge – a kerf on the underside of the overhangs case into the concrete.”

Mr. Sewell continued:

“There is one alternative to replacement, but it is tricky and would require the owners to find a contractor willing and able to carry it out. That alternative would be to re-cast the missing parts. As I said it would not be impossible, but it would be tricky. This would likely involve drilling holes near the missing areas, inserting stainless steel pins, and then re-casting the overhanging portions of the pagoda roof. Unless there is something that I'm missing, injection of consolidates is not going to solve the problem.”

Request for Structural Analysis

At the April 20, 2016 Landmarks Commission meeting, the Commission requested that Staff contact a structural engineer to order a structural analysis of the Pagoda. The goal would be to determine how structurally sound the pagoda is in order to determine what method of preservation or restoration would be most worthwhile or even feasible. A structural analysis would reveal whether a new roof could be supported and if any additional restoration is needed on the structure's columns or base.

Staff requested this service from Strand Associates, and had a phone conversation with Josh Straka of Strand on May 17th, 2016. In brief, Strand Associates is not comfortable completing this analysis or providing a recommendation on the structural condition. Mr. Straka explained that it will be very difficult to determine the stability of the footings without knowing how deep they go down, how the columns were constructed, or what materials the columns are made of. First of all, Strand cannot determine the above information without having access to historic building prints. To our knowledge, this information does not exist. Alternatively, the above information could be determined by some further analysis, such as drilling into the structure and extracting samples, or digging around the base to learn more about the structure's footings and base.

Both of these methods of further research cause concern. First, drilling into the structure without understanding its composition could cause further damage. Second, excavating around the base could disrupt what has apparently been stable for over 100 years and could cause differential settling that may cause the columns to become unstable. Excavating and removing soil would also require replacing the soil with some sort of appropriately compacted material. It is difficult and risky to know the best soil composition to replace it with to avoid further damage.

Finally, Strand noted that all of this information would be required before their structural engineer could make a recommendation on how much load the columns could structurally support with regard to a new or restored roof. The opinion of Strand's structural engineers is that there is too much liability and multiple unknowns, and therefore they are unwilling to perform additional research and would not be willing to make a recommendation regarding stability or structural load potential. For example, if the analysis of load potential is not correct, a restored roof could fall and injure park users.

Consideration of Timing of Park Improvements

It is imperative to consider timing of potential improvements to Stone Bridge Park for a number of different reasons. These reasons include: (1) careful consideration of the sequence of restoration events to minimize damage to both a newly improved park and a newly restored Pagoda, (2) concerted efforts to maximize fundraising potential and minimize budget impact, and (3) to determine how much time will pass before the park improvements are made so that the Landmarks Commission can evaluate how quickly the Pagoda is deteriorating to understand whether a shorter-term preservation strategy is needed prior to a larger-scope restoration.

Regarding the sequence of restoration events, the goal is to coordinate any restoration work with the Stone Bridge Park project in a chronological order as follows.

1. Any restoration work on the Pagoda should not be started until after initial grading is done at the park. The large equipment needed for grading would therefore not damage any new restoration on the Pagoda.
2. After this large equipment has left the park and the new grades are established, the Pagoda restoration work should be completed. This would allow additional equipment needed for the pagoda work (such as a vehicle capable of removing the pagoda's roof, if necessary) to access the park while it is still under construction.
3. Finally, the remaining park work such as final seeding and landscaping should be completed.

According to a May 17, 2016 conversation between the Parks Director and the Planning Director, the tentative schedule for Stone Bridge Park improvements is as follows.

1. 2018 Budget Request for Engineering and Design
2. 2019 Budget Request for Construction

The Landmarks Commission should continue analyzing information in this report to determine if a short-term fix is needed to slow deterioration on the Pagoda between now and 2019, or if the structure is stable enough to wait for a full restoration with temporary protection from the elements (such as covering the structure with a tarp).

