

## Craig, Sondra

---

**From:** Elsen, Nikki  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 11, 2023 2:53 PM  
**To:** Craig, Sondra  
**Subject:** FW: Harry J Olson Senior Citizen Center

**From:** rickhamc21 <rickhamc21@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 11, 2023 2:35 PM  
**To:** ZZ Council Members <ZZCouncilMembers@cityoflacrosse.org>  
**Subject:** Harry J Olson Senior Citizen Center

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [rickhamc21@aol.com](mailto:rickhamc21@aol.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

\*\*\* CAUTION: This email originated from an external sender. **DO NOT** click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. \*\*\*

I believe if you look at their proposal that it is actually more favorable to the city while giving them as the owner the feeling of an owner.

First your claw back proposal is unnecessary because they have agreed if the center ever needs to be closed that the city gets it back. (For a dollar) The only use allowed will be a Senior Citizen Center.

Under your proposal you mention that the city should get some of their investment back. Ok, how much? Unless it's 100% after any sale closing you will be leaving some of the proceeds on the table for the organization. Again how much?

With their proposal the city could close on the \$1 purchase and step in to their shoes and get all the proceeds. You could also demolish the property, fill entire lot above the flood plain and develop it for resale to 360° Real Estate for another apartment building. Your choice.

So in the end it seems to be six of one or a half a dozen of another.

I know that they would like ownership without possible city overreach. For example as owners they could take out a mortgage loan on it to remodel , repair, improve without having to battle the city and delay their plans.

Obviously all city ordinances would always still apply including the building inspection rules.

The city should want to complete the process started in 2016 to transfer the property from a lease situation as soon as possible. Stop the city expenses for utilities and maintenance ASAP . The \$300 annual rent was very supportive of the city to the center but is not at all supportive of the expenses of paying for the building's costs to remain open.

They want something that they can call there own, just like a homeowner. Like a home away from home. They will know everyday where to go and what is available everyday without fear from the city.(whether that fear us warranted or not)

We know how much things can cost when the city is involved. Need I mention the \$31,000 spent to open the doors of the Southside Neighborhood center for 4 days for the homeless? In a building already owned by the city. I will visit that when we discuss Homeless at a soon but later date.

After reviewing my comments, I think that the Seniors might be better off with your proposal. It could be possible that they could sell and share some proceeds back to city and relocate if they found a modern facility to rent, etc

I would simply recommend that the council to approve the resolution and preserve 100% of the equity for the city for a dollar and let them feel good about their center on their dime

Rick Hamilton

Sent from my Galaxy