



REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

July 12, 2024

The regular meeting of the Economic Development Authority (EDA), of Stafford County, Virginia, was held at the George L. Gordon Jr. Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Rd, Stafford, VA 22554 with a virtual option on Friday, July 12, 2024.

1. CALL TO ORDER

This meeting was called to order by Vice Chair, Ms. Hagerman at 9:00 AM. A quorum was present and accounted for.

Members

Howard Owen, Chairman (Virtual)
Heather Hagerman, Vice Chairman
Jack Rowley, Treasurer
Price Jett
Jeff Roosa
Marlon Wilson
Jeanette Holland

ED/EDA Staff Present

Liz Barber
Josh Summits
Christine Mulrooney
Linzy Browne

Also Present

Kilroy Robotics Team
Jen Morgan, IoT
Allan Watkins
Paul Santay
Mike Morris

It was noted that Mr. Owen was attending virtually for personal reasons (noted per VA Code), and his virtual attendance form was documented by staff.

Ms. Hagerman emphasized the disclosure of any conflicts of interest among members and staff. Ms. Hagerman discloses her involvement with the Stafford Handbell Society, as their Realtor.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Hagerman motions to approve meeting minutes. Mr. Rowley requests an amendment to the motion to include corrections to the spelling of Ms. Browne's last name. Ms. Hagerman amends the motion approve the minutes with the amendment. Mr. Jett seconds.

APPROVED 7 - 0

3. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

1. Kilroy Robotics

- a) Kilroy Robotics is a high school robotics team based at North Stafford High School, dedicated to fostering STEM education and practical engineering skills among high school, middle and elementary school students in Stafford County, Virginia. The team, which typically consists of around 20 students, is supported by mentors and volunteers who guide them through the process of designing, building, and programming robots for competitions.
- b) Key members include Elizabeth Reynolds, Ally Tren, and Christopher Byland, who play various roles such as team safety captain, build team member, and chairman respectively. They emphasize teaching fundamental skills such as coding in Java, electrical engineering, and mechanical construction using power tools. These skills are crucial as the team annually competes in the First Robotics Competition (FRC), a nationwide event that challenges students to build robots capable of performing specific tasks under competitive conditions.
- c) The team actively engages in outreach programs, visiting elementary and middle schools to inspire younger students and promote interest in STEM fields. Their efforts not only aim to win competitions but also to cultivate a passion for engineering and prepare students for future careers in technology. To meet these needs, Kilroy Robotics actively seeks financial support from corporate sponsors, local businesses, community organizations, and grants from foundations or governmental entities that support STEM education initiatives. The team's ability to secure funding directly impacts their ability to sustain their competitive edge, expand outreach efforts, and provide valuable educational opportunities to students interested in STEM fields within Stafford County and beyond.
- d) Over its 25-year history, Kilroy Robotics has accumulated numerous awards and accolades. Alumni have gone on to pursue successful careers in engineering at prominent companies such as Lockheed Martin and Microsoft, attributing their interest and skills to their experiences with the team.
- e) Looking ahead, Kilroy Robotics seeks to expand its impact by increasing mentorship opportunities and attracting more students and educators to participate in their programs. They continue to advocate for greater awareness and support within the community to ensure sustainable growth and innovation in STEM education.
- f) Ms. Morgan inquired about non-monetary support that could be offered to the team. Mr. Brown emphasized that mentorship is a critical area of concern. He noted that for effective team management, ideally, there should be one mentor per five to six

students. Currently, with only three mentors available, the team's growth is constrained, as larger teams (with 50 to 60 members) often benefit from having up to 20 mentors.

- g) Additionally, Ms. White highlighted the need for increased outreach to students and educators who might be interested in participating. She noted that while the previous head coach was a teacher, the current reliance on CGS is less effective. Having additional teachers or coaches with strong connections to the school would significantly benefit the program.