Recommended Treatment Approach

Recommended overall treatment approach (preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or reconstruction); recommended treatments for individual features or areas; Prioritization of recommendations and cost estimates. In the case of a recommended capital improvement project, a qualified consultant, such as a historic architect, is usually hired to prepare construction documents. Depending on the thoroughness of the document, additional testing or research may be needed prior to proceeding with the work.

According to Quagliana, Monona has the following four options for the pagoda:

1. Do nothing and keep the pagoda as is.
2. Restoration in place.
3. Rehabilitation in place.
4. Rehabilitation in new location.

In email correspondence with Mary O'Connor, Quagliana stated:

"In the restoration concept the pagoda would be repaired but not altered. The landform and the landscape around the spring would be returned to that illustrated in the 1951 images. In the rehabilitation concept the pagoda would be raised approximately two feet, the basin partially disassembled and rebuilt, the existing roof removed and replaced with a replica. The stone walls would be moved back several feet from their current location and other vandal minimization changes made to the landscape. In the rehabilitation in the new location concept of the pagoda, basin and stone walls could be moved/relocated toward the north".

In the meantime, the city can ring the perimeter wall with a thicker landscape to prevent people from jumping on the pagoda roof which further encourages degradation.

Future Areas of Research

Identification of future areas of research or documentation

1. Create a pro/con list of each alternative regarding costs and implementation strategy
2. Generate a description of how to preserve the pagoda with specific plans, an estimate of probable costs, funding sources and a timeline.
3. Have a formal condition assessment⁸
 - a. Conduct on-site observations and basic measurements of pagoda
 - b. Have a City of Monona crew excavate to expose foundation
 - c. Take photos of existing conditions
 - d. Possibly take sample of concrete for analysis



⁸ Taken from Charles Quagliana's Proposal for Monona

Resources

<http://www.nj.gov/dep/hpo/4sustain/preparehsr.pdf>

http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-178435149.html?refid=easy_hf

Charles J. Quagliana, AIA
Preservation Architect
5641 Willoughby Road
Mazomanie, WI 53560

HISTORIC PRESERVATION ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES
for
Springhaven Pagoda

July 25, 2016

Sonja Reichertz, AICP
City Planner & Economic
Development Director
City of Monona
5211 Schluter Road
Monona, WI 53716

Dear Ms. Reichertz,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide you with a proposal for professional services related to the Springhaven Pagoda.

Based upon my previous experience, recent meeting on site, and my present understanding of the project, I would recommend the following scope of work.

Mobilization

- Meet with Landmarks Commission, or staff, to confirm scope of work and schedule
- Confirm City goals and objectives

Condition Assessment

- Conduct on-site observations and basic measurements of pagoda
- City of Monona crew excavates to expose foundations
- Take photos of existing conditions
- Possibly take sample of concrete for analysis
- Brief meeting on site at end of work day to discuss preliminary findings

Treatment Options

- Review preliminary findings with two other preservation experts (PEER Review)
- Refine analysis and findings
- Define issues, concerns and areas for further analysis
- Develop recommendations and alternatives
- One review meeting with Landmarks Commission or staff

Report

- Develop final text and illustrations for report
- Integrate photos and undertake final editing of report
- Final review and approval by Landmarks Commission
- Prepare a final report consisting of one volume of approximately 10 pages, MS Word, single column graphic layout, 8 1/2"x 11", color, electronic copy only.
- City of Monona will integrate this information in their draft *Springhaven Pagoda Historic Preservation Plan*.

Professional Fee

Compensation is based upon hourly rates and related hours assigned to each defined task and reimbursable expenses. Payments for professional services will be made monthly, within 30 days of invoice, upon presentation of a detailed invoice. Any additional services beyond the scope of this proposal will be performed upon written authorization and will be compensated at the hourly rates noted below.

Mobilization/Condition Assessment	10hrs/\$125/hr =	\$1,250
Structural engineer	4hrs/\$135/hr =	\$ 540
Treatment Options/Report	13hrs/\$125/hr =	\$1,625
Total		\$3,415.00

Analysis of concrete, if needed, would be an additional cost. Likely direct invoiced to the City of Monona.

