

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS WORK SESSION  
COMMUNITY CENTER  
MARCH 18, 2013**

Attended by Pivot Architecture, Community Center Committee and other Fair Family

## **INTRODUCTIONS**

Members of the Community Center Committee gave an overview of the history of the project, the zoning issues we face, the problems this facility will solve, environmental issues addressed and the opportunities the Center will create.

### **PROJECT OVERVIEW (Thom Lanfear)**

Our existing kitchen at Main Camp is in the flood plain and is inadequate to safely, healthfully and environmentally soundly feed and serve the number of people who eat there now. A lodge/upland kitchen/community center concept has been discussed since at least 1996 when it was put on a wish list at a Board retreat. The current Community Center Committee was formed about two years ago and charged by the Board to explore the abstract concept laid out in the Vision Quest

Our present zoning would not allow us to build a kitchen only, but a community center could get approval from the County.

At present we have problems with capacity, grey water disposal, health and safety compliance and storage as well as environmental and weather related issues. A new, permanent structure will be designed to address our growth issues, will let us expand our year-round use of the land, will let us preserve and showcase our legacy and will be a hearth for our community.

The purpose of this meeting is to present the report of Phase I of the Community Center project prepared by Pivot Architecture.

<http://oregoncountryfair.net/communitycenter/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/OCF-report-to-board-3-14-13.pdf>

The Board authorized this step so that we can fully understand the size, location and nature of the community center.

The Board formed a committee in April 2009 to explore building an upland kitchen and by October 2010 we had a work session to review the results of a survey of the Fair family. We synthesized all the comments, concerns and hopes people had and presented them to the Board. The Board passed a motion authorizing us to go forward and pursue the study of what it would take to take this abstract idea expressed in the Vision Quest and give it some real focus. See what the concerns, problems, challenges and opportunities are presented by the uplands part of our property. Much of the Fair property, including our original space, is zoned residential.

What's driving this project is the need to replace the kitchen that is now at Main Camp with an uplands kitchen. It is clear we need to replace our existing kitchen with an uplands facility. What this report provides is a common frame of reference and a serious look at the Fair property and the challenges we face in

building an upland kitchen. The problem presented by the County regulations is with these residential properties, there's no provision to apply for a kitchen, but we can apply for something called a community center. The challenge is to create some kind of structure that serves our needs as a kitchen while also meeting County requirements that it be a CC., although the County has no definition for a CC. When we turn in our application if it looks and feels like a cc, they'll be able to give us their approval. We need to answer the questions of the size, nature, and location, all of which we've addressed in Phase I. The next step is to explore fundraising and grant writing opportunities, including a capital campaign. The facility will not be paid for with event revenues.

### **HISTORY OF THE PROJECT (Hilary Anthony)**

After a Board retreat in 1996, where a need for a facility was discussed, a fairly large building committee was formed that did a great deal of brainstorming. Land use issues were a total mystery to us; we weren't sure how to deal with those. We had a long wish list, including dry storage, woodshop space, meeting room space, office space. The biggest problem was we didn't have a place to put it. This was before we had many of the properties we now own, such as Alice's, the Hub and Zenn Acres. When we bought Alice's we developed a philosophy of looking at it as a prototype for a "lodge" to see how it would work. We wondered if people would use it for a meeting and event space. The answer is a resounding yes.

The next time the idea came up for a large center was during the Vision Quest in 2002; we had large work sessions to find out people's wish lists. One important thing we learned was we had to change our vocabulary to community center to be able to get a permit.

Lara Howe took up the banner of building an upland kitchen around 2008, calling together a meeting of folks interested in discussing this further and addressing the myriad number of issues we have with the Main Camp kitchen. There was some resistance to the kitchen leaving Main Camp but in 2009 a new committee was formed to explore the options. We started doing research and making proposals to the Board concerning the size and scope. The Board then set aside money to take this project further. The Committee realized the need to spend some of that money to hire professionals to help us with the next steps.

### **PROBLEMS PROJECTS WILL ADDRESS (Charlie Ruff)**

One problem it won't solve is what to call this thing. We've called it a lodge and an upland kitchen, now we are calling it a community center. The important thing is this will be a hearth for centering our community around.

