

Board of Directors Meeting
October 1, 2018
7 pm, NW Youth Corps, Columbia Room

Board members present: Ann Bennett Rogers, Chewie Burgess, Diane Albino, George Braddock, Jack Makarchek (President), Jon Silvermoon (alternate), Justin Honea, Kenya Luvert, Paxton Hoag, Sue Theolass. **Peach Gallery present:** Staff (Crystalyn Autuchovich, Mary Callaghan, Robin Bernardi, Shane Harvey, Stephanie Talbott); Officers (Hilary Anthony, Lynda Gingerich, Kimmo Howard); and 70 members and guests. Sam Rutledge facilitated the meeting.

This Board of Directors meeting is being videotaped and will be available to the Fair family on the OCF YouTube channel for those wanting to watch the proceedings here tonight. To get links for this and all Board meetings, go to the Board section of oregoncountryfair.net and click on "Sign up to receive videos of monthly Board meetings." Please note, Board meetings held at the OCF site are not live-streamed due to intermittent access to the internet.

New Business

Ratify election results and appointments of officers (Jon)

Announcements

KOCF: The First Annual Halloween Hullabaloo will be Saturday, October 27, at the WOW Hall. There is a costume contest, raffle prizes, music by Sol Seed and special guest Steel Wool. Please put that on your calendar!

Stephanie: The KOCF Halloween Party will have a sliding fee scale (suggested donation \$5 to \$25) and funds raised will provide support for KOCF and the Jill Heiman Vision Fund. Come celebrate and kick off the Fair's 50th Anniversary at 7 pm Saturday, October 27, at the WOW Hall, 291 W. Eighth Ave. in Eugene.

Summerfield: Another Board Candidates town hall meeting was held October 7 at Whirled Pies in Eugene.

Staff Reports

Crystalyn: Hi everyone — It has been a busy month! We had the Financial Planning meeting recently and Hilary and Linda will present that later this evening. The 50th Anniversary Task Force has been working with the Budget Committee on a comprehensive proposal and I hope that the BoD passes it tonight. Between what the Task Force and various crews have planned, I think it will be an amazing time! Stephanie, Lynda, Adam, Jim, and others have begun meeting again to work on how we can have a comprehensive database that will include all crews and booths. The last thing I want to say is that I truly hope we can all be kind to one another.

Shane: I agree with Crystalyn. It is heartbreaking to see everybody at odds with each other and is unfortunate.

Regarding the SUP, we did hear back from the county hearing official and were given approval. The decision has been appealed and will go before the county commissioner and Land Use Board of Appeals. Unfortunately, we had to cancel the cross-country race this year due to permitting issues. There may be ways to circumvent this with advance event and facility permit planning, so we have a meeting scheduled with the coach in January 2019.

Stephanie: It's been rough lately and I know we are all better than what is being said on Facebook. We have been busy and ramping up into entertainment application season, advertising for the 50th, crew meetings, and budget planning season. This is a year-round organization and it doesn't stop.

Mary: It's been busy at the office with elections and reimbursement deadlines. Thanks to everybody for getting the reimbursements in on time. Norma retired a month ago, so thanks to those for their support during the transition. If there is a way I can help, please email or call the office. The first Board candidate forum in September was a success. It was live-streamed and is still available on the oregoncountryfair.net site. To share a quote from my dearly departed, "teamwork makes the dream work" and I hope we can do some dream work here.

Robin: We had another awesome success for Culture Jam this year. This was our 17th full-week Culture Jam! It's hard to believe. Huge thank yous to everyone who helped make it such a success. Specifically, I appreciate my dedicated co-workers who turn the wheels to keep this organization running every day; Board members and ongoing donors — thank you for making sure Culture Jam has the support it needs to thrive; the joyful Beaver Dam Builders who have been helping us set up the site for 13 years now; Culture Jam's heroic, ever-creative and fun-loving Kitchen team; my handful of behind-the-scenes support people who I couldn't do without; and finally the mentor staff of artists, performers and professional youth workers who spend quality time with the youth throughout the week.

At last count, more 200 people played a part in making Culture Jam happen this year — and this doesn't count the over 50 youth and their families who were positively affected. Our work is based on creating a dynamic, safe, supportive, artful and inspiring environment in which the young people can recognize their value. With this, they can go home with the resiliency needed to face the inevitable challenges in life. It is that matrix of love which does the magic, and I wish that matrix of love on our community right now.

Committee Reports

Elections: Jen Lin said the Annual Meeting is Saturday, October 20, at the Whitaker Elementary / Headstart building, 21 N. Grand Street, Eugene. Absentee ballots have been sent and we continue to send more out as requested. Last year we sent out over 1,200 ballots and this year are up to 1,600. If you live in Eugene, please make the effort to come to the meeting for your ballot. Last year we had just under 63 percent return rate. If you have requested an absentee ballot, please make the effort to return it. We anticipate a heavier return rate this year and can use all the help we can get counting at the meeting. Any help you can give counting is appreciated and refreshments will be provided.

Elders: Peggy said Elders met in September and reviewed their meeting minutes: Abbreviated meeting due to many committee members attending NAO meeting. After quorum met, approved minutes for June 2018. Budget item reimbursements requests were turned into Katie.

Many Elders pay more for their passes to allow paying for Elders passes for those with financial issues. We have named this fund Luis Ferano Memorial Elder fund. He was the first to give extra for Elders and passed this year.

Spirit Walk is cancelled for 2018.

An Elders newsletter for Fall 2018 will be put together and distributed.

An Elder resource booklet will be created, details to be in newsletter.

Set dates for upcoming Elder events.

The next Elder Committee meetings are scheduled for Thursday, October 25, and Thursday, November 15, at Growers Market, 454 Willamette St. in Eugene at 7 pm.

The Elder Retreat will be November 17 -18, at Alice's Wonderland.

Agenda: New site for the Still Living Room; Mouseman is our representative to Path Planning and will give them our findings.

December Holiday Party to be at WOW Hall, date TBD.

Bylaws: Diane said the Bylaws Committee met twice regarding changes to the wording of Article VII, number 5. That information will be presented later tonight in the meeting.

Path Planning: Paxton said Path Planning met September 16th. We heard several subcommittee reports — Smoking Areas, Festive Restive, Memoria and Safe Spaces. We added items to the workplan. We also reviewed the subcommittees we have and which were active and which were inactive. Active subcommittees are Front of the Fair, Dust abatement, Cultural resources, Still Living Room, Long-Range Path Planning, Smoking, Memorium, and Safe Spaces. We appointed Laurel Georger to be our 50th Anniversary Committee Liaison to Path Planning.

We then debriefed the committee members on the 2018 Fair. Dust control was a large part of the discussion, smoking areas, path pinchpoints, Altared Space also contributed. Kirk indicated the Lighthouse will have to move as part of the Main Stage reorientation scheduled for next year. Other areas that need looking at are Shady Grove bank erosion, Security Peninsula/the loft to make it work better for everyone, Wally's Way and decongestion in Xavanadu.

Future meetings were scheduled, October 14, November 11 and December 16 at Alice's, January 20 and February 17, 2019, at the office in Eugene and March 17, April 14 and May 19, 2019, at Alice's.

KOCF: Dean reported that if you were out on West 11th on September 29, you may have noticed either him or Mother Earth waving a kettle corn sign in the air trying to get people to pull into the ReStore. KOCF was there all day doing our programming live and celebrating world habitat day and selling Kettle corn as a fund-raiser for the station. The ReStore was one of KOCF's first underwriters.

The programming staff met last week. Discussions about the ReStore remote and Falcon football led the meeting off. The new Falcon radio schedule started last week. The schedule is split to better accommodate the student schedules. The new morning shows are 8:15 to 9:30 and afternoon shows run 2:30 to 3:30. They are hosted by Casey Sullivan, Ivy Culy, Elle Russell and Sol Howell-Gilbert. Some of you may know Elle as she has grown up at the Fair.

On a quick side note about how we impact the community: Our star student last year, Anna Marshall, has recently been hired by KEZI as a producer for their 4 pm newscast. News director/anchor Matt Templeman says that her experience of working for the radio station was a key to her being hired. She had the skills to quickly learn their systems.

I suspect this is true for many of you, but this is why I do this volunteer work. Thanks for allowing it to happen. The Development Group is meeting this coming Thursday. We'll be working on fine-tuning the activities of the Halloween party. Our communications processes will be discussed. Promotional materials for the station, bumper stickers and t-shirts are both in need of orders but with a pending frequency change, things are up in the air. Also, we'll talk about the transmitter move and KEPW.

I'm starting to believe we will actually be heard in the greater Fern Ridge area as well as Eugene sometime early in our 50th year of celebration. I have been working with the Public Works Director of Veneta. The city has a water tank on top of Bolton Hill. There is a new cell tower at that location. I'm exploring the cost involved in placing our antenna/transmitter on both the city owned water tower or the American Tower-owned cell tower. The cell tower is about 80 feet tall and above the water tower and would lower our monthly electrical cost. But I suspect the monthly lease expense will likely be out of our league. The city water tower also is a great location and will greatly improve our signal. I'm working on the logistics of the move — things like ordering an electrical feed, city council approval, insurance, equipment needed at the new site, a tamper-resistant and weatherproof enclosure, and contracting electrical and antenna installation costs. RF Engineer Jay Hennigan is helping me with much of the engineering and I'll be working with OCF staff on much of this.

Personnel: Justin said the committee has been working on the annual evaluation for a lead professional. Crystaly'n's evaluation is in draft form and coming out soon. A link will be sent to the Board, Officers, Coordinators, Staff, BUMS, as well as posted in PDF on the oregoncountryfair.net site. There are some new questions; it is easy to fill out and will take 20 to 30 minutes. We will ask for them to be completed by October 21 so the PC can compile the information for the Board retreat.

Member Input

Chewie: I want to express my gratitude for having served on this Board and remind people I am a write-in candidate this year. As a member, I am asking for your support. Anybody who wants to contact me, feel free. My email is chewieburgess@yahoo.com and anybody can ask me questions.