Schedule

Summer – Fall 2016

GENERAL CONDITIONS

- The project is located in Stone Bridge Park on Winnequah Drive in Monona.
- The pagoda is a designated Monona Landmark.
- The consultant shall be provided full access to the property for the duration of time required to complete the work.
- City of Monona shall provide required information, documents, materials and relevant information, approvals, decisions and direction in a timely and efficient manner for the orderly progress of services.
- City of Monona will assemble and copy all relevant available historic documents and make them available to the consultant in electronic and editable format
- All proposed work will comply with National Park Service Standards and Guidelines
- Structural Engineer will be Kurt Straus of Structural Integrity, Inc., of Middleton, WI.
- Hazardous materials are not included in this scope of work
- In recognition of the relative risks, rewards and benefits of the project to both City of Monona and the consultant, the risks have been allocated such that City of Monona agrees that, to the fullest extent permitted by law, the consultants total liability to City of Monona for any and all injuries, damages, claims, losses, expenses or claim expenses arising out of the agreement from any cause or causes, shall not exceed the value of the contract
- This list is not all inclusive

I look forward to working with you on this proposed project.

Sincerely,

Charles J. Quagliana, AIA
Preservation Architect

cjquaglianaarchitect.com

CQ7/25/2016

From: Sonja Reichertz
To: [Mary O'Connor \(mkoconnor73@gmail.com\)](mailto:Mary_O'Connor_(mkoconnor73@gmail.com)); "[Bernstein, Rick A - WHS \(Rick.Bernstein@wisconsinhistory.org\)](mailto:Rick.Bernstein@wisconsinhistory.org)"; [Branda Weix \(bwdatafarm@gmail.com\)](mailto:Branda_Weix_(bwdatafarm@gmail.com)); "aro@aroeberle.com"
Cc: [Intern City Planner](#)
Subject: FW: Pagoda Proposal from Charles Qualiana
Date: Thursday, July 28, 2016 9:02:06 AM

See Charlie's answer to Rebecca's question.

Sonja

Sonja Reichertz, AICP
City Planner & Economic
Development Director

City of Monona
5211 Schluter Road
Monona, WI 53716
608.222.2525
sreichertz@ci.monona.wi.us

From: Charles Quagliana [mailto:cjquagliana@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 6:41 AM
To: Sonja Reichertz
Subject: Re: FW: Pagoda Proposal from Charles Qualiana

I will be using primarily Schmitt Technical Resources of Cross Plains for issues related to the concrete mix, but certainly can talk to Simon also.

On Wed, Jul 27, 2016 at 12:55 PM, Sonja Reichertz <sreichertz@ci.monona.wi.us> wrote:
Hi Charlie,

Please see the question below from Rebecca.

Sonja

Sonja Reichertz, AICP
City Planner & Economic
Development Director
City of Monona
5211 Schluter Road
Monona, WI 53716
[608.222.2525](tel:608.222.2525)
sreichertz@ci.monona.wi.us

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

From: Rebecca [mailto:rmholmquist@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 12:47 PM
To: Sonja Reichertz
Cc: Mary O'Connor (mkoconnor73@gmail.com); Bernstein, Rick A - WHS (Rick.Bernstein@wisconsinhistory.org); Branda Weix (bwdatafarm@gmail.com); aro@aroeberle.com; Intern City Planner
Subject: Re: Pagoda Proposal from Charles Qualiana

Will he rely on an expert such as Simon to determine the ratio?