2. RIoT Update/GO VA Grant

- a) Ms. Jen Morgan provided an update on RIoT's efforts in Region 6, focusing on expanding smart technology initiatives through three projects. RIoT, a nonprofit based in Raleigh, North Carolina, aims to foster economic development by integrating technology across various industries. Their programs include supporting startups through a free 12-week accelerator program without taking equity or IP. With over 1,900 startups supported across 18 cohorts, RIoT has contributed to creating 135 jobs in Virginia over the past three years.
- b) Ms. Morgan highlighted the completion of a successful project funded by GO Virginia, aimed at expanding smart technology solutions across Region 6. The project, supported by a \$96,250 planning grant, facilitated workshops and strategic planning to address regional challenges through technology-driven solutions. Key activities included discovery workshops, a call for solutions that attracted 28 applications, and subsequent meetings where 14 solution providers presented to 17 local government representatives. The project identified significant interest in implementing solutions, although funding constraints were a common challenge among local governments.
- c) Looking ahead, Ms. Morgan recommended pursuing implementation funding to proceed with five selected solutions and suggested ongoing training, workshops, and project shaping meetings to support future initiatives. She emphasized the potential for continued growth and ecosystem development in Region 6 through strategic partnerships and further funding opportunities.
- d) Mr. Rowley sought clarification from Ms. Morgan on which of the companies selected for implementation had ties to Stafford. Ms. Morgan clarified that 1 out of the 14 chosen solution providers was based in Stafford, indicating local involvement in the project.
- e) The conversation then turned to attracting companies to Stafford, prompting Mr. Roosa to express reservations based on his experience with Requests for Proposals (RFPs). He cautioned against relying solely on promises of relocation without firm commitments, highlighting the risk of companies acting merely as intermediaries for software rather than creating substantial local economic impact. He emphasized the need for rigorous evaluation to determine if these companies would indeed contribute to the local economy through job creation and active participation in local events and programs.
- f) Ms. Morgan acknowledged that it was crucial to move beyond superficial commitments and ensure that companies deliver on their promises to benefit the community. She

proposed strategies to incentivize companies to invest in Stafford, such as ongoing financial support, active participation in local business events, and collaboration with economic development agencies.

- g) Mr. Rowley expressed support for seeking future funding opportunities that align with Stafford's economic development goals. He suggested leveraging local partnerships and resources to sustain the momentum generated by RIoT's initiatives in Region 6.
- h) In conclusion, the meeting highlighted the necessity of aligning RIoT's initiatives with tangible economic outcomes for Stafford. It emphasized the importance of thorough evaluation and strategic planning to ensure that initiatives translate into lasting benefits for the local community.
- i) Mr. Rowley and Ms. Hagerman both complement Ms. Morgan's efforts and how important their work is.

3. Stafford Economic Development Report

- a) Ms. Barber provided a detailed update during the last meeting, addressing various topics. She began by revisiting the request from the EDA members to use printed agenda materials in 3-ring binders. As requested, the "mission, vision, and values" statement was placed in the front of the binders for reference. Jack had requested a roster on page two. The binders include a copy of the bylaws, VA code for the IDA & Revenue Bond Act, all for reference. Additionally, a quick cheat sheet of Robert's Rules is included, followed by agenda tabs labeled according to the information on the agenda. Ms. Barber mentioned that the binders could be reloaded each month, and members are free to take any of the pages inside with them after the meeting, if needed.
- b) Ms. Barber then provided an update on RV Parkway, a county-owned property that will be considered by the Board of Supervisors for transfer to the EDA so it can be sold to create operating capital for the EDA. The process of determining the right of way and utility easements is nearly complete, with fieldwork wrapping up this week and the plat following next week. Once the plat is completed, it must be approved and recorded, a process that takes about three months. A public hearing for the transfer is expected in Fall 2024. Once that is completed, the Board of Supervisors will consider for approval of the property transfer to the EDA. Ms. Barber also highlighted that VDOT is planning public hearings for intersection improvements at RV Parkway, Old Forge, and Rt. 17, which could enhance the property's value due to improved accessibility.

Regarding communication with First Line Technologies, Ms. Barber mentioned that she has not spoken with Amit for the past two to three months. Amit is aware of the ongoing process, and re-engagement is planned once the public hearing is completed and the paperwork is drawn up. To her knowledge, no agreement exists between the EDA and First Line.

- c) Ms. Barber updated the board on Buc-ee's. A conditional use permit request for a vehicle fuel sales facility, filed on February 28th. The Planning and Zoning (P&Z) staff has

completed the first round of comments and is awaiting a resubmittal from Buc-ee's. The economic development department is currently hands-off, as the process is managed by the P&Z. She provided a link to the P&Z website for members to view all comments and updates related to Buc-ee's application.

Mr. Roosa emphasized the need for caution when discussing sensitive topics like Buc-ee's in public, as EDA members' statements could be taken out of context and affect their positions. He reiterated that the EDA is not a political board and should remain neutral, reminding members to be mindful of their public statements.