Don: I've enjoyed 35 years being a coordinator and moving on hope to work with Elders. The Fair has been more than just the Fair event to a lot of us over the years. (He showed all of his laminates.) I've enjoyed passing our ways on and teaching people how to be nice. Thank you.

Michael: Board candidate Jon Steinhart (IT Crew) wants me to read this statement: I am writing once again in hopes averting disaster at the Fair. The manner in which you're steamrolling major changes is strikingly similar to the Kavanaugh nomination. It belies any notion that the Fair is somehow different or better than the "real" world. Maybe you've drunk different Kool-aid than I have, but the Fair is not a cookie-cutter nonprofit organization. It is much more bottom-up volunteer-driven than a typical nonprofit. And it relies heavily on its volunteers to put on its annual event which is the major source of funding, whereas fund-raising and action is distinct in typical nonprofits.

We'd be in a different place had Mary written a professional report that allowed readers to understand her reasoning and recommendations. But she didn't. It seems like there are only two responses forthcoming when people have questions about her report,

which are "because I said so" and "I don't like your attitude." Maybe you folks have forgotten how well those answers worked when you got them from your parents. Nothing in Mary's report justifies the rush that you appear to be in to make these changes. Sure, she says that "you can't start looking for an ED without" but no reasons are given.

It is certainly possible to transform the Fair into a top-down, authoritarian, management-driven organization as Mary recommends. The Fair will probably survive at least for a while, but in name only. The analogy that comes to mind is the change that was made some time back to the Drum Tower. Annoying as it might have been at 4 am, the Drum Tower was the heartbeat of the Fair. The present configuration did ameliorate some of the path congestion problems. But, while we still have something that we call a Drum Tower, it's a pale shadow of its former self. The change unintentionally vanquished much of its magic and energy.

It would be heartbreaking to see that happen to the rest of the Fair, which is why any process for change should be more deliberate and involve as much of our family as possible. The current Board's headlong rush to enact unsubstantiated changes put forth by someone who doesn't appear to understand its heart and soul is irresponsible.

Justin: I would like to take the time to thank Crystalyn, Shane, the Staff, Officers and this Board. They continue to show up every day, take the hits and take care of business despite what I feel are constant personal attacks to the job they do every day. If we want to hire an Executive Director or lead professional, I hope we can turn the tide of disrespect and retain them. It is essential that they are around for this transition. While we may not agree with everything, we owe them a certain amount of respect, love and empathy for the job they do amazingly every day. It is the least we can do. I personally want to say thank you.

Heather: Emotions have been running pretty high and a letter has been circulating, forwarded to me by some of the people targeted in this letter. Three of those people are Board candidates — Spirit, Shelly and Jon Steinhart — and the fourth person is Reese. I have really stringent standards for what constitutes an attack and for me this piece more than qualifies as a series of extreme personal attacks. I will be submitting this entire letter for the record with the request and approval of some of those named. The letter was written by a spouse of somebody on the management team. It is really extreme.

Jon P.: The issues being discussed tonight are really profound. The outcomes may change the entire nature of our way of approaching things.

Jon Silvermoon: Isn't this out of order? NAO recommendations are an agenda item.

Jon P.: I am not speaking to the recommendations. I am talking about our way of approaching things. I realize, Jon, that you probably don't want me to say what I am going to say. The fact that people disagree with the official representation from the Board about major structural changes to the Fair does not mean they are attacking staff, the Board or anybody else. I think for the OCF to continue having the integrity it has had, people need to be able to have open discussions about these issues without being branded as attempted abuse. I know some people have been abusive on both sides of these issues and that is inappropriate any way you look at it. Just disagreeing or having a different proposal does not mean you are criticizing, attacking or in any way abusing somebody else.

Spirit: Yesterday another coordinator called me and said the best analogy they could give to what was going on right now is how a Buddhist monk can take a long time to carefully create a beautiful, big mandala and then in one fell swoop it can get brushed away. It can start over, and I hope we can start over. It affected me and was profound.

I agree with Jon P. There are about 87 of us signed onto a letter that went to the Board this morning. We very carefully crafted it so that it wasn't personally attacking anyone and shared our concerns. I feel like it is not fair to judge those who do have a difference of opinion. We have the right to that opinion.

Justin, with all due respect, I think it is interesting you talked about the attacks on management but you didn't talk about the attacks on volunteers — defaming attacks on four hard-working volunteers for the Fair. I'm sorry that you can't even acknowledge that.

Donations / Secretary Report

Note, Friends of Buford Park & Mt. Pisgah was removed from the general consent calendar due to Jon Silvermoon being an employee, so was voted on separately.

The Board agreed to vote on the following donation requests:

\$1,500 Housing our Veterans/Mike: Our addresses are 2339 and 2343 Augusta in Eugene, and we welcome community support. We are asking for money for practical stuff. We need dressers, kitchenware and dishes, beds and bedding, and hygiene products. Donations are appreciated.

\$1,000 Wordcrafters in Eugene/Jorah: The donation proposal is to help with ACE YOUR APP! College Essay Mentor Day. This year we are excited to partner with the Downtown Eugene and Springfield Public Libraries. Our availability and access will expand exponentially, and we have focused on times when youth is available. For more information on volunteering as a mentor at this event, contact wits@wordcraftersineugene.org. We are so grateful for your support.

\$1,000 Siren: Board Director Ann said Siren is a women-based group with music and spoken word. Siren is hosting and presenting Our Bodies Our Voices Our Open Mic this season. It provides a safe space for female identified musicians, storytellers, comedians and poets to share their work with the community. Ann said she supports this as she spent two weeks with a women's group and were told, "What, got no men with you?" So, it is supporting women and it's amazing that this kind of stuff is still going on.

Donation requests of \$3,500 approved: 10-0.

Jon Silvermoon removed himself from the meeting for the following discussion:

\$2,000 Friends of Buford Park & Mt. Pisgah/Gretchen: We are a small organization around since 1989. We work on habitat restoration, trail building and have more than 500 volunteers involved. We have a native plants nursery and encourage people to come out and visit. With what is happening in the world, it is really nice to get out in nature.

Lynda: I go this place almost every day to walk my dog. The work they are doing is amazing. I've seen it over the past several years. They harvest seeds from local plants, grow them into plants and then to seed to continue reconstruction and restoration of native habitat. I hope the Board approves this.

Chewie: I had the opportunity a few years ago to work on the channel restoration at the park, up to my neck in ice cold water in December. The work put in and facilities we have at the park are worthy of any natural environmental organization, including our own, that has a mission to educate the public and allow people to see the woodlands of the Willamette Valley.

Justin: I appreciate what Chewie said. In my early 20s I lived out on Seavey Loop and it is the crown jewel for an opportunity to experience nature and get out and walk. It's amazing and I am honored to support this.

Justin moved and Chewie seconded approval of \$2,000 to Friends of Buford Park & Mt. Pisgah.

Motion passed: 9-0 (Jon S. was not present during the vote).

Old Business

Appoint Sanitation Coordinator was tabled until the Board meeting on December 3.

Sue moved and Jack seconded to approve September 10, 2018, meeting minutes.

Sam: My name is actually Samuel Rutledge. I have intentionally misspelled it on Facebook so that people cannot find me, but I am listed in the minutes as Sam Lutredge which is not my name.

Motion passed: 10-0.

Chewie moved and Jack seconded to approve the remainder of the Fiftieth Anniversary Budget Proposals.

Sallie: I am here on behalf of the 50th Task Force that includes Cynthia Wooten, Sandra Bauer, Jerry Joffe, norma sax, Laurel Goerger and Crystalyn. Please know several task force members are in the room if you have any questions. In addition, a couple people from the Fire Theater are here.

Hilary: A couple years ago the Budget Committee gave word to crews to please let us know their proposals. Things came in slowly, then the task force formed and helped get more proposals, and helped to get the crews excited. The Entertainment coordinators made some proposals, and the Budget and 50th committees, and staff worked with them to shape the proposals. The only ones we asked to be included was Main Stage because that is a big draw.

Many of the Entertainment coordinators had some really great ideas and the Budget Committee did not want to be picking and choosing individual projects but we wanted to create some kind of fair, tiered way to make it possible for each of the entertainment areas to do something special. Of the \$140,950 total recommendations, minus the \$16,000 approved last month, \$58,500 is for Entertainment.

E.K.: I'm from Main Stage and I'd like to thank the Board for thinking about this proposal. We will do our best to honor your gracious awards to us. We will get something really rockin'!

Crystalyn: I hope the Board moves forward with this. I have talked to other people who run large events or festivals and they all talk about anniversary years as an investment in your future. You want people to buy tickets for the 50th but also for the 51st. I really believe, not only investing in our quality entertainment, we have an amazing group of people on the task force who have been with the Fair for a long time. They are working hard to look to the future and also honor the past. I feel like this is a great package and that the Board approves it.

Jon S.: I am going to vote for the motion, and I still have some concerns about priorities. It is my intent after next year's Fair to increase the amount going to philanthropy, above and beyond what is in this budget. It is one of the areas I have concerns about. I hope

the \$5,000 we are allocating for the Jill Heiman Vision Fund is still given, even if we raise \$50,000 from other sources and reach our goal.

I have also been in discussions with Tom Noddy about the Midnight Show and trying to work out a supplemental addition to this proposal. There are additional items I am trying to work out and might be coming back to the Board for a small supplement in the future.

Motion passed: 10-0.

Justin withdrew the motion to approve all Nonprofit Association of Oregon (NAO) recommendations, in order to go into more specific details.

Jon S. moved and Paxton seconded that the OCF secure the services of an outside Human Resources Consultant.

Jon S.: The HR consultant will advise and assist as necessary in personnel matters including hiring of employees and to advise on employment law. This HR professional shall always be consulted when there are serious employment issues and when consideration is being given to terminating the employment of a regular employee.

Palmer: I wonder if this changes our relationship with Cardinal who does our payroll and are the HR people we have talked to in the past.

