

MINUTES
City of Monona
Landmarks Commission
Wednesday March 10, 2021

Chair Goforth called the meeting of the Monona Landmarks Commission to order at 4:32 PM.

Present: Chair Kristie Goforth, Ms. Mary Murrell, Mr. Rick Bernstein, Ms. Anne Wellman, Ms. Branda Weix, and Ms. Rebecca Holmquist

Absent: Mr. Erik Lincoln

Also Present: Douglas Plowman, City Planner, Amy Rosebrough – Wisconsin State Historical Society, and Ann Waidelich – Historic Blooming Grove Historical Society

Approval of Minutes

A motion by Mr. Bernstein, seconded by Ms. Wellman, for the approval of the minutes of February 10, 2021 carried with one correction.

Appearances

There were no appearances.

Unfinished Business

A. Discussion of Recommendations from 2019 Mead & Hunt Architectural Survey for Future Preservation Activities

Mr. Bernstein introduced the topic, and that the Commission had previously discussed how to approach the archaeology in Monona as a compliment to the Architectural Survey that was conducted in 2019. Amy Rosebrough, the State Archaeologist joined the meeting to add to the discussion. The SHPO has recommended a survey of all City properties and parks in Madison for some time, in order for a Phase 1 identification survey to be completed. This would evaluate if there are below ground resources worthy of protection. Ms. Rosebrough added that the San Damiano property is a good candidate given the limited disturbance on the site. There was discussion of the public vs. private property investigation opportunities in Monona. Ms. Rosebrough responded that lakeshore properties with limited disturbance provide great opportunities. She added that public properties are a good way to begin the process, and develop owner support for private properties. This work is eligible for CLG funding, particularly as there are few archaeological requests that are received.

Ms. Murrell asked what has already been done on the Mounds that exist in Monona. Ms. Rosebrough responded that the Historical Society has existing reported site locations, but many maps are old and vague. The Society are always working to try to narrow these down, and refine the boundaries. Mr. Bernstein asked if these maps can be shared for greater planning purposes. Ms. Rosebrough shared that datasets can be purchased to assist planning. This would include information of if there is a known burial site, and if it's on the National Register. The data can be processed, and possibly shared with the Landmarks Commission even though it is sensitive information. Chair Goforth asked about the Winnequah Road Mound Group, and asked if the boundary is all of Winnequah Road. Ms. Rosebrough responded that the survey on file is not as detailed as they would hope, with estimated locations only. Shovel testing is the best way to finalize locations, and rule out areas of concern that were previously identified. A question was asked surrounding the extent of the shovel test as part of the Phase 1 survey. They methodically sample across an area, sifting the dirt through a screen, causing minimal disturbance to the grass. Planner Plowman asked the approximate cost of a limited scope Phase 1 survey as it relates to the maximum CLG grant. Ms. Rosebrough responded that the San Damiano property,

and a handful of parks could be possible for the maximum grant award of \$25,000, although individual prices vary significantly. The question of the Stone Bridge Park was raised, and if an archaeological survey was completed. Ms. Holmquist shared that a survey was completed for Lottes Park, and Chair Goforth added that a Phase 1 archaeological survey was completed for Stone Bridge Park and it was deemed clear. Completed surveys can be included as part of any data purchase of the GIS maps. Ms. Weix asked about Frost Island in the Frost Woods neighborhood. Ms. Rosebrough responded that this is exactly the type of area they would like to investigate given that it is undeveloped.

The possibility of pursuing a CLG grant for archaeological work was discussed, and this will be on a future agenda for additional discussion.

New Business

A. Discussion of Historic Preservation Month Events

Planner Plowman reintroduced the discussion from last month's meeting to collect oral histories about properties in Monona as part of Historic Preservation Month. Planner Plowman had gathered materials related to the 75th Anniversary of Monona, and much of this was focused on the City itself, rather than specific properties. It was agreed that this seems like a good opportunity for the Commission to celebrate Historic Preservation Month, and to possibly collect comments via Zoom or other online methods. Ms. Waidelich shared that the oral histories at the Dean House are 10 to 15 years old, and deal with people and social development rather than properties. The other oral history project was conducted by the Monona Public Library, and they are not oriented to buildings either. The Monona History Club collected some feedback during the 2019 Architectural Survey for a couple of properties.

