

Minutes  
Culture, History and Governance (CHuG)  
Sub-Committee  
October 10, 2007

Present: Paul Giese, Nancy Henderson, Mark Hochman, Karen Keane, Jack MacLean, Harriet Todd, Peter Sugar

We discussed the following:

- We reviewed several points enumerated by Bill Stason (who unfortunately could not be present) in a memo (see attached); this served as our agenda.
- The question was raised as to what if any government action was involved in dealing with cultural institutions. In many ways there is really only a philosophical connection, which creates an atmosphere for the particular cultural institution to flourish. At the same time, an effect of having the institution in town is that it affects how the town thinks of itself.
- There are also some physical effects from some institutions: influencing traffic, noise levels, parking, land-use etc.
- The best way that the town can interact is by encouraging discourse and creating a dialog between the town and the institution. This in the long run will also affect the town's policies.
- Therefore we need to emphasize what we as a town can do to foster this relationship as a mutual endeavor.
- We all agreed that we should continue with the interviews – except insofar as they may overlap with another sub-committee's work – thus we will postpone any conversation with the schools or any of the government bodies. Here is a list of outstanding interviews (with the interviewers):
  - LEAP – KK, NH
  - First Parish – BS, NH, PS
  - MMNHP – JMcl, MH
  - C of A – NH, BS, PG
  - Thoreau Institute – JMcl, BS, PG, PS
  - Emerson Auxiliary – NH, HT(Note: our interviews should seek ideas from the institutions and not just factual answers to our questions)
- We agreed that we will make every effort for these interviews to be completed by Thanksgiving. We also may wish to inform the other subcommittees, in case some of their members would like to accompany us on these interviews.
- Ranking of historical edifices: we discussed the types of historical buildings in town – some publicly and some privately owned. We considered the importance of having an effective maintenance and preservation program in place which we will need to discuss - but we also concluded that ranking these structures in some priority order probably would not be required. Jack drew our attention to the fact that recently in Lexington the Lexington Historical Commission put out an RFP for preservation consultant architects to deal with three of their structures. In Lincoln, the Lincoln Historical Commission has not taken such a role, and the question was asked whether it, in fact, should?
- We also agreed that it was time for CHuG to begin work on governance. We will start at our next meeting (10/17). As a homework assignment, we should all have

read/re-read the Report of the Task Force on Town Governance (1994) as background before the meeting, and thus come prepared with some appropriate bullet points to bring to the discussion (see also our earlier discussions and topics raised)

- Surveys: we felt that a town-wide survey should be conducted sooner rather than later as its outcome could assist us in our deliberations. Thus we should begin formulating this survey – by thinking of questions we would like to have responses to and sending these to Mark to organize them into a coherent form.
- The survey could take a total of 10-12 weeks to complete from start (formulating the questionnaire) to finish (tabulating and assessing the data). It should not be too long (i.e. should not take more than 15 minutes max. to complete) and the choices need to be reasonably easy to understand. We would be available to take a lead in working with the other subcommittees in this effort. The hope is that we may be able to complete this part of the work by the end of January, before we would be holding a town-wide meeting on the MP.
- We also discussed the way we might be able to work with the other subcommittees – one way would be to deal with this question at the SC and asking the chairs of the subcom's to do a better job of reporting on their work and how this may encourage interaction between the subcom's (we are concerned that a much larger meeting with all members of all subcom's may not produce good results).
- Another point to take up at the SC would be the contract with COG. There are aspects of the contract which Judi seemed to want to avoid at our last meeting (citing budgetary concerns), but which after all were part of the contract and thus required to be addressed by COG. Among these is the base-line report which we felt needs to be completed sooner than the 6-8 months she was suggesting.

Next Meeting: 7:30 AM on 17 October, 2007: the topic – Governance. Also reporting back from the SC meeting of 10/16