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jul 27, 2016, at 12:36 PM, Sonja Reichertz <sreichertz@ci.monona.wi.us> wrote:
>
> Landmarks Commission:
>
> The reply from Charles is: "Well, the price for some testing to determine the composition of the concrete is \$1,000. Way too expensive for this small project. So we will rely on traditional concrete mix ratios typically used in the late 1880s. So no additional cost to the project."
>
> Good news.
>
> Sonja
>
> Sonja Reichertz, AICP
> City Planner & Economic
> Development Director
> City of Monona
> 5211 Schluter Road
> Monona, WI 53716
> [608.222.2525](tel:608.222.2525)
> sreichertz@ci.monona.wi.us<mailto:sreichertz@ci.monona.wi.us>
>
>
> From: Sonja Reichertz
> Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2016 8:57 AM
> To: Mary O'Connor (mkoconnor73@gmail.com); 'Bernstein, Rick A - WHS (Rick.Bernstein@wisconsinhistory.org)'; 'rebecca holmquist (rmholmquist@gmail.com)'; Branda Weix (bwdatafarm@gmail.com); 'aro@aroeberle.com'
> Cc: Intern City Planner
> Subject: Pagoda Proposal from Charles Qualiana
>
> Landmarks Commission:
>
> Per the discussion at the last two Commission meetings, attached is a formal scope of work from Charles Quagliana for your information. He noted that the lab analysis, if needed, will be an additional cost. I asked him to provide an estimate of this additional cost which he is working on. Our Public Works Department has the ability to excavate around the base of the Pagoda and will do so under the supervision of Charlie. I will also be taking the information from Charlie and working it into our Preservation Plan. These two items by city staff will help

keep costs down. I am working with the Finance Director to confirm our funding for Charlie's work. No work will be done until after a final vote on this at the August 17th Landmarks Commission meeting.

>

> Sonja

>

> Sonja Reichertz, AICP

> City Planner & Economic

> Development Director

> City of Monona

> 5211 Schluter Road

> Monona, WI 53716

> [608.222.2525](tel:608.222.2525)

> sreichertz@ci.monona.wi.us<mailto:sreichertz@ci.monona.wi.us>

>

>

>

> From: Charles Quagliana [mailto:cjquagliana@gmail.com]

> Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 7:37 AM

> To: Sonja Reichertz

> Subject: Springhaven Pagoda

>

> Proposal attached.

>

> <winmail.dat>

Landmark Nomination

1. Name

historic

and/or common

2. Location

street & number

city, town

congressional district

state WISCONSIN code 055 county

3. Classification

Category	Ownership	Status	Present Use	
<input type="checkbox"/> district	<input type="checkbox"/> public	<input type="checkbox"/> occupied	<input type="checkbox"/> agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/> museum
<input type="checkbox"/> building(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> private	<input type="checkbox"/> unoccupied	<input type="checkbox"/> commercial	<input type="checkbox"/> park
<input type="checkbox"/> structure	<input type="checkbox"/> both	<input type="checkbox"/> work in progress	<input type="checkbox"/> educational	<input type="checkbox"/> private residence
<input type="checkbox"/> site	Public Acquisition	Accessible	<input type="checkbox"/> entertainment	<input type="checkbox"/> religious
<input type="checkbox"/> object	<input type="checkbox"/> in process	<input type="checkbox"/> yes: restricted	<input type="checkbox"/> government	<input type="checkbox"/> scientific
	<input type="checkbox"/> being considered	<input type="checkbox"/> yes: unrestricted	<input type="checkbox"/> industrial	<input type="checkbox"/> transportation
		<input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> military	<input type="checkbox"/> other:

4. Owner of Property

name

street & number

city, town _____ vicinity of _____ state _____ ZIP _____

5. Location of Legal Description (In County Courthouse)

courthouse, registry of deeds, etc.

street & number

city, town _____ state Wisconsin

6. Representation in Existing Surveys

title

date _____ federal _____ state _____ county _____ local

depository for survey records

city, town _____ state _____

7. Description

Condition

excellent
 good
 fair

deteriorated
 ruins
 unexposed

Check one

unaltered
 altered

Check one

original site
 moved date _____

Describe the present and original (if known) physical appearance

8. Significance

(Continue on separate sheets if necessary)