Hilary: Cardinal has been able to advise on things like our pension, ACA, reporting issues and Crystalyn can speak to her consultations with them. They certainly have been an HR resource. I'm not sure how much overlap, difference, or what is envisioned by an HR consultant we are seeking.

Crystalyn: Cardinal does have HR Department for hire, and I have consulted with them previously on personnel issues. I'm curious if you want to formalize that relationship or find somebody else and who is going to make that decision. I would like some clarity on that.

Spirit: I'm curious as to when we are going to secure them and a cost analysis. I think we could do really well with an HR person as soon as possible.

Jon P.: I only gave a thumbs up before, but I was presuming it meant you were going to cast a wide net in looking for that. I think some fresh perspectives in HR experience would help. I encourage you to do a full, broad search for the best possible option.

Jon S.: I would hope that we could have a consultant onboard by early next year. The financial aspects of that will be folded into the budget process. It doesn't preclude us from having more than one. I would anticipate continuing to use Cardinal for the payroll-related stuff we have been using them for. I'm looking at this as being a kind of a joint decision between Operations and the Board and a cooperative effort. It is open ended and I do agree to cast a net out there for the determination of what is going to best fit our needs. This probably won't be confirmed and in place until the new Board is in office.

Motion passed: 10-0.

Jon S. moved and Sue seconded that Bylaw Article VII, number 5 of the current OCF Bylaws last amended November 7, 2016, be changed to: "The Board shall appoint an employee or employees who shall be the lead professional(s) of the Oregon Country Fair and who will be responsible for all operations of the year-round organization. The Board will hire, evaluate, decide on salary increases and, if necessary, terminate the contract with such professional(s)."

Gwyneth: Does that mean that the lead professional is responsible for all the operations, and they would be the personnel provider of BUMS and coordinators or something else?

Aaron: I don't have any objections to this in particular, but I think it's missing something because we are changing from where the Board could appoint as needed to where they can only appoint a lead professional. So, I think we have a gap here and should have an additional sentence that says when the lead position is vacant or when the lead position is held during a probationary period then the Board shall appoint such employees and other personnel as may be necessary to oversee the operations of the year-round organization. It affects another motion tonight if we don't have more specific wording.

Jon P.: What happens when the lead professional makes some hiring or firing choices that do not seem appropriate to the Board, what remedies does the Board have if this motion is passed?

Stephanie: It is my impression this motion was made in consultation with the Bylaws Committee and lawyers.

Aaron: Diane mentioned the Bylaws Committee looked at this motion as it stands right now. My suggested changes would also have to go through the Bylaws Committee as well if we decide to put that information in.

Chewie: Respectfully, I am in favor of the bylaw change, but not in favor of a lead professional or anyone else having say over who becomes a coordinator and who doesn't. As I read this, it is rewriting our fundamental rules as they exist right now which is that the Board has oversight of hiring and firing coordinators. I am not in favor of that and will not vote for this. I appreciate the time and thoughtfulness that went into creating this.

Jon S.: I did get your email, Aaron, about your suggested change and the reason it is not here is because I want it to go by the Bylaws Committee. I don't have a problem, in principle, having that kind of language but I don't want to do without the Bylaws Committee first. There are a number of things the Bylaws Committee is going to need to look at. I also think the authority is implicit with the Board's authority to deal with a vacancy (of the lead professional position) of how they see fit under Oregon law.

Paxton: The Bylaws Committee did meet twice and with a nonprofit lawyer to go over this wording. It was changed because of that discussion. I assume if we move more of these things in the future that no hiring is done in a void and that there is always collaboration with others involved. It would be highly unlikely that an ED could just hire and fire people on their own.

Motion passed: 9-1; Chewie opposed.

Jon S. moved and Paxton seconded to:

1) approve the proposed Executive Director job description dated October 1, 2018, and establish a salary range of \$80,000 to \$105,000 for the position.

2) that an ad hoc committee of the Board called the Executive Director Search Committee be established with the following members:

- a. the President of the Oregon Country Fair,**
- b. four members of the Board of Directors,**
- c. one Back-Up Manager selected from those expressing in writing an interest**
- d. two non-Board crew coordinators selected from those expressing in writing an interest,**

e. and two other Oregon Country Fair members who preferably have nonprofit management Executive Director or senior management experience or an Officer of the Board selected from those expressing in writing an interest.

3) That the Board call for interested persons who meet the above qualifications to submit letters of interest listing their experience and qualifications to be on the Executive Director Search Committee to the Board by November 1, 2018. Such letters should be emailed to office@oregoncountryfair.org or sent via U.S. mail or delivered in person to the Oregon Country Fair office, 442 Lawrence Street, Eugene, OR 97401. Notice of these procedures are to be posted on the . net site and submitted to the Fair Family News.

4) That this ad hoc Executive Director Search Committee is charged with conducting an Executive Director search and recommending, in order of preference, up to three qualified candidates for hire to the Board of Directors in early 2019.

5) That the hiring, performance evaluation, and termination of paid staff be transferred to the Executive Director, effective within two months of the hire of such Executive Director. In the interim, if the Board chooses to proceed with a hire, the Board will form an ad hoc hire committee with no more than eight paid staff and members who have experience and knowledge in the area for which the staff member is being hired.

Gwyneth: I want to thank all of the people who have been working on the Bylaws Committee and all the other committees. There is so much heart, volunteer time and effort that have been put into all of this. It sounds like there is a job description in these current documents and I want to clarify again, who is the lead professional responsible for volunteer positions such as BUMs and coordinators, or somewhere else in the organization outside the operations of the lead professional?

Aaron: This was the section I referred to that could be affected by the bylaws. However, if Oregon state law allows the Board to do operational duties — even though it's not in our bylaws — that include hiring people then it may not be as critical. This section says that if the Board chooses to proceed with the hire, the question becomes do they have that right if we change the bylaw. It also says the Board adds an ad hoc committee that is knowledgeable in the area the staff member is being hired, but it doesn't actually say for that committee to make recommendations to the Board. You could interpret that as saying that ad hoc could do the hiring. I would add to that to make recommendations to the Board, and I would like confirmation that the Board has the right if they change the bylaws to hire and fire other staff members.

Michael: I think to do this by November 1 is really fast. I would think potential executive candidates might have plans during the holidays.

Crystalyn: It is for people interested in the hiring committee.

Jon P.: I'm glad Jon talked about it being wording that was created today. In fact, all of these motions were only available on the internet, as I understand, to the Fair family about 48 hours ago. These are complex motions. For many people, this is the first time they will see them. Many Fair family will not see them for some time in the future. This is an incredibly short notification period for Fair family for these kinds of major structural changes.

Crystalyn: I think this is really important. We desperately need an experienced Executive Director, and in order to recruit, that director needs to be empowered in this way as well as some of the other motions.

Jon S.: The job description I referred to dated October 1, 2018, doesn't mean it was developed that day. It is essentially the same job description that has been posted on the .net

site since the first NAO listening session in August. It's not something that just got created today. I'll read a couple sections of the job description:

Under Leadership and Management — "Uses a participatory management style to establish and enhance a collaborative organizational culture that is consistent with the organization's stated mission, vision and values without relinquishing final decision-making responsibility." Key words are participatory management style. It is incumbent on the Board when they hire the person to fill this position to ensure they are fulfilling their job duties in a way that involves and allows participation of stakeholders and people effected by this position, implementing decisions and what that decision is going to be.

Under the Oregon Country Fair Event — "Oversees and empowers the Operations Manager in the execution of their duties managing the Oregon Country Fair event." Those coordinators whose duties primarily deal with the event, currently that is something the old GM does and that will be included in the OM job description. The ED will oversee the OM and the execution of OM duties and needs to ensure the OM is exercising their duties in the same manner that is participatory, collaborative, and reflects the values of the organization.

Also, "Works with the Operations Manager to ensure stakeholder input into performance evaluations of BUMs and Coordinators and other members holding key operational roles." Again, they aren't doing it direct with the OM to ensure folks have a say in those processes. I encourage folks to look at the whole job description, and it doesn't mean we can't change it. It's a work in progress and in all the job descriptions I've done at various places I've worked, I have never had a situation where a new job description that gets created is the same a year later. You learn as the person fulfills that position and you tweak, amend it and address things that come up. This is not set in stone. This will be able to be changed as the person takes the position and we see how that person performs.

Ann: I agree with what Jon S. said. The Board has been working on this job description for two years. It got to a point where we got stuck and the NAO was able to help us move forward. As Jon S. said, this description is basically the same one earlier and we can modify these things. This has been a very long process. We modify and change our guidelines every year, and we can change this to as we see fit.

Chewie: I am in favor of having a lead professional. There is a semantical thing that a lot of people do not understand between an ED and a GM. My idea is to have a GM with executive powers. I am going to vote for this because we need to get on and have somebody leading this organization. I appreciate that both Jon S. and Ann addressed that this can be tweaked, needs to be and will be because most people aren't going to come into this job knowing the special tenures of this organization as compared to other nonprofits.

This is a unique nonprofit, and I sit on several boards for several nonprofits. I'm surprised that we have taken this long to come to this and I really appreciate the NAO and Mary's help on making this codified. I am going to vote for this with the understanding I would rather have a GM with executive director powers. Anybody who wants to talk to me about that, I'll be glad to do so.

George: In addition to what has been presented to the Board tonight, I also think there are additional checks and balances that fit in. You can look at the carefulness of the Hiring Committee that is going to be put together and deliberately involving people with significance interest in the Fair long term. It feels really well done and I support it. It is critical for this organization to move forward.

Paxton: I like the ED job description. I think it is time we have somebody who can deal with things 12 months a year instead of from May to August. That has been

problematic for decades. I like the way the job description is structured. I think it gives checks and balances. I hope we can find somebody to fulfil all of the requirements.