- d) On the topic of SAM.gov, Ms. Barber mentioned that Price now has been granted access, and more points of contact are beneficial. She is coordinating with Price to ensure proper access and management of the account through the econdev email.
- e) Addressing recent emails about Belmont Park and sports facility proposals, Ms. Barber expressed frustration over the perceived misinformation and lack of communication. She highlighted the active efforts by the economic development staff, including attending webinars and conventions, and meeting with potential partners. She emphasized that the staff is working on various projects, including potential sports facility concepts, and requested EDA members to communicate directly with her for updates to avoid misinformation to the public.
- f) Ms. Barber acknowledged feedback from Mr. Rowley regarding responsiveness and committed to improving communication. She explained the challenges of managing 154 departmental leads and assured the board that she is doing her best to keep them informed. She requested that members contact her directly for accurate updates.

4. Public Comment

- a) Mr. Watkins expressed his happiness to have the opportunity to speak and mentioned that Mr. Owens had previously reached out to him, which prompted his appearance. He was thrilled to hear from Ms. Barber about the extensive behind-the-scenes work that he and others were unaware of, stating that it made him very happy. Mr. Watkins mentioned that he sent another email the previous day, which would likely be forwarded to the board. This email followed up from his perspective and that of the public regarding Mr. Sills' vision for Belmont Park.
- b) Mr. Watkins elaborated that, from what he understood, Mr. Sills currently has only one tenant for one building on the property, leaving a substantial amount of land available for other purposes. He shared that Mr. Sills, if possible, would still like to pursue his original vision for the property. He was pleased to hear about the ongoing behind-the-scenes activities and has been in contact with the sports facility company involved. He mentioned a recent webinar that provided valuable information about how the company works with public and private partnerships, which he believes is the only viable way for such a project to succeed.
- c) Mr. Watkins emphasized that he is a regular citizen trying to bring people together for the benefit of Stafford County. He has spoken with parks and recreation departments and all the supervisors. Although he wanted to speak with the board in May but didn't have the chance, his goal is to facilitate discussions that lead to a development

benefiting Stafford County's citizens and generating more revenue than the current industrial plan. Ms. Holland asked for his name, and Mr. Watkins replied, expressing his desire to meet with Ms. Barber to gain more information to share with the public.

4. TREASURER'S REPORT

- a. Mr. Rowley provided the Treasurer's Report, directing attention to a financial summary provided in the package. He mentioned that he reviewed the details and highlighted that the summary on the front page indicated a slight increase in investments and a decrease in cash due to moving funds into a CD that was not invested last month.

He noted two significant financial points. First, he received notification of Don Newlin's retirement from STIFEL, who has been their contact for years. Mr. Newlin listed a new contact within the organization who will take over his responsibilities. Mr. Rowley had reached out to her prior to receiving the official retirement letter but waited for confirmation before proceeding.

- b. Second, regarding the audit, Mr. Rowley reported receiving an email with a substantial data request, indicating that the audit is progressing and in the hands of the auditor. He and staff are in the process of supplying the requested data, and nothing seems out of line at this point.

He then moved to approve the Treasurer's report. Mr. Payne requested that Mr. Rowley amend his motion to "accept the report" in lieu of "approve". Mr. Rowley amended his motion to accept the Treasurer's report, and Ms. Hagerman seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7-0 APPROVED

5. SECRETARY'S REPORT

- a. Ms. Browne provided the Secretary's Report, highlighting upcoming events and ongoing projects. She mentioned the "Beer & Business" event scheduled for August 14th from 4-5:30 PM at Highmark Brewery, sponsored by Arsenal Events. With 48 people registered a month in advance, the turnout looks promising. Additionally, she received word—though not yet a signed contract—that Aquia Realty will sponsor the November event, which will be held at Adventure Brewery.
- b. Ms. Browne reported progress on the Veteran Business Bootcamp, which remains tentatively scheduled. She is collaborating with Susan Ball from the SBDC, continuing their annual partnership for this event. Ms. Browne also noted that it is nearly time to start sending out RFPs to secure a date and venue for the Business Appreciation Reception (BAR), typically held in late April or May to coincide with Small Business Month.

6. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

- a. Mr. Owen began the Chairman's Report by asking Ms. Barber to share a letter from Beth Black of the Fredericksburg EDA, which can be found in the members' binders. The letter

advocates for a bike lane on the Falmouth Bridge, and the Fredericksburg EDA has requested support from the Stafford EDA. Mr. Owen expressed his belief that a bike and pedestrian lane would be beneficial, noting the current narrow sidewalk. Mr. Rowley inquired whether a financial contribution was requested in the letter, but Mr. Owen clarified that only a letter of support was requested. Mr. Rowley supported the idea, comparing it to the Chatham Bridge's biking and walking facilities, and Ms. Hagerman agreed. Mr. Roosa questioned the EDA's influence compared to a supervisor or Board of Supervisors endorsement. Mr. Owen asked members to read and consider the proposal over the next month and to gather more information before acting at the next meeting.

- b. Mr. Howard responded to Ms. Barber's comments, clarifying that his email aimed to inform that the EDA was not involved in the property project on Rt. 17, which was approved by the BOS. He was surprised that some members of the Board of Supervisors were unaware of this.
- c. Mr. Owen asked Mr. Roosa and Mr. Wilson about the FRA and the Testbed's direction. Mr. Roosa said Mr. Spence was working with the FRA for board representation but had no new updates. Ms. Barber stated she would reach out to Mr. Roberts and update the EDA next month.
- d. Mr. Owen then asked about the reimbursement process for Amazon fees. Mr. Payne explained that the county must submit the request to Amazon. Mr. Rowley estimated the amount at \$6,000. Ms. Barber noted that a BOS budget request might be necessary for the reimbursement, and Mr. Payne agreed to handle the matter if the EDA sent him the bill.
- e. Mr. Owen inquired about the contract with the retail consultant, to which Ms. Barber responded that they had signed on for help with retail, restaurant, and entertainment recruitment. The EDA will be involved as stakeholders in the data report and subsequent steps, expected in two to three months. She will update the EDA when reports are provided.
- f. Mr. Owen thanked Ms. Hagerman and former EDA member Ms. Danielle Davis for their service and recognized Ms. Hagerman's contributions, presenting her with a commemorative clock. He praised her work, especially on the Thompson Avenue project, which benefited the EDA and the county.

7. COMMITTEE AND WORKING GROUPS REPORTS

A. LOAN COMMITTEE (J. Rowley, J. Summits)

- i. Mr. Summits provided a summary of the June loan payment report, noting that the loan interest amounted to a little over \$13,000, with about \$280 paid on the holding account, leaving an ending balance of \$7,375. He mentioned that Vitae Visual's payment is in deferment, with full payments resuming in August. Santana Holdings has missed their last two payments and further action by the EDA may be necessitating moving to default. Next Level Mosaic's behind on their July payment, and is working with law enforcement to address some issues, and further updates will be provided as the situation progresses.

- ii. Mr. Summits then discussed the loan application for Stafford Handbells, a non-profit music foundation, requesting \$140,000 from the business growth fund. He gave a brief overview of their project and financial situation, highlighting their move to a new location at Banks Ford Parkway, and the need for funds to finalize the build-out of their space. Legal counsel confirmed that the EDA could use their property as collateral, pending a title search.

Mr. Rowley raised concerns about the loan's alignment with the EDA's funding goals and the organization's ability to secure the loan given their non-traditional revenue model. Ms. Hagerman vouched for the organization's long-standing presence and community impact, including providing quality of life and utilizing a previously vacant building. Despite these points, the board discussed the importance of evaluating the risk and ensuring that the organization's revenue model could support the loan repayment.

Mr. Jett and Mr. Summits discussed the details of the collateral and the organization's financial stability, considering the non-traditional aspects of their revenue and expenses. Mr. Roosa emphasized the need to align with the county's strategic objectives, including economic development and community impact.

Mr. Rowley then motioned to deny the loan request, citing that the organization's ability to repay the loan was not in question but suggesting that EDA funds could be better allocated with a better alignment to the EDA's mission. Mr. Jett seconded the motion.

MOTION TO DENY APPROVED 7-0

B. BUSINESS RESOURCE COMMITTEE

- i. Kilroy Robotics Grant Application- Ms. Hagerman initiated the discussion regarding the Kilroy Robotics grant application. Mr. Roosa questioned whether they had explored all available federal, state, and local grant opportunities. Ms. Hagerman explained that while they had addressed this as best as possible, finding and securing grants typically involves bringing on a mentor from the granting organization, which is challenging given their limited mentorship resources. She highlighted the impactful story of a Ms. White from Lockheed, who went through the program, attended UVA, and returned to Stafford as an engineer.