Period	Areas of Significance—Check and justify below			
<input type="checkbox"/> prehistoric	<input type="checkbox"/> archeology-prehistoric	<input type="checkbox"/> community planning	<input type="checkbox"/> landscape architecture	<input type="checkbox"/> religion
<input type="checkbox"/> 1400–1499	<input type="checkbox"/> archeology-historic	<input type="checkbox"/> conservation	<input type="checkbox"/> law	<input type="checkbox"/> science
<input type="checkbox"/> 1500–1599	<input type="checkbox"/> agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/> economics	<input type="checkbox"/> literature	<input type="checkbox"/> sculpture
<input type="checkbox"/> 1600–1699	<input type="checkbox"/> architecture	<input type="checkbox"/> education	<input type="checkbox"/> military	<input type="checkbox"/> social/
<input type="checkbox"/> 1700–1799	<input type="checkbox"/> art	<input type="checkbox"/> engineering	<input type="checkbox"/> music	<input type="checkbox"/> humanitarian
<input type="checkbox"/> 1800–1899	<input type="checkbox"/> commerce	<input type="checkbox"/> exploration/settlement	<input type="checkbox"/> philosophy	<input type="checkbox"/> theater
<input type="checkbox"/> 1900–	<input type="checkbox"/> communications	<input type="checkbox"/> industry	<input type="checkbox"/> politics/government	<input type="checkbox"/> transportation
		<input type="checkbox"/> invention		<input type="checkbox"/> other (specify)

Specific dates

Builder/Architect

Statement of Significance (Give specific sources for all statements of fact.)

HISTORIC RESOURCE NOMINATION

Landmarks Commission

City of Madison Planning Division
215 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., Suite LL.100
P.O. Box 2985
Madison, WI 53701



(1) Identification of Historic Resource

Resource type (choose one)

*Landmark**

*Historic District**

** Please refer to Landmark or Historic District Nomination Form
Preparation Guide for instruction on completing this form.*

Common Name

Historic Name

Current Use

Location of Historic Resource

Street Address

Parcel Number(s)

Legal Description

(use continuation sheet(s) as necessary)

(2) Form Prepared By

Name and Title

Organization Represented

Address

Telephone Number

Email address

As the preparer of this document, I am signing below to signify that I believe this document is complete and contains true and accurate information.

Signature

Printed name

Date submitted

(3) General Historical Data

Original Owner

Original Use

Architect/Builder/Designer

Architectural Style

Date of Construction/Period of Significance

Moved or Original Site?

Physical Condition (excellent, good, fair, poor, deteriorated, ruins)

Preparation Guide for HISTORIC DISTRICT Nominations

General: Use this instruction page for the nomination of a Historic District. See the Landmark instruction page for the nomination of a landmark. The Preservation Planner will review the nomination form for completeness and may ask the preparer to submit additional information and documentation as needed (Historic Preservation Ordinance 41.10(3)). Please contact Amy Scanlon, Preservation Planner, with questions at 608 266 6552 or ascanlon@cityofmadison.com.

(1) Identification of Historic Resource

Resource type – Check the Historic District box only.

Common Name – Provide the historic district with a name. If a historic district amendment is being proposed, please use the current historic district name.

Historic Name – This section is for Landmark nominations only. Mark as “Not Applicable.”

Current Use – Briefly describe the general type of historic district (Commercial, Residential, Industrial, or combinations of these, etc.).

Street Address – This section is for Landmark nominations only. Mark as “Not Applicable.”

Parcel Number(s) – Provide all parcel numbers included in historic district. Maps can also be included as supplemental information

Legal Description – Provide a legal description of the historic district boundary. Use continuation sheet(s) as necessary. Maps can also be included as supplemental information.

(2) Form Prepared By

Name and Title – Provide name of person responsible for form preparation.

Organization Represented – Provide name of organization or mark as “Not Applicable.”

Address, Telephone Number, Email address – Provide contact information of person responsible for form preparation.

Statement of Completeness and Accuracy – Sign and date the form to signify that you believe the document contains true and accurate information. Unsigned nomination forms will be considered incomplete and will be returned.

(3) General Historical Data

Original Owner, Original Use, Moved or Original Site?, Physical Condition – This section is for Landmark nominations only. Mark as “Not Applicable.”

