

**MINUTES
OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
VETERANS MEMORIAL COMMITTEE
HELD AT CITY HALL
March 16, 2012
7:30 AM**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Goergen called the meeting to order at 7:30 am

II. ROLL CALL

Answering roll call were Members Benson, Cardarelle, Christiaansen, Lonsbury, Reed, Schwartz and Goergen.

Staff in attendance: John Keprios, Edina Parks and Recreation Department Director

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Motion by Member Schwartz and seconded by Member Goergen approving the meeting agenda with Member Schwartz adding that he would like to thank Janet Canton for all of the work she did for the committee.

Ayes: Benson, Cardarelle, Christiaansen, Lonsbury, Reed, Schwartz and Goergen.
Motion carried.

IV. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

Motion by Member Lonsbury and seconded by Member Cardarelle to approve the Consent Agenda as follows:

A. Approval of the February 24, 2012 Veterans Memorial Committee Meeting Minutes.

Ayes: Benson, Cardarelle, Christiaansen, Lonsbury, Reed, Schwartz and Goergen.
Motion carried.

V. COMMUNITY COMMENT

There were no members of the general public present at the meeting.

VI. REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

A. FUNDRAISING PLAN

Member Goergen provided an update from the Edina Community Foundation. He stated that the balance as of the end of February was \$2,650 in foundation funds supplemented by the foundation's grant. He indicated that the committee asked for \$10,000 from the board and received \$3,700, so they have a total of \$6,350 to date. The artist will be paid \$3,800 and payments are up to date.

Member Goergen indicated that he feels they need to have a fundraising plan, perhaps a pyramid of potential donor amounts to be put in place to provide guidance and for perspective donors when soliciting donations. He stated that Mr. Keprios put together four different pyramid matrix ideas that could be shown in a presentation, as follows.

1. 1 @ \$150K; 2 @ \$100K; 2 @ \$75K = \$500K.
2. 1 @ \$100K; 2 @ \$75K; 2 @ \$50K; 5 @ \$25K and the remaining \$25K from a collection of smaller donations = \$500K.

3. 2 @ \$75K; 4 @ \$50K; 4 @ \$25K; \$25K from a collection of smaller donations; \$25K in-kind donations = \$500K.
4. 2 @ \$50K; 4 @ \$25K; 10 @ \$10K; \$25K from a collection of smaller donations; \$175K in-kind donations = \$500K.

Mr. Goergen indicated that Member Lefler suggested idea number one and he countered with idea number two, while Mr. Keprios provided ideas three and four to spark dialogue. He explained that although most of the donations will be coming from significant donors, and even if those donations reached their \$500,000 goal, they still want to be able to open it up to the community, whatever they deem appropriate to donate. Therefore, all of the above ideas have a balance to be raised after significant donor donations so the entire community will have helped finance the memorial.

Member Cardarelle noted that the Rotary Foundation board has requested a presentation. Member Goergen replied that they asked for \$20,000 over three years from the Foundation and they indicated that they do want to support the memorial as a signature project. The request has gone to committee and no decision has been made yet as they asked for a presentation to the Foundation committee. Member Goergen and Mr. Keprios are willing to appear before the committee or Rotary Club at their next weekly meeting. Marketing created a video to show to the entire organization, April 12th at 1:00 pm at the Edina Country Club. Mr. Keprios indicated that Member Lonsbury put together a PowerPoint presentation to show to the committee today, which is keyed up and ready to go in the Chambers. Member Cardarelle explained that the Rotary Club is very receptive to showing the presentation. He indicated that he has been in the club for 50 years and wants to be there for the showing.

Member Goergen asked about the pyramid determination. Member Lonsbury replied that while he has no specific ideas or experience doing this he thought that the committee should ask for as much as they can and take what they can get, so based on that philosophy he recommended the committee choose idea number one.

Member Goergen commented that he doesn't think idea number one is spread out enough, noting that they should seek 25 major donors or a high number. He stated that in a meeting with the Mayor last week he was told an individual that had given a donation recently said that it wasn't the greatest time to be fundraising, especially in this area of the city, thus not a good time to ask for big dollars. He suggested idea number two since it was more spread out and leaves \$25,000 for community donations, for a total of \$500,000.