Jack: Over last two years, we have filled our staff positions and I think they are good choices. We are poised to put the last piece in place and I think it is important it gets done now. I want to be clear, the candidate has to be able to fulfill the role. The ad hoc committee with enough participation from everybody, thoughtfully getting together as we are now and discussing all these issues, keeping those lines of communication open — then we will have a good hire. Let's not lose what we have gained in this discussion, all this interaction and communication. All of it has been very helpful and made many things clear to me. Let's not lose that edge that's been created.

Chewie: Out of respect, I would like to give time for member input from Don and hear what he has to say.

Don: My question has to do about the process of the ED search committee. I like how it is laid out and question is, do we still have a Personnel Committee?

Diane: We have been working on this for a few years through all of the cries of "When are we going to hire a GM?" So, it does not feel rushed to me at all and I apologize if it feels rushed to anybody else.

Motion passed: 10-0.

Jon S. moved and Sue seconded to rename and repurpose the Personnel Committee:

1) That the Personnel Committee be renamed the Personnel Policies Committee and repurposed to develop and recommend policies to the Board that relate to paid personnel;

2) That the existing Personnel Committee work to separate the existing Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual and planned updates into a section containing policies and a section containing procedures;

3) That the existing Personnel Committee consider what changes to committee composition and procedures might be appropriate and to submit recommendations to the Board in January 2019.

Spirit: I am OK with the PC policy change, except I would recommend removing the word existing from #2 and #3.

Brad: As a member of PC, I couldn't support this motion more.

Palmer: Ditto what Brad said.

Jen Lin: Ditto.

Michael: I agree to remove the word existing. Other than that, I have no objections.

Aaron: Suggestion, the PC might want to work with the HR person on "what changes to committee composition and procedures might be appropriate."

Peaches: I also think it would be good to see something in this description about how PC will be working with our HR professional, and that the HR professional be an integral part of the composition of the committee.

Jen Lin: But of course, we would do that anyway without it being written. I don't know if the person would be present for every meeting, but certainly that is the point of having a council. Just as with lawyers, they may not be at every meeting, but we consult them as necessary.

Summerfield: I think the "of course" is addressing the fact that it doesn't feel like "of course" throughout this period of time being with the PC. I think it would have been

appropriate to have an HR person for a lot of things that has happened over the last year. The absence of that speaks volumes. I don't think it is understood and assumed, and I do think we need to say it. I think it's a really important piece of this and I support the work you are doing toward that.

Theanna: I would like to thank all of those who have gone into developing this motion in the last year. This is a community and a membership which has worked increasingly hard to make sure their voices are heard, to ensure clarification of process and representation is developing. Regardless of any changes that do or do not take place regarding Board personnel, NAO recommendations and hiring of an ED, this will go a long way in cementing that representation is present.

Jon S. and Sue agreed to a friendly amendment to take out the word "existing" from #2 and #3.

Jon S.: As to what folks are saying about making sure this committee works with the HR professional, that's implicit in talking about changes to the composition procedures of the committee. I also think, for those of you who are Board candidates and get elected, one of the major issues is the Board will need to look at all the committees and decide which is governance and which is operational. In that process, the PC would be looked at and will be task of the new Board.

Jack: The word "existing," it really doesn't matter if it is there or not. I'm saying that because we are talking about a Board committee. Personalities don't play into what this is about. This is about PC. The existing PC will be changed to a policies and procedures committee. As far as language goes we are talking about a committee, not the people on the committee. I want to make sure we put this into perspective. It's a big change, changing the PC to something else.

Paxton: I assume we want to keep a separation of new committee and HR firm. I see the new committee consulting HR when developing policy. I don't think the HR firm should be part of the committee, and separation is important to keep. Similarly, a separation between HR and management that allows people to go to HR when there is a concern and not have to report directly to management. I don't know how that is going to work out.

Jack: For all of this, if we are going to follow this through regarding wording of the committee, change it to: 2) That the new Personnel Policies Committee work to separate the existing Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual and planned updates into a section containing policies and a section containing procedures.

Jon S. and Sue agreed to a friendly amendment to change the name of the committee in #2 and #3 to reflect the new name.

Jon S. moved and Sue seconded to rename and repurpose the Personnel Committee:

1) That the Personnel Committee be renamed the Personnel Policies Committee and repurposed to develop and recommend policies to the Board that relate to paid personnel;

2) That the Personnel Policies Committee work to separate the existing Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual and planned updates into a section containing policies and a section containing procedures;

3) That the Personnel Policies Committee consider what changes to committee composition and procedures might be appropriate and to submit recommendations to the Board in January 2019.

Motion passed: 10-0.

Jon S. moved and Sue seconded a motion regarding Backup Managers:

1) The Board accepts the NAO recommendations concerning Backup Managers (BUMs) as a starting point for change and directs the Operations Manager to work with BUMS, coordinators and paid staff to refine and implement the recommendations.

2) Written BUM job description(s) shall be developed by the management team by December 31, 2018, in a process that incorporates the advice of the Board and other stakeholders. At such time as an Executive Director is hired, responsibility for ensuring that the job description(s) are kept current shall fall jointly to the Executive Director and Operations Manager.

3) Written procedures for BUM appointment, performance review, and removal shall be developed by the management team by January 31, 2019, in a process that incorporates the advice of the Board and other stakeholders. At such time as an Executive Director is hired, responsibility for ensuring that those procedures are kept current shall fall jointly to the Executive Director and Operations Manager.

Aaron: I want to comment that I have no problems with this, as long as it is noted that section one says this is "is a starting point for change."

Jon P.: My observation is there is a lot of things with wording such as starting point, work collaboratively, etcetera in all of these motions, but there are no mechanisms that tell anybody how those will occur or if they will occur.

Spirit: I think it's odd to have the BUM management team come up with their own performance review process. I hope you give the coordinators the same respect you do the management team by allowing the coordinators to also come up with written appointment performance review and removal.

Don: To clarify, having the BUMs write their own job descriptions is the best thing to do, but there is nothing about job descriptions for coordinators.

Michael: I echo Spirit's concerns may disagree a little bit with Don because it's my impression the BUMs are already part of the management team. I feel it's problematic to have them develop and review their own tasks and job descriptions. My only hope here, it's mentioned twice, is stakeholders will be considered. I don't know if that means input from the membership or coordinators, or not.

Crystaly: I do believe "stakeholders" includes coordinators and other people who work closely with the management team. This process granted the volunteer part of the management team to work on the first draft of a job description. It will be submitted to me and I don't know exactly how the process will look, but ideally, we'd having a meeting with management and membership and talk about it. The final approval would be up to the OM and ED, and I envision it will be the same review process as my position.

Peggy: In the industry, it is quite common for people to write their own job descriptions because they know their job best, and it is just a starting point. It goes through other iterations before it's accepted.

Dean: I am a little confused. It sounds to me like one BUM job description, but I thought there were a number of different responsibilities within the BUM process. I am wondering if that is going to be flushed out to a variety of different job descriptions.

Amy: Self-evaluations give you a way to learn a lot about someone and you can engage in dialogue when people are looking at themselves and holding themselves accountable. I am my own worst critic and hold myself to higher expectations that a lot of

other people do. So, I think self-evaluations are a really good tool when you are really trying to find out how people are doing.

Aaron: In Mary's final draft about BUMs in section 9, right before she discusses the job written descriptions for the BUMs, her statement is the coordinators work in collaboration to achieve future goals. The intention given this, I believe, is that they work together including on a written job description.

Crystalyn: From what I have seen with the management team, 99.9 percent of what we do is collaboration with people so I fully agree with what Aaron just said. In response to the specific job descriptions, the BUMs do have different skill sets that they bring to the team. I envision getting more specific down the road but with our current workload I see us trying to develop an overall one. Through time, over the next few months, we can get more details. I don't think I could get 10 job descriptions done by the end of the year.

Brad: How we work currently is collaboratively as a team. We are very open and honest with each other. We use people's strengths and give tasks to those well suited based on their skillsets. We do our best to communicate with each other to work things through. I see this process as more of a general list of tasks.

Spirit: When I mentioned the BUM appointment performance review and removal, I should have clarified and said performance review process because I agree with Amy about self-review. I just was thinking it would be more appropriate for the Board or OM to come up with the process for the performance review.

Paxton: I view this as codifying something that has grown organically. I have followed the BUM team process for many years and it really has grown as an organic process of its own. I have always viewed it as coordinating with Operations and seems to be a fully operational team. Who better to write the job descriptions than the people who are doing it. It's a great place to start. It will go through several reviews before it is adopted. I believe the BUMs fully want to help in this process. They are truly dedicated to the Fair and I think they realize the benefits of clarifying their roles. I really support this.

Ann: I want to echo what Paxton said. In writing your own job description, I've done it several times and understand how it works. The BUMs are intelligent, professional people and they can identify their key skills and abilities. We are about change. We were about change in 1969 and we are still about change and doing things differently.

Justin: I also support this. Maybe this will help dispel some misconceptions around the BUM team and add clarity to their role in this organization and how they relate to the various, different teams. I think, if they can define process, reporting relationships and their role in the organization, it is a great start.

In the past couple of years, the PC has started using self-evaluations with current staff. It's about getting evaluation of the current staff and it's all out there right now. We are getting responses. Especially with the coordinators and liaisons, it's a positive opportunity to have that self-reflection and, like Amy said, to match up where they think they are versus where you think they are. It provides an opportunity to look at it through their lens. It's invaluable feedback and insightful. The evaluations help drive the evaluation conversation and action items going forward. I am very supportive of this.

Jon S.: To establish legislative intent at this in the minutes as a record, I want to make it clear when I use the word "stakeholder," I am also saying that it would incorporate coordinators and Board members. And when I use the words "incorporates the advice," I'm looking at it as a collaborative effort. Just to be clear, that is my intent in this motion.

Chewie: I am very in favor of BUMs doing their own job description. I think it's imperative they do it because nobody else knows what they do. Knowing most of BUMs, I think they are very dedicated to the Fair and will be impartial in writing the general description of what it is they do for the Fair. I'm totally going to support this, which is surprising to me because I didn't have any intention of supporting this. There is not a single thing in here I can argue with. It's great and I'm looking forward to seeing the job descriptions. Thank you all for what you do.