Mr. Bernstein shared that he had developed a bibliography for Monona's International Homes, which Planner Plowman will forward to the Commission. There's a lot of information, but it's quite incomplete. He sees an opportunity to focus on those, and to add to this information. There could be enough information to share in a uniform fashion, possibly a webpage for each. The Commission was supportive of this idea, and see it as a good way to present the information. Planner Plowman can develop a form for the website, and seek input on these properties from Monona residents. There was discussion of Mr. Aro's property, and if he was interested in adding his property to the National Register. It may have previously been deemed eligible, and may be why Mead & Hunt did not include it in their report. Planner Plowman will contact the property owner to discuss further. Ms. Waidelich shared that the Dean House back porch could be used to host a get together to discuss the International Homes as COVID restriction begin to lift.

B. Discussion of Text for Springhaven Pagoda Signage and Stone Bridge Park Signage

Ms. Wellman updated the Commission that she had spoken to Parks Director Anderson regarding the construction timing at Stone Bridge Park. He said it would be completing in August, and so she recommended it may make sense to discuss the sign once construction is finished. Ms. Wellman suggested splitting the sign in thirds; Stone Bridge Park and the geology of springs, the Keyes family and the Pagoda. Ms. Holmquist shared that she thought the sign was for the Pagoda and not for the park. Ms. Wellman had reviewed comments from the public, and hoped to give context between Stone Bridge and Springhaven as well. There was discussion what is part of the Pagoda project, and what is representative of the larger park. Mr. Bernstein doesn't mind broadening the content on a larger marker, and suggested also including Native American history. He also recommended including information about how the Pagoda roof was restored.

Ms. Weix shared her concern about the size of the sign adjacent to the Pagoda. She suggested adding a second park sign with more detail elsewhere in the park. There was discussion of one or two signs, and consensus was for two signs in order to cover the content. The word count of

500 was discussed, and it was agreed that this is a lot of text. Ms. Murrell suggested cutting the text back, in order to keep visitor's attention. Ms. Wellman will share the written draft with Planner Plowman who will circulate it with the Commission.

C. Recommendation to Council on selection of Springhaven Pagoda Contractor

Planner Plowman provided an update on the Springhaven Pagoda. The RFP closed last Friday, and there were 3 bidders, with the lowest qualified bidder being Joe Daniels Construction. They are the contractor working on the larger park project as well. Patrick Eagan reviewed all three of the proposals, and there were no omissions, and he deemed them complete. Ms. Holmquist shared a couple of concerns; specifically their limited experience with concrete restoration as a general contractor, matching historic concrete, as well as historic restoration. Planner Plowman responded that the technical documentation requires samples to be provided, and the contractor will follow the specifications prepared by Mr. Eagan. Ms. Holmquist asked about the cuts between the columns and roof. Multiple bids planned a structure to maintain the integrity of the base. A benefit of this bid is that larger work occurring at the park may be able to be coordinated better than other bids. Planner Plowman shared that the "bid tab" is available online, as well as the two other contractors that bid on the work.

A motion was made by Mr. Bernstein and seconded by Ms. Holmquist to recommend Joe Daniels Contracting for the Springhaven Pagoda Restoration Project to City Council. The Commission wishes to emphasize the requirement that the Commission review a sample of the concrete, and that they take care of both the columns and the base when sawing off the roof.

The recommendation passed unanimously.

D. Staff Updates

i. CLG National Register Update

Planner Plowman updated the Commission on the possible nomination of the Panther Mound. He is addressing questions that the owner has, and he is coordinating with the SHPO to get the answers that they need. The eligibility of plaques were confirmed as a use of CLG funds, so this could be an opportunity to use some of the remaining funds.

E. Landmarks Commission Requests for City Staff

None.

Upcoming meetings

Upcoming meetings are scheduled for April 14, 2021 and May 12, 2021 (Cancelled).

Adjournment

A motion by Ms. Murrell, seconded by Ms. Holmquist, to adjourn carried. (5:56pm)

Submitted by,

Douglas Plowman, City Planner