Member Reed asked if it is considered necessary to have a matrix of numbers to show people. Mr. Keprios replied that it is suggested because when talking to heavy hitters at the beginning of a campaign these people want to know what the plan is, how much they are asking for and from how many individuals; it helps when a goal is shown.

Member Benson asked what is Mr. Olson's response to the numbers since he has a lot of experience in this area. Member Goergen replied that the first time they chatted with Mr. Olson he diagramed a pyramid on a napkin and said that the committee needs to have something to show people.

Member Reed asked if for idea number two the committee thought there were 10 heavy hitters in the community that could be approached versus five. Member Goergen said the list is still being put together, which Mr. Olson and Member Lefler will be providing.

Member Lonsbury stated if an individual gives \$100,000 to the project they need to have significant worth and there is those who can do it but they are limited so the concern is spreading it out. The question becomes what is the closing ratio, if we find 100 people can we close on 10%? Member Goergen suggested the committee come up with a ratio number and then assign monetary amounts to those five or eight people. Member Lonsbury replied that whatever the monetary limits are, he would rather talk to five people who can write checks for \$75,000 to \$100,000 and try to up sell them. He concluded that their plan should be to search out four to five major donors that support and can contribute 80% of the project.

Member Benson stated that even for smaller donations those giving should be followed up with a note, with a secondary tactic of sourcing for possible additional dollars. Member Lonsbury suggested they create an 8 1/2 x 11 certificate with a thank you letter for their contribution and add a note of who can you tell about what you did and have them forward those names back to the committee.

Member Goergen asked if they are given the option, why not show the presentation to as many people as they can as the Rotary Club will give funds but 140 people will be watching the video. The initial goal is financial but secondarily to receive additional names.

Motion by Member Lonsbury to take a two-prong approach to fundraising - one, to look at 4-5 major donors to raise 80% of the anticipated project cost and be recognized on sentinels and two, the remaining 20% to be raised by community organizations, seconded by Member Cardarelle.

Member Goergen stated that besides recognition on the memorial they have miniature eagles. Member Lonsbury replied that donors will tell them what the gift condition is. Member Reed replied that obligating the eagles could run them a lot of money. Member Cardarelle suggested they need to leave the type of recognition open.

Member Reed stated there is space for more than just one donor on a sentinel. Member Lonsbury replied that if a donor gave \$200,000 maybe they could have their own sentinel.

Member Benson asked what is Mr. Olson's role working with the committee, as it seems he has the mechanics and enthusiasm to lay out a structure on an ongoing basis and that it would be helpful to have his assistance. Member Goergen replied that they were trying to determine if he was waiting to be asked more formally or to be a paid consultant. Member Benson noted that Mr. Olson's sense is that he doesn't want to be overbearing initially and that he is waiting for the green light to be assertive so he will speak with Mr. Olson for clarification.

Ayes: Benson, Cardarelle, Christiaansen, Lonsbury, Reed, Schwartz and Goergen.
Motion carried.

B. PLAN B

Member Goergen, indicating that the memorial cannot be started until funds are in the bank, asked what the plan is if the \$500,000 goal is not raised. He suggested one option is to request recommendations from Mr. Kost since he is the architect. He asked if plans remain unchanged and the goal is not met, since the focal point is the eagle and the artist has already renegotiated the contract, should the eagle be purchased with whatever funds are collected so it will be in our possession.

Member Lonsbury asked if the memorial can be done in phases, suggesting that the wall with the eagle can be completed and as money comes in the project could continue with the plaza. He expressed that having the eagle in storage didn't sit well. Mr. Keprios replied that if this approach is taken they would have to run it through the public process. He noted that Mr. Kost previously indicated they could consider revisiting materials being used, for example, concrete instead of granite, which could amount in significant savings. Member Lonsbury stated recommendations are needed from the architect and professionals on staff.

Mr. Keprios stated that if the goal was not met, to alleviate concern donors should be advised that their donations will not be returned but that something different will be done with the dollars and that they will still be recognized for it. Member Lonsbury suggested donors be told that they will still be building a memorial, and that there are a lot of options for materials, etc.