Jack: To give some history because it is important, this whole discussion started in 1997 when the Board allowed a GM to select their BUMs. The important part is not so much the act but the date. Immediately in those minutes was a work session about what was necessary to move from an operations Board to a policy Board, and there have been numerous iterations. Early on for myself as a Board member that was a mantra of operations. I'm not going to use any other words than mantra. Mantra is a very positive word. It was a wise decision then and following through now x-amount of years later is a wise decision. It might take a little bit to actually live that. I think the first barrier we have is I don't think the Board wanted to not really give it up. So, it took this long to get to a point where historically we've already seen the merits of working on policy and not operations.

Motion passed: 10-0.

Jon S. moved and Paxton seconded to approve codification of coordinator appointments and dismissals:

1) The Board accepts the NAO consultant Mary Miller's recommendations under #10 of her Final Report dated September 2018 concerning coordinators as a starting point for change and directs Operations to work with coordinators to refine and implement the recommendations with the objective of forming the proposed Coordinator Resource Groups no later than January 31, 2019.

2) The Board transfers coordinator appointment approval and dismissal authority to the management team effective no later than March 31, 2019, or when an Executive Director is hired – whichever comes first.

Don: I realize I am a retired coordinator now, however it would be nice if it said something in here about job descriptions. In my personal opinion, I left my position without a replacement and my job has changed a lot where I was working. Why is a job description mentioned for BUMs but not coordinators? In all my years I only knew of one coordinator who got fired because there were policies not followed properly. This isn't very informing and I don't understand it.

Chewie: I'd like to move to table this motion.

Aaron: This one is a little more complicated than the others. On September 4, NAO Mary called a meeting with some people where we specifically discussed coordinators' situations. What Mary has come up with reflects some of that but there is a crucial piece missing. It doesn't give coordinators equal responsibility for a dismissal of another coordinator as it does to the BUMs and other management teams. It was discussed extensively and I think we should have it.

The coordinators represent the largest body at the Fair, the crews and volunteers – thousands of people. Those coordinators are highly skilled and experts in their field. They should have authority to govern themselves with a management team. We discussed coordinator groups chosen by their peers as part of this approval and dismissal process. I recommend we change #2 to: The Board transfers coordinator appointment approval and

dismissal authority to the management team and two coordinators (chosen by their coordinator group) two months after an ED is hired. I truly believe coordinators need to be respected for the authority they have, yield and the jobs they do.

Tom: I'm from Recycling and enthusiastically support transferring the coordinator appointment to management team. Recycling Crew is an operational crew. We work closely with management team all year round and do not work closely with a lot of other coordinators and they don't know what we do. Management does and I would feel much more confident working with management.

Also, Recycling Crew elects our own leaders and determines our own culture. We actually do have a process whereby coordinators can be replaced and they are constantly. We have a culture that supports what we do and I don't think that will be interfered with by a closer relationship with management.

Emma: You've said a lot about what I've been thinking to say. I have a personal relationship with other coordinators and some people of the Board, but professionally I work with the BUMs and management and they know what it takes to run the pre-Fair kitchen. I would not feel comfortable with representatives of other coordinators.

Hilary: I know the way different crews work over time can change. On the Budget Committee, we deal with a lot of crews. I want to give a big shout out to Recycling and the way they work democratically with representation and working cooperatively to figure out how to solve problems and move onto the next phase. Big kudos to them; it's a difficult job to do and most crews don't.

I hope the amount of interest we have right now aligns with authority and how our crews interact with management. I hope we continue to make a more transparent organization that can work through problems. I think the crew relationships within operations is essential.

Michael: It seems I am hearing commentary, and with the graphics it seems they are painting themselves into a corner. According to the job description of the graphic, coordinators are going to elect someone that represents them in different groups and then they are answerable to the BUMs, who are answerable to the OM and ED.

My concern is we probably should talk and discuss what and how to enable coordinators to work among themselves. I hate to remove them in another layer just like I feel the membership itself is being removed a layer back. Yes, the membership is still able to write to the Board or maybe call them, but they are now individuals instead of being able to go through their leader or coordinator direct up through the chain of command.

Brad: In my own approach, I work as collaboratively as possible with the coordinators I liaison with. I do not see it in any way a top-down-anything kind of situation. People are really trying to solve their problems and come to solutions. I would love to see coordinators have job descriptions. I deeply respect all of the coordinators who I work with, even the ones that drive me ape shit and there are not very many of those. I want to speak up for myself, that I don't see a big change here. I just see a de-politicizing thing of the accountability side of the equation.

As a former member who would have coordinator issues come up before me, and watching the process play out over the last couple years, it really sucks to have to make a very hard decision on a publicly elected Board and, quite frankly, have to bring in the calculus of your next election and what kind of votes you are going to get based on making the right decision for the organization. I think that all of these moves are a move in the direction of codifying policy versus operation separation that has been needed in this

organization since 1997. It was on the Board in 1998 and 2006, and as I said at the NAO meeting, I feel like the policy versus operation thing has been used historically in this organization as a political football that gets kicked around based on which group wants to deal with something and which group doesn't want to deal with it. I feel it is about time we grew out of that.

Crystalyn: I fully agree with getting coordinator job descriptions and really hope we get coordinator resource groups. We don't have it all figured out. I hope the coordinators and we could all get together and try to figure out where those resource groups go. I am hopeful those groups can help coordinators and the people within those groups to write job descriptions and maybe coordinators can write them themselves and then they get evaluated. We can figure that out. This whole process is going to be re-evaluated in a year or less. The Board can always change its mind.

I ask the question of the coordinators in the room and the Board: how frequently do we have operational conversations with coordinators? Myself, and the management team, have them a whole lot. I feel like in reality people feel like they are being removed, but it is a whole process of appealing and decision if I get super crazy to fire you all then I am pretty sure the Board would fire me. I am not kidding, and I am not that kind of person. Number one, I knew most of you when I was really needed as a coordinator. There are a lot of checks and balances in here that I see. I really think it is important, for some of the reasons Brad said, and this will create a system that will allow issues and problems to get dealt with significantly quicker. I really hope this passes.

Also, Charlie Ruff wrote a letter and was submitted to Kimmo for the minutes. I won't read it because it is long, but it absolutely begs the Board to make this change given his experiences working for the Fair. Another previous GM I've also talked to. This is a really important decision for the Fair and I hope it passes.

Summerfield: I want you to look around and see who you recognize in this room because there are fewer than 100 people here and they are the same faces you see in this room year-round that are attempting to represent our organization. It's family, people we love and respect who put their hard work into this place. The coordinators have more direct contact with the entire volunteer base in this organization. When volunteers have an issue, they don't come to the Board or to Shane or Crystalyn. What they do is go to their coordinator. They want to figure out this process. I think the process is in-line but what they struggle with is trust and that is something we have been dealing with this whole time.

Right now, what is happening is we are isolating the power structure. We have this Board that we can speak to that we elected. We have a voice in who sits up there. If we don't have that power, if you take operations away entirely from the Board — which some of it is a great decision, I think you have too much on your plates — but operationally I think for staff it is more of their job. But in this particular situation, we need an outside perspective. We need somebody, when there are those personality conflicts, and I think you people have been that piece for people to reach out to when they have an issue. They can reach out to you to get an objective opinion. Crystalyn said they would fire her if she made an egregious decision, and that is not going to be the Board's decision anymore. That's going to be the ED's decision and that is not somebody we elect. They are hired and exist outside of our scope.

I understand we are supposed to trust this process is going to be followed and that nobody is going to be removed. But I know a few people right now, if we didn't have the Board in charge of hiring and firing coordinators, who absolutely would have been critical

pieces lost from our organization. I respect this is where we are going and I don't think it's even really a discussion. I know it's going to go through, but I think that is something to think about. That is where our fear is coming from.

Crystalyn: I just misstated that there is an appeal process to the ED of any decisions. Then, I would assume an ED would fire me, and if they didn't I would assume the Board would fire them for not doing their job.

Wren: I was at the little meeting Aaron was referring to that Mary called to try and refine some of the proposals she made. We talked about coordinators there a whole lot. The reason we talked about them was because we saw the coordinators as the people that really represent the membership on their crews, and that individuals come to the coordinators. We wanted the coordinators to be more acknowledged as having expertise in their area and how that can be put into the structure and elevated — the voice of the membership and that expertise. The idea was to come up with some sort of coordinators group or coordinators council that would be advisory to operations and perhaps to the Board. We talked about how to help operations implement policy down to the Board, and this is a good start.

We know a coordinators council would be a big group and thought about if one crew really know what other crew does, so that is why we came up with resource groups so that people who work in the same areas can get together. I'm not sure if one big group or smaller groups is the best way to go, but that is what the thinking was. The idea is that these groups would be coordinator-led and come up with their own ideas to present to operations. Or if the Board has an idea to present, the coordinators would be consulted when things are being implemented. Personally, I was hoping the coordinators would have a codified voice in the process of how policy gets implemented. When we talk about those coordinator groups, I hope that is the goal of those groups.

Theanna: Listening to the different perspectives, I absolutely respect there are crews who believe the management team much better understands the scope of their responsibilities. I also would appreciate consideration regarding the addition of one or two crew representatives working with the management team on hiring and firing processes for coordinators. I've spoken with multiple coordinators in and beyond the context of these gatherings who desperately desire that representation within these discussions and increased collaboration and communication regarding these actions.

Jen Lin: I have many thoughts and as I see many of us, it is a really big elephant. We all know our part of the elephant that we see and we work with. But very few of us know the entire elephant. It's one of those pieces where the higher up you go, the broader the vision we must have and the understanding of how it all works. I know what I do, but not what every other crew does and I couldn't speak to that. We each know part of the elephant but need to work together to see the whole elephant.

I also trust the management team is looking out for the care and feeding of the whole elephant. There are processes and if we don't get it right the first time, we implement and make change and modify to continue to make it work better. I have seen it over the decades I have been involved.