Architect/Builder/Designer, Architectural Style, Date of Construction/Period of Significance – Provide general information about these categories as they relate to the significance of the historic district. Use section (5) for the detailed description of significance.

(4) Describe Present and Original Character and Features

Provide detailed description of the character and features of the historic district. Include details about the physical setting/location. Use continuation sheet(s) as necessary.

(5) Describe Significance of Property and Conformance to Designation Criteria

Provide a detailed description (using continuation sheet(s) as necessary) of the historic, architectural, or cultural significance of the historic district and how the significance relates to the at least one of the following designation criteria as specified in the Historic Preservation Ordinance (41.10(2)):

- (a) The district is associated with broad patterns of cultural, political, economic or social history of the nation, state or community.
- (b) The district is associated with the lives of important persons, and/or with important events in national, state or local history.
- (c) The district encompasses an area of particular archaeological or anthropological significance.
- (d) The district embodies the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type inherently valuable for its representation of a period, style, or method of construction, or of indigenous materials or craftsmanship;
- (e) The district is representative of the work of a master builder, designer or architect.

(6) List of Bibliographical References

Cite sources referenced during the research of the historic district and the preparation of this nomination document. Use continuation sheet(s) as necessary.

(7) Additional Information

Provide any other information related to conveying the significance and description of the historic district.

Landmarks Commission

City of Madison Planning Division
215 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., Suite LL.100
P.O. Box 2985
Madison, WI 53701



Preparation Guide for LANDMARK Nominations

General: Use this instruction page for the nomination of a Landmark. See the Historic District instruction page for the nomination of a historic district. The Preservation Planner will review the nomination form for completeness and may ask the preparer to submit additional information and documentation as needed (Historic Preservation Ordinance 41.10(3)). Please contact Amy Scanlon with questions at 608 266 6552 or ascanlon@cityofmadison.com.

(1) Identification of Historic Resource

Resource type – Check the Landmark box only.

Common Name – Provide the landmark with a name. If a landmark amendment is being proposed, please use the current landmark name.

Historic Name – Provide the historic name of the landmark or mark as “Unknown.”

Current Use – Briefly describe the current use of the landmark (Structure, Landscape, Landscape Feature, or Object).

Street Address – Provide the street address of the landmark.

Parcel Number(s) – Provide all parcel numbers related to the landmark site.

Legal Description – Provide a legal description of the landmark site boundary. Use continuation sheet(s) as necessary. Maps can also be included as supplemental information.

(2) Form Prepared By

Name and Title – Provide name of person responsible for form preparation.

Organization Represented – Provide name of organization or mark as “Not Applicable.”

Address, Telephone Number, Email address – Provide contact information of person responsible for form preparation.

Statement of Completeness and Accuracy – Sign and date the form to signify that you believe the document contains true and accurate information. Unsigned nomination forms will be considered incomplete and will be returned.

(3) General Historical Data

Original Owner, Original Use, Architect/Builder/Designer, Architectural Style, Date of Construction/Period of Significance, Moved or Original Site?, Physical Condition – Provide general information about these categories as they relate to the significance of the landmark. Use section (5) for the detailed description of significance.

(4) Describe Present and Original Character and Features

Provide detailed description of the character and features of the landmark. Include details about the physical setting/location. Use continuation sheet(s) as necessary. Photographs should be provided as supplemental materials to document the existing condition of the landmark.

(5) Describe Significance of Property and Conformance to Designation Criteria

Provide a detailed description (using continuation sheet(s) as necessary) of the architectural, cultural, or historic character of the landmark/landmark site and how the significance relates to the at least one of the following designation criteria as specified in the Historic Preservation Ordinance (41.07(2)):

- (a) It is associated with broad patterns of cultural, political, economic or social history of the nation, state or community.
- (b) It is associated with the lives of important persons or with important event(s) in national, state or local history.
- (c) It has important archaeological or anthropological significance.
- (d) It embodies the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type inherently valuable as representative of a period, style, or method of construction, or of indigenous materials or craftsmanship.
- (e) It is representative of the work of a master builder, designer or architect.

