

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MEETING

25 JULY 2017 MINUTES

Attending:

Andrew Scribner-MacLean, Bill Nemser, Chris Worthy, Dick Downey, Jack MacKeen, Jerry Culbert, Karen Freker, Lynda Thayer. Absent: Ron Calabria, Sarah Cressy, Paul Nickelsberg

Invitees: Erik Hansen. Tim Hess. Guests: Brad Mathews, Glen Fines.

Information:

1. Meeting called to order at 8:05 AM.
2. Minutes of the 11 Jul 17 meeting were not ready and will be approved at the next meeting
3. Tim Hess from the Cultural Council (CC) was asked to give an update on his committee's views regarding the mural on the Murphy-Snyder building.
 - a. There was concern about full funding up front vs. incremental funding. CC felt that incremental would create the opportunity of editing the art by withholding funding.
 - b. The concept of incremental funding came from the Economic Development Committee (EDC) originally as a way to get the project moving whereas the full funding scenario may scare off budget approval because this is the first time anything like this is being done.
 - c. The CC feels that they should be the only ones judging the art (via public input and hearings, etc.) and that it not be subject to others' personal preferences by withholding funding.
 - d. Next there was discussion about whether it should be a request for proposal (RFP) published as a not-to-exceed price (allowing a range of bids) or a fixed price award. A not-to-exceed would allow an up-and-coming artist to compete more evenly vs. an established artist and / or bids varying reflecting different cost of material to complete. The other alternative was charging a fee in order to submit a bid thus filtering out lesser known/talented artists.
 - e. Question was asked if any research was done on how others have handled it in the past. For example, how did the Federal Government handle the awards of various monuments on the Washington Mall? How did they evaluate? Etc.
 - f. Are we looking for an open RFP or are we commissioning a work of art? The proposal by Art Space for the wall behind Memorial Park was mentioned as another option (Town to supply materials and local artists would do the work for free).
 - g. No action was taken by the EDC on any of the above and it was suggested that the CC put together a concrete plan with thoughts about how they would answer any objections in order that the plan not get stalled further during the approval process. The EDC expressed support for the concept and hoped the CC would continue by doing a little additional homework so that the EDC can help bring this to fruition.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MEETING

25 JULY 2017 MINUTES

4. Marketing report (Subcommittee of Andrew, Jack & Sarah)
 - a. The group identified 5 roles for town government in marketing:
 - i. Services provided by the town
 - ii. Recruitment of new businesses to the town
 - iii. Communicating Community Events
 - iv. Promoting existing businesses
 - v. Data Collection
 - b. Creating a message, including theme and / or logo to enhance the selling of these functions.
5. Advisory committee
 - a. It was suggested that an additional committee be formed as an advisory committee. The idea was to dialogue with folks actually operating businesses in the town.....sort of audit or QC of EDC work.
 - b. Discussion of the pros and cons.
 - i. Pro: EDC does the detail work and Advisory sets the goals and make sure EDC stay on track.
 - ii. Con: Dilution of responsibility and sense of ownership. As unpaid positions, hard to keep enthusiasm to do detail work.
 - iii. Alternative suggestion was we combine the thought process into a scheduled review with all interested parties on a regular basis, semi-annual, for instance. An example was the meetings held with merchants in Nov 16.
 - iv. Another alternative is to have the Marketing subcommittee liaise regularly with merchants and other affected parties on their needs and the EDC's responsiveness.
6. Meeting ran out of time and will postpone agenda items 3b and 3c until next meeting.
7. MOTION: Moved to adjourn at 9:19 AM
VOTED.