What I expect and anticipate after all my years as part of the Fair is communication goes up and down, backwards and sideways, and is a constant flow of communication from the grassroots (membership) up of how we organize. Granted, we have come to the point where we need the management of a city. The information comes up, the information comes down. Whatever part you are in that loop, it's your responsibility to make the information

flow in whatever direction. If you are a coordinator, it's your job to flow information to your membership and to management.

I hope in the coordinator council or whatever it will be called, will be folks from operational committees. They too are just as much a part of this and have as much stake in it.

Spirit: What seems pretty clear to me tonight, it seems there is a lot of work still to be done in this section. There are things in here I don't fully agree with. There are things I might agree with but I think it is a lot of information in a short amount of time that has not had time to be vetted. Aaron, I appreciate the time you have given the past 24 hours to read these and you will be getting my vote. I have not had the time to go through these as thoroughly in the quick time frame, especially with the motions.

I'd like to speak on the coordinators resource group. I would prefer it to be one group with a wide range of representation. The group can reach out to specific crews as needed. I would like the group to be able to work together with management. Coordinators can come up with their own job descriptions better than anybody else. We can work collaboratively to come up with our roles and responsibilities. Scope of authority is not mentioned anywhere here. I have requested to define that more than a couple times. I would like to work with the management team to establish together an appoint-and-dismiss process. I think we do need process. Hilary is right, not all crews function as well in an appointment process like Recycling does.

If this were to be tabled tonight, it's not going to be something imperative to hiring our GM. Even a work session calling all coordinators together and not a closed meeting. There was not one operations coordinator during the Fair that deals with emergency response at that meeting. I would like to have more input than what this allows. I have concerns with removal and suspension, the process and checks and balances. I think these things need work. Even if we took one month, it would be something to communicate more about it and fine tune some of this. I don't believe in pushing something through and then having to go back and fix it later. It's not all horrible, it just needs work.

I would like a little bit more collaboration and work on this. I would appreciate if you would table this and not push this through tonight. The checks and balances aren't quite here like everybody thinks they are. I've been on the other end of things as I've witnessed with some people. I am very fortunate to have a great relationship with my BUM team, and I know that is not the same for everybody. So, let's just take our time on this one and work on it.

Palmer: I am not even sure where to begin, to tell you the truth. Summerfield you are right — it is quite often the same people in the room who we have known, worked with, sweat and cried with for decades. What is happening is really heartwrenching to a whole lot of people. It's an open meeting and more people can come if they are willing and able. It is online. There are some new faces here more recently than in the past. It's because there is an interest, so there is an attendance.

Back before many of you were born, I was on one of the first teams accountable to the GM. I was Computer coordinator back when Rebecca was Booth Reg coordinator. I was accountable to the GM. I was Media coordinator back in those days as well and was accountable to the GM. I think coordinators should be accountable to operations. Regarding coordinators not having job descriptions, back in Leslie's day there were attempts at getting operations manuals put together. Part of that was asking coordinators to write a job

description of what and how you do what you do. I have no idea what the response rate was.

There are some that see this as another step between the members and the organization, and I just don't see it that way. We elect the Board and they hold the paid staff accountable. I think the BUMs working with the OM is a fine thing. Having a broader set of shoulders is a lot more access for more people to be heard and understood. Out of this, I hope the Fair family comes to respect paid employees and Board members, and never again calls at 3 am or 6 am or texts at night or whenever it strikes their fancy. We have people who are volunteer or making their living and deserve respect. We are all part of the family. Let's respect each other. We can disagree come hell or high water, but hopefully to a good place and I support the motion.

Dean: This may be unpopular, but I too support the motion as a "starting point for change." I have been a coordinator and one of the things I have seen is inconsistency amongst the coordinators in their skillsets, how they coordinate and do their jobs. We've got some damn good coordinators, we really do. They know what they are doing, but there are some that are not as good.

I've seen coordinators appointed because they are popular, not because they are the best qualified. I see nepotism happening within the crews. It is not making us an inclusive organization. We need and have to work on that. We are excluding communities out there because we are not inclusive. It is really important and I don't think included in the description.

I want to see the work we do be more transparent. I hope this will be a starting point for that. I heard about a crew who voted against being more transparent. It was a discussion on their crew when appointing new coordinators. They didn't want to be transparent because they thought it would take away the magic of what they do.

Stephanie: I have worked closely with a lot of coordinators in this room. They are amazing at what they do, jumping over very high bars and exceeding at what they do in the name of getting it done at the Fair. They really do a lot of the heavy lifting out there and I admire them. That is not what this is about. It's about who is accountable to staff when things happen.

We have to have the tools available to get the work done and have the Fair be safe and successful, and have operations go smoothly. If something is happening with a coordinator that is not making that possible, there needs to be a way to step in because when something goes wrong, it is us here at the table being held accountable, not a volunteer in the field. Coordinators are amazing and awesome, but there needs to be a little give and take on that.

This is not about losing your voice, silencing people, or making it so you have less influence on the process. That is not what our Fair is about. The most powerful people in this organization are the people who show up to committee and Board meetings and write letters. There are many ways to have your voice heard, and they are heard. I don't know any Board member, Staff or BUM who wouldn't take a phone call or email and not get back to you. You are not going to be agreed with 100 percent of the time. You will be heard and that is sometimes when we get our best feedback and where ideas come from. I think we should have faith the hiring committee will hire an ED with those values and that your voices are not going to get shut down. That is not who we are. Call me up if you have anything to say and I will talk to you.

Jon P.: I'm kind of old fashioned, like the old saw — “good fences make good neighbors.” That is also why I like good structure making good process, which makes good productivity and behavior. It's great to say we are going to be responsive and that is largely the case right now. I think the current staff is very responsive. I think the Board, by and large, is responsive. But I think the reason for that, at this very moment, is the members could appeal to their elected representatives to address their concerns. That makes the whole body of the organization more responsive, because the people the members elected have the ability to do something about their concerns.

I believe all motions put together, especially this one more than any other, removes the direct link of members' ability to impact the outcomes of operations. I doubt that anybody who is on staff or the Board right now is going to be less responsive next month or two months from now. But when you are making these structures, they need to stand the test of time. I don't think we should be going back and changing things over and over again unless they are not working very obviously. I like structures that make people accountable, especially accountable to the membership.

Brad complained Board members have to worry about their next election. That is what makes democracy work. If the members don't know you are addressing their concerns, then they don't want to elect you. That is how democracy works. At the heart of it, of what is being lost here, is the members' ability to impact what happens. The only way they have to do that is by voting for the Board. The Board they are voting for can't do anything for their concerns about operations, which is the concern most of the time. Then they have no real voice. It's great to draw them like clouds on this chart but there is no mechanism to actually make that happen once you remove the Board from these decisions. In this case you are taking the last link to the Board directly to Operations. I've heard a lot that members go to their coordinators, but maybe members want a more direct role in governance of the organization. That is what is being lost here tonight.

Christine: I don't have the text in front of me to say if I support it 100 percent or not. I want to say, I am hearing from a lot of people that crew leaders are feeling vulnerable to a structure of management that might be too small at the top and not reflecting enough from the volunteers' point of view. People become crew leaders not because they are popular, but because they are effective and listening to the members and the needs of what all these people are doing together. There is an element of charisma, which isn't necessarily reflected in analytical ways, and they are getting the job done. Tonight, we have made so much progress, people coming to an understanding of agreement and support for this in general. For all of this whole package to be understood and approved by the membership, maybe some of these ideas should be taken more slowly instead of accepted as all or nothing.

Spirit: To clarify, I said in a closed meeting there were two emergency response crews represented — White Bird and Fire — and I want to point out they respond and operate differently than other response crews during the Fair.

Sam: To reflect, I believe there is never controversy between people of good will if both sides don't have a point. There are reasonable points on both sides of this. A large part of what I hear we are struggling with on one hand is we want to defer to experience and let someone do their job and not get in the way. On the other hand, we also want to defer to a larger perspective where they may understand why something needs to happen that is not understood by some. We want to be able to do both things. I call on the Board to make a decision with that in mind, to think about the wisdom it takes to make a decision from

experience or perspective. I'm not sure what this means for this motion or proposal but I think it is an important reflection.

Shelly: Trust is broken here. We don't trust you. I don't trust you. There is a bizarre focus on who is in charge of who. It's very authoritarian. It's not democratic. This change is premature and inappropriate as long as we don't have an anti-bullying, anti-harassment and anti-retaliation policy in place. Not just in place but followed, adhered to and carried out. After the way management behaved and demonstrated their lack of judgement with how the Reese situation was dealt with last year, they are not qualified to make these calls.

We have BUMs who are currently and actively bullying volunteer members of this organization. We have spouses of BUMs who are currently and actively attacking and retaliating against volunteers. It is laughable to hear accountability being mentioned when there has been a gross lack of it here. If we were playing a drinking game, like some management did at the Candidates Forum, we'd all be drunk right now after hearing the term "chain of command" every 10 minutes. Is this the fuckin' Army?

Joe: We tend to not think that maybe we are actually in an organically grown system. We were organically grown out of the ground in the way that we have put ourselves together. We are not Disneyland. We grow from the bottom up but need organization when we get large enough. In a lot of ways, this is what we are going through. Always we have to remember we have grown from the ground up and have been able to solve problems. We are organically grown and have a built-in system of roots that are tangled up and we are now trying to straighten out.

Gwenyth: The Bylaws Committee and Mary have done a lot of work on this. I am hearing a lot of concerns about this particular motion, but we haven't heard a lot of alternative suggestions and I'm sure that is because I don't have all of the pieces. Ignorantly, I thought the structure of the Fair was equal parts of BUMs, Board and coordinators. Am I misunderstanding this? Are we changing this from three equal parts of the government to this hierarchal structure?

Chewie: I've been very adamant how I have a problem with the way this is set up. This is an interesting start. I tried to table it before. I don't understand why we need to push this part through right now. I heard Tom say that Recycling does things differently. I am one of the last living original VegManECs and am still part of the crew. We have voted since the day that crew started to every year elect our coordinators.