Mr. Wilson suggested that having a part-time staff member skilled in grant writing could help organizations like Kilroy Robotics secure funding. Ms. Barber noted that while Stafford County Schools have someone who applies for grants on their behalf, this support does not extend to non-profits or private organizations.

Mr. Roosa emphasized the need to align grant support with the EDA's mission and objectives, rather than acting as a charity. He acknowledged the program's value but stressed the importance of considering its economic development impact.

Mr. Rowley supported the idea of a \$10,000 grant, noting the program's past support and overall benefits to the school system and community.

Ms. Hagerman and Mr. Roosa discussed the potential workforce development benefits of the program, with Ms. Hagerman noting that it helps build a better-quality workforce. Mr. Howard added that the program's success could serve as a marketing tool for Stafford County, potentially attracting companies by showcasing the county's support for STEM programs.

Mr. Roosa expressed concern about setting a precedent for grant distribution and suggested helping Kilroy Robotics find other funding sources. Ms. Barber mentioned that she did connect Kilroy with Amazon's community grant application process, though she was unsure of the outcome. Mr. Wilson proposed the idea of having a dedicated grant writer to help secure funds for such programs.

Ms. Browne highlighted resources like the UMW Business Acumen Series topic regarding AI tools for grant writing, and the Small Business Development Center's classes.

Mr. Jett emphasized the program's unique contribution to skill development beyond what schools can offer and its potential to mitigate brain drain by encouraging talented students to return to Stafford after graduation.

Mr. Jett made a motion to approve the Community Based Organization grant for Kilroy Robotics in the amount of \$10,000. Mr. Rowley seconded the motion.

VOTE APPROVED 7-0

After the motion as complete, Mr. Roosa suggested that Kilroy Robotics recognized the EDA as a sponsor at competitions.

- ii. Ms. Barber then referenced a previous request by Mr. Rowley to replace the grant link on the website with an information flyer. She confirmed that this change had been implemented. The new flyer matches the style of the loan flyers and includes contact information. Potential applicants now need to contact the EDA to receive the grant link, ensuring it is not publicly available but controlled through direct communication.

C. PROPERTY GROUP

- i. Ms. Hagerman mentioned that she sees the importance of the Property Group, since it contributes greatly to the EDA's overall budget and income. She reiterated that she hopes that her replacement as a representative of the Garrisonville District will have the skills and ability to lead that charge with the Property Group.

D. TECHNOLOGY GROUP

- i. Mr. Roosa states that he will provide a Testbed update at the next meeting.

8. OLD BUSINESS

A. Election of Slate of Officers. Ms. Hagerman asks to table this item until the next meeting, specifically since the Chair was unable to attend in person, and not knowing her replacement. Mr. Wilson and Mr. Rowley both agree to postpone to next month. Ms. Barber reiterates that it is in the bylaws that the elections take place annually in July, but they do reserve the right to table this as needed. There is consensus amongst the board to table this item.

B. EDA MOU Division of Duties.

- i. Ms. Barber provided a large printout of the EDA MOU Division of Duties for easier viewing. She noted that this document had been provided last month for review, and the goal was to discuss and potentially revise it before formally drafting it into an MOU with the county.

Ms. Hagerman asked if the document was for review and approval, or if it was just for discussion. Ms. Barber clarified that the purpose was to discuss any revisions and finalize the content before it was included in a formal MOU draft, and she was seeking approval.

Mr. Rowley expressed concerns and indicated he had sent comments to Ms. Barber. He noted the need for further clarification on financial aspects and suggested reviewing his comments before proceeding. Mr. Roosa suggested having the MOU committee review Mr. Rowley's comments, or that he shares the comments with the full Board at the meeting.

Ms. Barber states that she did not bring copies of Mr. Rowley's comments to the meeting, but she felt the best platform would be for him to present and discuss the comments as a group.

Ms. Barber explained that Mr. Rowley's initial set of comments had been considered at the MOU committee level, and updates had been made accordingly. She would search for the newest comments and print copies for distribution. She proposed returning to this item once the comments were disseminated to all the EDA members for review.

Mr. Owen inquired about the conflict of interest section highlighted by Mr. Rowley, asking if it had been vetted by Mr. Roosa and Mr. Jett, or if it was part of the original document. Ms. Barber mentioned that this item was requested by Mr. Roosa at the committee level.