(6) List of Bibliographical References

Cite sources referenced during the research of the landmark/landmark site and the preparation of this nomination document. Use continuation sheet(s) as necessary.

(7) Additional Information

Provide any other information related to conveying the significance and description of the landmark.

Landmarks Commission

City of Madison Planning Division
215 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., Suite LL.100
P.O. Box 2985
Madison, WI 53701



SUBCHAPTER C: LANDMARKS (Madison, WI)

41.07 DESIGNATING LANDMARKS.

- (1) Designation. The Common Council, after considering the recommendation of the Landmarks Commission under sub. (5) below, may designate a landmark according to this section.
- (2) Standards. A site, improvement, or site with improvements may be designated as a landmark if the proposed landmark meets any of the following criteria:
 - (a) It is associated with broad patterns of cultural, political, economic or social history of the nation, state or community.
 - (b) It is associated with the lives of important persons or with important event(s) in national, state or local history.
 - (c) It has important archaeological or anthropological significance.
 - (d) It embodies the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type inherently valuable as representative of a period, style, or method of construction, or of indigenous materials or craftsmanship.
 - (e) It is representative of the work of a master builder, designer or architect.
- (3) Nomination. Any person may nominate a site, improvement, or site with improvements for designation as a landmark. The person shall submit the nomination to the City Planning Division, to the attention of the Preservation Planner, on a nomination form approved by the Landmarks Commission. The nomination shall clearly identify the proposed landmark, landmark site, and document why it qualifies under sub. (2). The Preservation Planner may ask the person to submit additional information and documentation as needed to complete or clarify the nomination. When the Preservation Planner determines that the nomination is complete, the Preservation Planner shall refer the nomination to the Landmarks Commission.
- (4) Landmarks Commission review and public hearing. Whenever the Landmarks Commission receives a complete, accurate nomination under sub. (3), the Commission shall review the nomination. As part of its review, the Commission shall publish a hearing notice according to sec. 41.06 and hold a public hearing on the nomination. The Commission may also conduct its own investigation of the facts, as it deems necessary.
- (5) Landmarks Commission action. After the Landmarks Commission holds a public hearing and completes its review under sub. (4), the Commission shall report to the Common Council a recommendation supporting or opposing the proposed landmark designation. The Commission may recommend landmark designation subject to terms and conditions that are consistent with this chapter. The Commission shall send a notice of the recommendation to each owner of record of each lot on which the proposed landmark is located at least 10 days before any meeting at which the Common Council may act on the Commission's recommendation.
- (6) Common Council action. After considering the Landmarks Commission's report recommendation under sub. (5), and based on the standards under sub. (2), the Common Council shall vote to designate or decline to designate the property as a landmark. The City Clerk shall promptly notify the Building Inspector and the City Assessor of each landmark designation. The City Clerk shall record the designation with the Dane County Register of Deeds at the City's expense.
- (7) Voluntary supplemental restrictions. The Common Council may at any time supplement the terms of a landmark designation, pursuant to an agreement between the landmark

owner and the Landmarks Commission, to enhance the preservation and protection of the landmark.

- (8) Recognition of landmarks. Whenever the Common Council designates a landmark under sub. (6), the Landmarks Commission shall affix a plaque identifying the property as a landmark to the landmark or landmark site. The plaque shall be placed so that it is easily visible to passing pedestrians. In the case of a landmark structure, the plaque shall include the accepted name of the landmark, the date of its construction, and other information that the Landmarks Commission considers appropriate. In the case of a landmark that is not a structure, the plaque shall include the common name of the landmark and other information that the Commission considers appropriate. If the Commission determines that because the landmark is ecologically or culturally sensitive a plaque would be inappropriate, no plaque is required. No person may remove or modify a plaque without approval of the Preservation Planner.
- (9) Amending a Landmark Designation. Any person may petition the Landmarks Commission to amend a Landmark Designation. The process for amending a landmark shall be the same as for designating a landmark under subsections (1)-(7) above.