Every year it is not a popularity contest. I've been part of it for years and it took me 15 years to become a coordinator. I was trained in the job by the people who started it. The Camping Crew is what it is today based on what came before it. It's not something that was created out of the mysticism of the Fair. It was created because it was true, needed to happen and be formalized. I am pretty sure a lot of people don't know what the VegManECs crew does. I am fairly certain a lot of people don't know what the Camping Crew does. Having made a career from writing a thesis on the OCF ecosystem, I also understand the land is part of us and we are part of the land.

I really hope that we can take a breath, look at this and think about it — the structure of what our coordinators need to be. I personally love everybody in this room. Whether they believe or not it is true. I don't believe that anybody here has done anything malicious. I believe some people have made some errors in judgement, myself included. That doesn't mean that we shouldn't all remember that we are all part of one family and be kind to each other. Remember your brother, your sister, your mother and your father because they are

part of us. We are us and I can't vote for this as it stands because I think it needs to be tweaked. I think this a great place to start. I ask again to table this motion.

Paxton: I'd love to see coordinator job descriptions. Leslie tried twice in her 17 years of administration but I think crews resisted and I am not exactly sure why. We also had an advisory vote several years ago that identified both membership and coordinators wanted to be under the GM. That was really pushed by coordinators originally. I don't understand what has changed in that, to be honest. I think there are a lot of checks and balances in the description of the NAO report and collaboration is required in almost all of the steps. I appreciate that and think it will help. I support this motion.

Justin: I'm happy this got expanded and I thank all the people for their work at that meeting. As a coordinator of Booth Registration, I don't know how I feel about sub-groups but am willing to go along with that to see where that goes. I am in agreement with Spirit but I originally viewed this as a functional group that could take up the issues that affect coordinators, and in dealing with a disgruntled crew member, they would be part of the process. My original vision was to think about how coordinators operate as a whole and function and building consistencies in how we do things.

I'm really proud of Booth Registration. When I came on 12 years ago, I built job descriptions for all the roles within our team and I have those. The crews that do have democratic process can share what they do with other crews, and we can adopt some standards. I've often talked about the ability to have apprentices in two-year roles. I built my job description because I had cancer, and I thought about how nobody knew what I did. It then becomes real about consistency and how we understand what we do as coordinators. The majority of us work our ass off, and I think the majority of us would like to hear how others are successful.

The vision I have for the coordinator council is a collaborative group that can take together the best of us and spread it across our family. The ability to have this conversation over the last couple of years and come to fruition is a damn good start. It's not perfect. We can start building us in a way that functions better and address the big issue of the collection of data from coordinators to management. There seems to be a sense of holding on to that stuff as it is yours, and it is us. When a coordinator left and dropped the ball, it took me two years to get to the point where I understood. From that standpoint, I wish I didn't have to do that. I wish if I came into or had to leave a position that the next person on that crew had a map. Not only a map of how the crew functions, but also organizationally. When you have goals as a group, then you can start focusing on each individual, each job and breaking it down. Put it out from the coordinator council to each coordinator as a task. I think we are better when we work together. This can be an opportunity to take the best from our crews, spread the word and create a better us. This may not be perfect but I know a lot of coordinators who want a voice and this starts to create that. It's a damn good start and I support it.

Ann: I am not and have never been a coordinator. I am a crew member because I enjoy more my interactions with other crew members. We voted out a coordinator one time, and they stick around. I see this as a process. I hear people saying coordinators are being micromanaged and I really don't see that at all.

I see the need for coordinator descriptions because that is where we are going to understand the variability that exists across the board and all the coordinators. We have 56 crews and there are more coordinators than that. This is a large body so I think job descriptions are important. I think we have a building block and it's important. We can

change it when we run into difficulties just like we change the Guidelines. The coordinators would be lost without their crews and that's the bottom up. My enjoyment has been working with all of the crews.

Sue: I think this is a huge improvement. I thank the coordinator resource group for whatever timeline they develop for themselves that will allow them to share the information about what works and doesn't work on their crews. They can learn from each other, make this structure stronger, more sound and more fluid. I think this will increase their voice. I look at this as an overall positive. I fully support it.

Diane: Over the last several days I have heard a lot of eloquent arguments on both sides this proposal. I can think of one crew or family who has found new and creative ways to bash those with whom we disagree. That has made it really sad. I've gotten emails back from people I respect and have known for years on both sides.

The ironic thing, as Paxton pointed out, is this shift. The coordinator appointment stuff was voted on by a huge majority back in 2015 and the very same people who put forward that referendum and signed it are the very same people who are now resisting it. So, I am really confused about that.

I would hope that members still come to Board meetings, and not just coordinators and crews but vendors and entertainment too because policy is very important, not just operations. I hope members will continue to come to meetings that include the Board.

George: It is critically important that we pass this motion tonight, and the transfer of the coordinator appointment approval and dismissal authority to the management team happen within two months of the ED hire. I think it's important to attract a director who really understands the landscape, their authority and capacity. I think we are going to attract the kind of people we need to make this thing go forward.

It's been stated a couple of times tonight, special interest groups seem to be banding together in defense of the current structure that is nearly, in everyone's opinion, failing one way or another. The goal seems to delay the change. But nearly everyone also agrees it needs to happen. Even the majority of coordinators polled in 2015 supported the transition of the coordinator roles to management.

The voices of the volunteer membership, its needs and desires dominate the discussions but what do other members of the Fair want, such as vendors and entertainers? I believe they want a transparent framework and structure in good alliance with authority and accountability. This results of this staging are being safe, healthy, being profitable and a drama-free Fair. They want the work needed to accomplish this goal facilitated by staff and crews working in concert.

To the vendors, entertainers, paying public — it matters not at all who is telling who what to do to make this Fair a success. What they want is everyone's contribution recognized and valued. They want managers and volunteers treated with respect, so you'll want to keep coming back to do it again. It's not really that hard. Let's double down on our passion for this thing and recognize the need for restructure in the ways we do business for the good of the cause.

Jon S.: I agree with many of the reasons why this should go forward, as other Board members have said. I have appreciated meeting a lot of new people when the Board has appointed new coordinators because a lot of them I had no idea who they were. But that is not a reason for us to retain that.

I am a coordinator. If I am in a coordinator resource group and a recommendation comes from a crew to appoint someone as a coordinator, I am going to want to know what

the criteria is that I need to use to evaluate this person's fitness for the position. What do you actually do as the coordinator and what are the skills you have? These are questions I have never seen asked in coordinator appointments when they come to the Board. They don't get asked here. In effect, they have gotten asked by management somewhere along the way. Most of the coordinator appointments the Board has made have been because management said they are a good person and get appointed. Again, I have enjoyed meeting new people, but I think we have more important things to do than be a rubber stamp for things in the coordinator appointment process.

To respond to what Aaron was proposing, in the removal of a coordinator, the appeals process of the ED in Mary's recommendation explicitly says there will be two coordinators involved in evaluating that. Her proposal also says recommendation of the coordinator comes to the coordinator's resource group first. If the coordinator resource group says this person is not qualified, then I don't see that as getting kicked up and I would see that as not going to the management team. I see that going back to the crew and figuring out, is there somebody better. Because that coordinator appointment has to pass through the coordinator resource group first, then that is where the coordinators have a say in it. I don't see a need to have the management team act on a recommendation for non-approval.

This is going to be a work in progress. Me as a coordinator, I can envision being on more than one resource group depending on what the crew or topic is. If it is something dealing the lots, Traffic or Lot Crew, then I would be there because that is where my crew works. If it is something dealing with 4A, my crew also deals with service animals. So, I can see a lot of overlap among the groups. I don't see a coordinator council and the resource groups as being mutually exclusive possibilities. I think we need to move forward. Anybody applying for the ED position is going to want to know if the ultimate authority lies with them. If their job tenure depends on the success of the organization and what we are doing to have some of the help and authority not be with them, we'll lose some candidates, and some people will not want to apply.

Yes, if the ED doesn't work right, the Board needs to bite the bullet and fire somebody. I still see members as coming to the Board with issues, but the resolution of the position is not necessarily going to lie with the Board. I would see us passing those on making management aware that the issues exist. In our supervisory role of the ED, we make sure it gets dealt with but not dictating how they get dealt with because that is an operational decision. I think we need to move forward.

Kenya: As I hear what people are saying, I want to say the only constant is change. One thing in that change is growth and I know that it is uncomfortable for a lot of people. Who likes change? To be stagnant is really not growth. Change is necessary and change is evolution. If there is no evolution there is death. This needs to live and be constantly moving. I think it is really great to establish best practices, really creating processes so that the next person can know what to do if something happens to you. Let's do this and set up a system so it will allow somebody else to do it and thrive at what you do so well. I am going to vote for this because I know that you can change it if you need to.

Jack: The most telling thing to come to me tonight is I've never really looked at coordinators, at least in their role, coming from this position of fear. It's not the way I look at coordinators. The majority of Board members have been coordinators or on operations just like many others have different roles in some shape or another. That is who we are. That is who we have been and I'm not exactly sure that part will change.

Things like “fear” and “losing our heart,” I don’t see any of that. You use your heart but you don’t usually give it up. The amount of intensity and the amount of passion over something that has been moving in this direction for a long, long time is encouraging to me. It’s very encouraging and something that I can grab on to and say: I can yield, and I can think and I can make a vision for the future. To be able to have a vision, you have to be able to see. That is why you yield and the only reason that you yield. You can’t yield unless you are extremely confident of what is underneath of what it is. When I meant underneath, I meant in organic and grassroots up. We are strong enough to yield and that is what we are doing.

Operations is something that is going to be giving us good policy, and channelling good policy to the Board and taking that out rather than at a next Fair. We can only do that from strength. We can’t do it any other way. So, if we are looking at this as some kind of turning point we are not going to be a merit anymore, I am not buying into that. This is strong.