Additionally, Mr. Rowley voiced his concern with the current bookkeeping service, citing that they are not bonded and questioning the adequacy of their insurance coverage. He raised concerns about the potential for internal fraud or collusion, emphasizing the need for tighter controls and possibly more oversight from county officials or legal advisors.

Mr. Roosa agreed with Mr. Rowley's perspective, noting that while there are always risks, it is crucial to understand and manage them appropriately. He supported the idea of the county having formal agreements and oversight, which is what he felt would be the purpose of the MOU. Mr. Howard also agreed with Mr. Rowley and suggested that these issues should be discussed in greater detail with legal experts or relevant officials.

After locating copies of Mr. Rowley's comments and disseminating them to the Board, Mr. Rowley expressed significant concerns about the liability and responsibility associated with managing a large sum of the organization's assets, specifically the monies held in the STIFEL accounts. He communicated that he feels it is unreasonable for a volunteer to bear full responsibility for such an amount and believes that the county should assume a formal role in oversight to mitigate risks. He worries about potential legal issues, including the risk of personal liability for actions taken in a volunteer capacity, since EDA volunteers are not elected officials. According to Mr. Rowley, volunteers act on behalf of the county and could be exposed to legal action if something goes wrong.

Mr. Morris, Deputy County Administrator, was asked to approach the podium for questions. He greeted the Board and asked for clarification on the specific question being discussed. Mr. Rowley explained his concerns about having sole responsibility for managing the EDA's large accounts. He felt it was unreasonable for a volunteer board member to bear such responsibility alone and suggested that the county should have some oversight given that the funds originated from county donations and property sales. He cited a case of embezzlement at a local business to underscore the risk involved and emphasized the need for a solution.

Mr. Morris responded that as a separate entity, the EDA is responsible for its own finances. He explained that county staff should not be involved in managing EDA finances and that internal controls, such as requiring a secondary sign-off, are decisions for the EDA to make. He acknowledged Mr. Rowley's concerns but noted that separation between the county and the EDA's finances is required.

Mr. Roosa asked Mr. Morris if the county could be held liable for the EDA's actions. Mr. Morris indicated that while the county appoints the EDA board members, the liability would be limited, and he would need to consult attorneys for further clarification. Ms. Barber added that the EDA's own liability insurance covers errors and omissions for EDA board members, which is why such a policy exists.

Ms. Morgan then referenced the Virginia Code, which indicates that EDA directors and officers hold no personal liability for the EDA's bonds. Mr. Morris clarified that this coverage applies to bonds but also noted that the EDA's own liability insurance would cover other risks.

Mr. Rowley suggested meeting with attorneys to resolve these issues. Mr. Jett proposed approving the other changes discussed, and seeking legal counsel to clarify financial accounts and insurance/liability issues. Ms. Hagerman asked if Mr. schedule a meeting with county legal counsel, EDA legal counsel, EDA Treasurer, and the members of the EDA MOU committee. Ms. Barber said she would work to get this meeting scheduled.

Mr. Jett also suggested striking the problematic clause about risk management and conflicts of interest until further clarification could be obtained. Mr. Wilson proposed revised language for engaging the EDA's attorney to ensure no conflicts of interest and provide guidance if any arise. Mr. Rowley agreed with this revision.

After deep discussion, consensus was reached regarding a number of minor changes to be made to the MOU, and an updated version will be provided for the next meeting agenda. All bullet points regarding financial accounts and EDA member liabilities will be tabled until clarification is received as a result of the meeting with legal counsel and discussed at next meeting.

ii. Brolin Creative Marketing events contract for fiscal year 2024-2025.

Ms. Browne explained that the contract had been amended to reflect changes and reviewed by EDA Legal Counsel. The contract includes a scope of work and a fixed price of \$41,637.75 for the year.

Mr. Roosa confirmed that the contract is a set price. Ms. Browne emphasized that this was a fixed price, not hourly-based, and included monthly billing for services provided.

Mr. Jett noted his appreciation of the reduced price since some of the responsibilities have changed now that the Economic Development department holds a separate contract for those duties.

Ms. Hagerman asked for a motion to accept the contract. Mr. Rowley moved to accept the contract, and Mr. Jett seconded the motion. The contract was approved with all in favor and none opposed.

VOTE APPROVED: 7 – 0



9. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Hagerman provides a motion to adjourn, and it is accepted.

VOTE APPROVED: 7 – 0

Respectfully Submitted:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "J Rowley". The signature is written in a cursive style.

Jack Rowley
Treasurer (in lieu of Secretary)