

PROPOSED

Minutes of 4/25/17 Maynard Economic Development Committee Mtg.

Gianotis Room, Maynard Town Building, 8 am.

Meeting called to order at 8 am.

Members present: Dick Downey, Bill Nemser, Jack MacKeen, Lynda Thayer, Ron Calabria, Chris Worthy, Karen Freker, Sarah Cressy & Jerry Culbert.

Others present: Michelle & Mel Barrett (Kind Goods) and Robin Schulman & Randy James (Bicycle Parking Maynard)

Members absent: Paul Nickelsberg & Andrew Scribner-MacLean

Downtown Map Project: Thayer reported that at a recent Maynard Business Alliance Meeting, attendees were interested in distributing the map.

BEEP Applications

Bicycle Parking Maynard: Schulman and James request funds to install 10 discounted Bike Hitch Posts through the MAPC program, to be augmented by an additional 20 meter hitches. The application estimates cost of \$5120. Additionally, the application suggests 23 locations. Cressy noted that Intel purchased bike hitches for downtown Hudson, and they are rarely used. She suggested that the Town might want to entertain a pilot program (10 hitches through the MAPC Discount Program), versus 30. Downey suggested that doing a pilot program, then augmenting the pilot program with another program, was not an efficient use of resources. Cressy asked if it was not best to create a bike corral in Naylor Court, rather than placing additional items on the sidewalk for DPW and Pedestrians to maneuver around. Similar to the concept of sign pollution, Cressy asked if adding additional structure to pedestrian areas is a wise choice. Schulman said that cyclists want to be close to their bikes. Culbert was concerned about the safety of people getting out of their cars. Schulman responded that since the hitches were attached to the meter, there would be no salient difference from what people presently experience. Downey reminded the group that this proposal answers downtown business owners' complaints of bikes against their windows and buildings. A motion was made and seconded to conceptually approve the program, but with the following caveats—promotion/education plan needs to be articulated, color needs to be decided on, and the complete program is dependent of DPW feedback and approval.

Kind Goods Frontage Beautification: The Barrett's requested \$10K funding to assist with the cost of sign and awning removal, brick repair, lime wash, sign and sign installation, door decal, window lettering and additional signage, window display lighting, planter boxes, ceiling tiles, plants, décor, misc. supplies, marketing, and Wholesale Buy. MacKeen mentioned that the program is in place to assist, but not completely fund. The Barrett's said that since most of the projects are DIY, the financial figures on the application are not accurate. Downey expressed that his opinion is that exterior (or façade) improvements generally apply to the common good, while interior improvements are business/entrepreneurial improvements in nature. Nemser stated that he felt that the reason the BEEP

was created out of the facade program was to allow a level of flexibility with the types of "business enhancement" initiatives that were possible to fund such as a business incubator. Nemser also stated that the reason of a facade program was proposed in the first place was because property owners were not making improvements and the idea was to encourage tenants to make the improvements. In either case he felt much of the request met the general criteria for the BEEP. Worthy pointed out that his understanding is that the type of exterior improvements requested is precisely what the BEEP was created to do. Downey stated that while he was not yet willing to support the request he felt it could be adjusted to meet the criteria of the grant. MacKeen made a motion to approve a \$5,000 grant however the EDC discussed if it would be preferable to have KIND revamp their application to a more specific request based on input received from the EDC. Downey pointed out he felt the EDC should provide a level of general support for the KIND request and made a motion to support the basic application with the understanding they would refine yet to basically reflect exterior improvements. The motion was seconded by Jerry Culbert and passed unanimously.

MacKeen asked if the board would be willing to meet in the future to 9:30 AM as meetings have been running over. There was a general agreement from the EDC to consider this. No decision was announced.

Collabra made a motion to adjourn the meeting seconded by Jerry Culbert and the meeting was joined at approximately 925.