You have leadership that is somewhat yielding out. I can’t see it any other way. I’ve been looking out there and more and more responsibility is coming out. I can’t look at this from a perspective of fear. I understand we have some trust to rebuild, but that usually happens. Please don’t give up your heart. There ain’t no reason.

Motion passed: 9-1; Chewie opposed.

Justin re-proposed the motion to accept the Nonprofit Association of Oregon (NAO) recommendations.

Justin moved and Paxton seconded to accept the final proposal of the NAO recommendations.

Motion passed: 9-0-1; Chewie abstained.

Stephanie: I have passed out an Office Task Force report I hope will be discussed at the Board Retreat. The report addresses our office needs.

Palmer: I want to make sure people realize this task force report is a synopsis, a survey of what some people have said and a very preliminary document.

Treasurers’ Report and Budget Items

Justin moved and Diane seconded to approve a budget adjustment of \$1,200 per month salary increase for Crystalyn as the acting GM since March 2018, continuing until an ED or lead professional is hired.

Hilary: We had done cash projections based on having another professional, so this is staying within that original budget for payroll.

Jon S.: A clarification, is the intent of the motion of salary and authorization to fulfill GM duties going to continue until an ED is hired?

Justin: Yes.

Motion passed: 10-0.

Jon S. moved and Paxton seconded to have the OCF group tasked to work with the NAO consultant be authorized to enter into negotiations to amend the contract.

Jon S.: Our NAO consultant has gone over budget. The contract would be amended by parameters discussed earlier by the Board in an executive session. The upper limit of what we are looking at is \$15,000 or so but that doesn't mean that is what we negotiate.

Palmer: If any of you have been thinking about trying to wrap your head around who we are and what we do the month and half including the Fair, I think you'd get a really big headache. I am also going to tell you and willing to bet that Mary can join the ranks of the OCF volunteer staff because I bet she did not bill for every hour she put in.

Crystalyn: The time Mary put in is drastically more than we anticipated. We did initially encourage her to increase her hours. She did not increase them enough. I hope it passes.

Hilary: I feel like it is really important for the committee to work with Mary on the budget, making sure her schedule conforms to the budget and keeping them informed as it accrues, letting them know where her total hours are and have better communication.

Motion passed: 10-0.

Hilary: My report will be abbreviated and I'm giving homework to the Board. We had a Financial Planning meeting and this is the packet. A lot of this stuff I will share with the membership at the Annual Meeting. There is a draft of the review of the 2017 Financial Statement and we should have the final by the meeting.

We had a killer year last year. Financially it was the best year ever. A lot of that was we had been planning for more on payroll for two or three years and we really geared up for Xavanadu and had little for capital projects. We transferred the remaining balance of our endowment over to Oregon Community Foundation and earned \$50,000 in one year. The profit that we had on the rest of operations was \$350,000 which was a bigger year than we have ever had.

Remember last year when we were doing all of those designations, part of it was because we had so much cash and we knew expenses would go up as we hired people. We put designations on \$575,000 to tie things down and then the wine property came for sale. You can see on that schedule we took \$250,000 out of that designation to purchase that property. At August 31, we had about two million dollars in the bank and about half of it was designated and the other half was for operations to get us through this year and into next. I have a lot of spreadsheets and with contingencies: extra payroll, and what if something goes wrong, or if we get more people coming in and I will share this information at the Annual Meeting or next month's Board meeting.

Some of the financial planning we are looking at addresses longer term needs, our cash flow and how we are going to make it, or what if it doesn't go exactly as planned. So far, we have generally been lucky. We estimate conservatively with our financial results and this year feels a little bit tighter partly because we have all of these reserved, designated funds. But we are in an awesome place financially. We are really lucky we can afford to be hiring this ED and we are really ready for it and have a lot of projects cued up.

Lynda: The revenue projections were also discussed at the Financial Planning meeting. Since this was discussed and approved last year (two-year budget cycle), you will get revised information in your Board packet by the November meeting since that is when we traditionally vote.

Sue: Lynda, bless you. Thank you so much.

President's Peace

Jack: We have an election and let's not lose sight of that. Change, risk of change ... the reality is change is here. We have three open spots on the Board. Change is here and that is the most important thing. In a two-year time span, we can have more change on the Board than has ever happened before. We need to embrace that and be thankful we are at that position right now.

When thinking about the future, if you have any thought about the next 50 years, we are looking at the biggest change on the Board since the last recall. It is big, it is beautiful and we shouldn't be afraid of it. I think it's a wonderful thing, so vote. A lot of absentee ballots went out this year. Heidi (Election Secretary) said we got 63 percent back last year where we had 1,200 and this year we are up to 1,600. We ran out of ballots and Heidi is putting more out there. Let's make sure they get returned. It's really, really important.

Everything leading up to this meeting tells me how important this election is. The strength that was shown and the amount of passion, and the amount of love that was poured in tells me the outcome is going to be beautiful. That is what we do this for. We do this so that we can choose the person who sits up here and look out forward. That is what at stake in this election. We've got a lot of people running, so thank you very much.

Draft Agenda for November 5, 2018, Board Meeting, 7pm at NW Youth Corps, Columbia Room

Approve October 1, 2018, meeting minutes

Ratify election results and appointments of officers (Jon S.)

Appointment of Executive Director Search Committee (Jon S.)

Letter to the Board dated October 1, 2018, was asked to be included in the minutes:

Greetings to You All,

I am writing because I feel we are at a tender and critical moment in the life of our organization and event and I thought it important to share some of my thoughts with you as you grapple with some difficult decisions for our future.

Let me start by saying, I was very encouraged by your decision to work with NAO on how to effectively pursue and engage a new lead management position. In my estimation, addressing the staffing situation that has been left dangling since the departure of the last general manager, is the number one concern the organization must resolve. That is not in any way a criticism of the current staff, who have all stepped up admirably in the void, rather an acknowledgement of the extreme demands the situation puts on a staff that is stretched thin, even when all positions are filled. I can also tell you from direct experience that "acting in capacity of" rather than being installed as the GM is a recipe for both individual and organizational misery at the OCF. It is apparent to me the last two plus years of just such a situation has contributed greatly to the current difficulties facing us.

For the most part, I agree with the recommendations from Mary Miller of NAO. I also mostly agree with the BoD motions you will be dealing with this evening, as I understand them at the time of writing this. While there are some things that I would change, I see enough compromise and organizational progress to support them as they currently read and emphatically urge you to move ahead and adopt them without delay. It is my hope that by enacting these changes, it gives enough of the oversight tools along with space for other elements to evolve, that the kind of candidate we need for the ED job will

apply for the position. That will also largely be determined through the hiring process itself, therefore I encourage you to engage experienced professional help to support that part of the process as well.

I have read and heard several deeply fear-based criticisms of these proposals and of organizational change in general, and I would urge you not to respond to or act from a fear perspective. This organization needs to mature structurally to keep pace with our physical growth and the cultural changes we are facing. No good thing goes on in continuity without change and evolution. The idea that systems and roles, that were adequate 40 years ago when the OCF was a mere fraction of the size and complexity that it has become, can still be effectively serving us today, strains credulity. The idea that the Board loses ultimate authority over everything and/or anything because it places the implementation of operations in the hands of staff, could also be considered incorrect. Likewise, the idea that membership loses its meaningful role in addressing operational concerns because of these proposed changes, could easily be considered a false notion. The idea that the volunteers, who we all agree are the lifeblood of this organization, will be any less empowered to make decisions, act creatively or generate ground-up solutions because of these changes, does not make sense.

What will change with the enormous level of autonomy that Fair crews have in deciding how to accomplish their duties or manage their budgets because of this? The only real change will be in how the staff, who are tasked with and held responsible for safely executing the event, will have a role in determining who will coordinate those operational crews and how they are evaluated. The coordinators of the Fair carry so much of our workload and should rightly be lauded for how much they give to the Fair and their crews. They are however operational crews and it is not diminishing them in any way to shift their appointment, evaluation and removal process to the BoD-hired operations staff who will be held responsible for how those crews execute their duties. Currently, within the purview of their crew, coordinators have nearly absolute power and control. They decide who can be on the crew and who cannot. They can base this decision on whatever factors they like including because they just do not like an individual or potentially some more questionable basis. There is literally no mechanism in our organization for evaluating the performance of coordinators in whom so much is entrusted. Does it make sense that you the BoD would be responsible for those evaluations and if so ask yourselves why? How would you do them and what would you base them on?

This is all to say that accountability and autonomy can coexist. If it works at the crew level, then it should work at the staff level as well. Just as we appoint coordinators and give them operational oversight in their domain, why wouldn't we do the same with staff? Trust your ED to hire staff and trust your staff to do their jobs, including operational coordinator oversight, just as we trust coordinators to staff their crews. If a coordinator is not performing adequately, then the staff must work with the ED to resolve the situation. If the staff is not performing adequately, then the ED must resolve the situation or replace them. If the ED is not performing adequately, then you the BoD must replace them. This requires a system that is built on trust but ensures accountability at each level. In any of these cases, you the BoD can always review a situation that seems amiss or as you deem appropriate to help maintain that trust, but you are simply not set up to manage them all. Until, we have a manageable system, based on autonomy with accountability, then trust will be hard to develop and maintain. We will also have a very hard time finding and engaging an ED who will want this job and who can also be successful.

I know that all of you love the Fair and that you also know just how hard it is to be in a leadership position. I will close by encouraging you to choose, not based on fears and old ways of thinking, but rather to look to the future and support systems that develop trust based on evaluation and accountability. The Fair offers a sense of freedom that is not always there in our larger society but within that freedom there is a responsibility to the greater good of our OCF community. The autonomy we so deeply appreciate about the Fair will only continue to exist if we are accountable to each other and put the needs of the whole first. We are at a crossroads for the OCF and hiring the next right person is only half the equation. If we do not give them the tools, structure and support to be successful and to develop that trust, then we will be back here again. Finding and engaging the right person for the ED job will be more challenging now than ever, even as it has become more critical of the organization and time if of the essence.

Sincerely,

Charlie Ruff

Former General Manager