

Minutes
Culture, History and Governance (CHuG)
Sub-Committee
March 7, 2007

Present: Susan Brooks, Dan Elias, Paul Giese, Sarah Holden, Peter Sugar

We discussed the following:

- Paul was elected chair and Peter Sugar was made Clerk
- Dan was a stand-in for Karen Keane – the two of them will ‘platoon’ each other at times due to their business commitments
- Paul gave a background briefing of the Master Plan process and its anticipated costs. We believe that \$95K (what we will be asking Town Meeting) is quite a lot of money
- Membership of our sub-committee: we agreed to hold for the moment as we do not want to have the group to be too large. We are holding one place for the Historic District Committee (Colin Smith to name a representative) (Current membership: as above, plus Mark Hochman and Harriett Todd)
- We should look at the old Town Governance report and its follow-up: some of the ideas have as yet to be implemented. (‘Good ideas should not sit on the shelf’) Some of the points have been adopted through incremental changes
- It is assumed that the CLRPC group at their meeting on 8 March will be looking at what we have achieved so far
- We reviewed the five sub-committee titles and then focused on ours: what in fact is meant by ‘Cultural and Historical Resources’. We need first to identify and inventory these resources
- What are existing institutions (Pierce House, Council on Aging, DeCordova, SPNEA, etc.) and their influence on the town? We should get hold of/read their mission statements
- Our intended approach: an interviewing process: talk to them and establish a method for interfacing with them
- What can a consultant do: how to write the RFP: the difficulties involved, understanding that our process is on-going while we are still writing the RFP.
- The RFP could be a two part process: limited initially to consulting about the consultant and only then going to actually finding the appropriate consultant/s. Part of this process should also be the definition of the cost-benefits of a consultant for the MP
- It is equally hard to define when and where we would spend the funds – it is tied in part to the process as it develops.
- Another question is how to split the funds between the five sub-committees: while it may be equitable to do this on an equal basis, some may need more than others
- Why only a single consultant? Perhaps there should be a lead consultant who will then find the appropriate specialists (or perhaps we can find the specialists and not need an ‘organizing consultant’ in the lead?) We need to justify the appropriate consultants and also ensure that there is no duplication of the work (between our subcommittee and the others)

- The charge should establish the end products/deliverables and we need to be conscious of, and integrate with, the other sub-committees
- The 2007 TM is our only opportunity to get the funding: TM of '08 would be too late. (Note: while we should indeed get started now, we will not be able to get the consultant on board before July 1, '07 at the earliest)
- Our upcoming agenda:
 - Read existing sample documents (e.g.: MP of Concord and possibly Sudbury and Lexington)
 - What are our issues and problems – establish our ‘opportunities’
 - List of our institutions: listing of contact names
 - Write a template for the interviews (‘thumbnails’)

Next meeting: March 14, '07 at 7:30 AM in the ‘auditors’ room in the Basement