Member Cardarelle indicated he thought the goal was \$400,000, but two to three months ago, it was raised to \$500,000. He noted that the construction budget stays at \$400,000 but that they may need \$500,000 in the bank. Member Goergen explained that Mr. Kost provided an estimated budget of \$438,000. The committee then discussed the fact that the project cost was over \$400,000 and that included in the budget is two optional items, two sentinels and two benches, which after adding these items in the budget was \$458,000. At that point, the decision was made to go to at least \$450,000 but since they needed City Council approval the budget was raised to \$500,000 to cover any additional unknown expenses. Mr. Keprios responded that City Council approved \$400,000 so far but they don't want to go back to the council for more after they nail down the number of sentinels.

Member Reed asked about in-kind payments. Member Cardarelle stated that they will get in-kind services but that it is hard currently to plug in these numbers, for example how much excavating will cost. He noted there are several companies he can approach. Member Goergen asked about timing for approaching companies to which Member Cardarelle answered when construction starts so they can get contracts out. Member Christiaansen asked if in-kind donations should be sought at 75% completion.

Member Lonsbury asked if historically in-kind has been received. He suggested a review of the budget to figure out what real or anticipated costs are compared to in-kind and thought maybe this would be a good exercise before going to donors. Member Goergen replied that they have the budget and can go line by line to figure it out. He noted that as they get closer to goal they should start getting contractors lined up, then when they receive the final approval from City Council there will be no delays.

Member Schwartz stated that a basic, written out, timeline is needed indicating what we have to do and where we need to be at what points in time. He proposed this be an agenda item for the next meeting, to come up with a wide timeline starting with when they want to be done and then working backwards. Member Lonsbury added that the timeline should be expanded to planning – who is doing what, when – a project plan is needed, not just dates. Member Goergen noted that they had a timeline to dedicate the memorial of July 4, 2012 but due to the fundraising issue, they will not meet this timeline. Member Schwartz suggested they should have a target of when the memorial will be done.

Member Benson suggested someone get a hold of Mr. Olson and have him on the committee to assist with fundraising because this is the key issue right now. Member Lonsbury asked if Member Benson would be interested in co-chairing fundraising for the committee. Member Benson replied that he would be willing to be involved and put forth the effort but that it would be difficult for him to have a set schedule.

Member Goergen suggested Mr. Olson be approached and find out if he wants further involvement. He also stated that Denny Schulstad is the Honorary Fundraising Chair and will be the dedication speaker. He is willing to help in any way possible and will be introducing us to three of the six names he gave but beyond that, he doesn't want to be on the committee. Member Reed suggested that the fundraising position be a non-paid position.

Mr. Keprios noted that Ms. Bender is not going to be attending committee meetings anymore and recommended Mr. Olson be part of the committee and take over Ms. Bender's spot to head fundraising. He added that he will contact Mr. Olson first and see if he is interested.

Motion by Member Benson to remove Ms. Bender from the committee and recommend Mr. Olson be part of the committee to head fundraising, seconded by Member Schwartz.

Ayes: Benson, Cardarelle, Christiaansen, Lonsbury, Reed, Schwartz and Goergen.
Motion carried.

Mr. Keprios noted that City Manager Scott Neil will be going to the legislature to request tax exemption status for this project.

VII. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. FUNDRAISING/TREASURER

No report.

B. MARKETING/COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Marketing Chairman John Lonsbury indicated that he will be discussing the brochure with Mr. Keprios and should have something next month. Member Goergen asked about a timeline for updating the website. Mr. Keprios replied that the new city website is about to be launched so they did not want to work on it until afterwards.

C. RESEARCH (KIAs)

No report.

D. DESIGN/ARCHITECTURE

Member Christiaansen requested all members please send him quotes so he can start compiling a list and once received this list will be sent to everyone for voting. Member Goergen stated that placement still needs to be decided, maybe on the sentinels.

Mr. Keprios stated that Mr. Kost believes there is severe overreaction to the fear of vandalism and that raising the structure two additional feet, to eight feet, will not provide a return on investment, but they could go up to 6 ½ feet. A mock-up of a 6 ½-foot structure will be requested.

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 am