We currently have problems, and in some cases compliance issues around gray water, fresh water use, land use and zoning, growth and capacity issues, as well as health and safety issues. We have long strained the capacity of our Main Camp kitchen. The appropriate facility would help us start to walk our talk and lead to better use our resources. This helps address the long-term health and viability of our event and our organization. We do not want to be in a gray area with compliance. We don't want all of our eggs in the non-conforming land use re-verification basket. We use the site so much earlier and so much more the entire year round, largely because of our growth. We have to feed everyone and this building is designed to do that. With this building, we can hopefully get

ahead of the curve in terms of capacity to feed our volunteers who put our event together, a primary function. This building isn't intended to replace meeting space in town. We're already having many meetings out at site. This will also allow us to do things we haven't even envisioned yet. Calling it a CC allows us to use it for many things. If we call it a lodge, we're stuck at 3000 square feet. If you think 8000 or 9000 square feet is too big, do you think 3000 is adequate for the amount of kitchen space we need? There are ways we could potentially start to solve a lot of problems we've faced over the years and continue to build community, , year round in the heart of our greatest shared resource, the land we steward and protect.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES (Anna Scott – Community Center, Land Use Management and Planning and Peach Power Committees)**

For those 26,000 meals we prepare, we use an estimated 64,768 gallons of potable water during Main Camp and the Fair. That's enough to fill a 10-foot tall room, 25 x 35 ft. During the peak of kitchen activities, outflow gray water exceeds the ground capacity to absorb it. This is not a good fit for food production and gray water disposal. The idea is to design a gray water system that will clean the water to the point where it is safely disposed of and used for irrigation and non-potable uses. The scale of our gray water uses would be determined by the next phase of the architectural and engineering work. The ways the uplands are currently zoned, we're constrained so we have to be creative and we're really good at being creative.

The Long Tom watershed is what brings us spirit. Creating a sanitary system for reclaiming as much as our gray water system as possible is walking our talk of reverence for the land. Each year we're creating approximately 22 8'x8'x6' tanks full of gray water and running it into the ground near the beautiful Long Tom River. The solution is to move the kitchen out of Main Camp to the uplands area.

### **OPPORTUNITIES (Charlie Ruff)**

One of the biggest opportunities with this facility gets is to get us out of the gray area of where we stand with regulatory authorities. It gives us a whole level of standing if we build this into a site use permit and it gives us a regulated, sanitary permanent kitchen that we can use year-round. There's an opportunity to design something that actually fits us, that fits our culture, our environment, and our needs.

We put a premium on buying land and that's a good thing. It's the best investment we could make. There are all sorts of scales of economy and benefits we can get environmentally, in terms of fiscal resources and human resources. There are a lot of upsides in that opportunity. We have the opportunity to build this hearth for our heart. We have a place to come together to make and break bread and build family and community. It helps to have that sort of center. We have an opportunity to have a location that takes advantage of year-round use of the land. A lot of folks come out to the land and what they're able to do in the wintertime tends to be greatly inhibited once it starts to rain a lot. We look every year for where to do things like a cider party or this and that. This could be a facility that could meet so many of those needs. When we bought the original

property it was not that dissimilar a leap of faith from the investment we're talking about making with this project. That worked out pretty darn well. I think we're due to have a home that could support so many of our current activities. And even more. We have an opportunity to have a place where we can share and showcase year round the wonderful things we all know and love about the fair through workshops, small events and other program work. It's another step in the process of re-defining community; that's what we've been doing for 43 years. It's just another step in that process.

To me this feels like we have an opportunity to help safeguard and assure the future of much of the legacy of the folks that have gone before us to get us to the point we're at today. There's been a lot of work by so many people over the last 43 years to help us get to be here now. A building like this helps make sure we can continue to feed the folks we have to feed in the future and have a place we can call the hearth of our 446 acres.

### **PIVOT ARCHITECTURE**

Eric Gunderson and John Stapleton from Pivot/Solarc took us through high points of the Phase I report they presented to the Board of Directors. This is a feasibility study to fully understand the size, location and nature of the Community Center.

<http://oregoncountryfair.net/communitycenter/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/OCF-report-to-board-3-14-13.pdf>

A lot of good work was done by a lot of people, particularly this committee. They challenged us when we offered them advice. They made us go back and look again at things. They were passionate about moving this ahead and embracing the values of the Fair. Once we figured out there was a need for a CC at the fair, it was our job to figure out what is a CC for the fair? CC isn't necessarily the most descriptive word; I like Charlie's word for it – hearth. It probably captures the feeling better.

We set about a process of investigating what this facility could be. We had five major steps: (1) figure out what the needs are; (2) quantify those needs – how big does it need to be; (3) test that building against our values as a fair family; (4) determine what are the resources it would take to build this (5) lastly, we wanted to bring all that information together in a way that would be accessible to all of you and that would capture all the information we gathered along the way.

