| ISSUE  | RESOLUTION   | COMMENTS/NOTES  | PRIORITY LEVEL |
|--|--|---|----------------|
| Color coding is illegible against gray background for oldest properties (very light purple). | Using dark basemap as default, or change the color scale used  | Dark basemap helps, but is only slightly better because dark purple then becomes hard to see. May need to provide a different color scheme, or slightly less variation in the color scale. This could also become less of a focus if tabular data is available in the map in a sortable format, then visibility would be priority over easily decyphering the color scheme.   |                |
| Public would like to see which properties have been lost to demolition.                      | Contrasting (red?) hatching to denote each property that's been demolished   | This could be a separate layer, or maybe a conditional formatting that applies when the data indicates the property has been demolished. We would want this to be linked with Energov data so the map is automatically updated when the demolition permit is granted to the property owner. I don't think we have any other follow-up on whether the demo is actually completed after the permit is issued.   | **             |
| Public has requested that tabular data on the properties be made publicly available.         | Adding the metadata table to the public-facing map.  | As long as we are using one source table that is updated each time a property is added, this should be a good asset. It allows for further information to be displayed and it can allow for additional filtering options in terms of architectural style, architect, etc. Whatever data points we have available can be filtered/searched in the tabular data, which can then zoom to the property/district selected. Could also display all properties that share a particular data point at once (georeferencing age, trends, architects, etc.). May also explore adding another desigation as 'threatened' in the future, but this would require a definition of the term with objective criteria.   | *              |
| Lack of visual appeal, static map with little interactive functionality                      | Incorporating photos, slideshows, or videos with the map. Additional functionality such as a search bar and data table, filtering tools. | In terms of visuals, I think the map itself is probably almost maxed-out with it's capabilities, but maybe the map becomes a part of something larger, like another webpage that provides the vehicle for slideshows and other visual interest with the map inset with the other tools listed above integrated. I've thought storymaps would be a really interesting way to organize the map information, but I've just never had the time nor the knowledge to get that project off the ground. Now that we're working on the preservation plan, though, we need to elevate our game a bit. My goal is to pull together a solid digital plan complete with links to our other resources, like the interactive map, so everything we do is easily accessible. |                |
| Request to also add neighborhood association boundaries to map                               | We have these in a layer already   | Can easily be added, but may clutter the map.   | *              |
| Public also wants to have NRHP listings denoted on the map                                   | I have a list that can be used to identify these properties, but its separate. We would have to create a new layer for NRHP listings.    | We've deliberately avoided this up until now because it becomes confusing since the boundaries can be different between local districts and national districts. (East Campus) But, I think this could be beneficial for the public, if we can make it legible. For these I would think just a dot or icon would work great. Other communities use stars (not my favorite), which allow users to easily locate NRHP properties, but also leaves room for any other underlying layers of information. This is good because they will almost always be dual designated loccally as a landmark or district.   |                |
|  |  |   |                |
| Examples to draw from https://www.libertymissouri.gov/2656/Guided-Walking-Tou                | Liberty, MO Walking Tours  | Imbedded walking tour map, info pane with description of  |                |
| rs https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/e1bbb29edd6c43e2a 1aaf478937cf3a0                    | Columbus, OH Planning & Preservation website   | each property  Story maps aren't completely necessary, but they could be a neat foundation for walking tours. I'd like to just build a map that functions as our primary database for HP information, that we can then link to when we want to make these side quests for the public.   |                |
|  |  |   |                |
| Example of what I'm trying to avoid  |  |   |                |
| https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/0e72fecc76b84<br>24381c865f8cad3c2b0                | St. Joseph historic properties   | Just too much stuff in one map. The extra data that we're trying to include would present better in the table anyway.   |                |