First step we did was a program kickoff that was a discussion of what are the elements of a community center. We used a technique we called mind mapping. This is a way to organically and collaboratively talk about what the needs of the Fair are with a community center. We had a large gathering with six groups at tables for each topic. We covered the site, events, the kitchen, meetings, dining and storage and support structures. People could wander around and participate in all of those things. Lots of great ideas were generated; really a way for everyone to give voice to what they were thinking about. We took all of that home with us and started to look at what the needs of the fair are.

The next focus area was the site. Where would it make the most sense to put the community center?. You have incredible resources within your organization to think about - □ natural systems, archaeology, security, water, all the utilities that are there, all the people that have a say in how that property is

used. On top of that, we want to respect fair values – use of the land, use of the resources, all those things. We began by identifying the criteria of what would constitute the ideal location. As an example, we want not to disturb natural systems that have a long history on the site. We needed to find a place that would do no harm to natural systems. We wanted to make use of existing infrastructures – road, access. There are many resources there: wells, the Hub, various things we could make use of. We had three sites to look at: Alice's area, Zenn Acres and the Hub area. A big criteria was staying out of the flood plain. In that workshop we looked at all three of those locations. We learned that people wanted a CC site that was near and well connected to the existing site; we wanted to stay above the high water line; we wanted to make use of investments you already made in infrastructure.

Another story this tells is ways to deal with parking. In the winter we need to be more careful with parking and we wanted not to have a parking lot. That would be so much not part of the fair values. We looked at disbursed ways for parking. As a conclusion, we came to a hybrid of Zenn Acres and the Hub.

Third thing we investigated at a group gathering was sustainability, which is so much at the core of the Fair's values that it was fundamental to understand how that could be reflected in a CC. We brainstormed a whole variety of measures we could use from net zero for use of water to producing your own power, having zero waste to anywhere in between those things. We also looked at all the hard work the Board and the CCC had done in the past to set values as a group and your hopes for sustainability. The table in the report summarizes the brainstorming efforts in that group meeting. We categorized health, site, energy, water and materials. We tried to include things in that category that seemed important to consider. At the end of the evening everyone got to choose the six things they thought were the most valuable to include. The biggest one of all was net zero energy. Other things that scored the highest include minimum disturbance of the site, sanitation, ground water heat exchange, using solar energy, natural light, treating water on site, net zero water use, durable materials, healthy building materials, simplicity and reusing/recycling materials. In having this discussion there was some consensus but there were a lot of challenges. People wondered if we would be able to afford to accomplish this. We promised ourselves we would remember that going forward. We needed to test these things – are they realistic, do we have the resources to accomplish them and do they truly reflect Fair values?

What are some of the things we need to think about as we looked at the property and what the impact of the CC would be there? There are a number of them. One is if you really wanted to generate power and make use of the sun, we would have to orient the building that would get solar access and be sure to create a kind of meadow in front of the building to allow the sun to reach it all seasons of the year. We restore the oak savannah where you have fir forests that could shade the building. You could possibly have disbursed parking. The only parking you would have to pave is accessible, handicap parking spaces. We looked at some of the resources you have there, existing wells, water storage, relationship to the existing hub, and some of the other facilities you've already invested in.

We've made diagrams with proportionally the square footage the programming suggests. The pieces in the diagram are the indoor kitchen, a CC,

and then a covered outdoor space. We pushed hard with the committee on how much needs to be inside vs. what could happen just under a cover and still get all-season use. We talked early on about the building unfolding for different times of the year. We realized parts of the kitchen could continue to be outdoors and save the amount of square footage we would need to build. That's a big part of what drives the cost of the facility. We wanted to face south, we wanted to be oriented to an open space where uncovered, outdoor gatherings could happen also.

The kitchen obviously needs to be near so we can use the CC for meals as well as other kinds of gatherings. The gathering portion of the enclosed CC could open up to be an outdoor space so that you have a net value for both of those is a large space.

From the mind maps and from listening to all of you as closely as we could, we assigned building square footages to all the activities that you might have out there. Kitchen, CC and support spaces are all enclosed parts of the building. For the multi-purpose gathering space you wanted to be able to have 250 people indoors in an enclosed, heated space. You could have an event – could be a meal, music, wedding, a whole host of things. There was a whole range of activities identified in the mind mapping exercise that could go on. That number 250 is big because it drives the size of that space. We said it would take about 3,000 sq feet.

The kitchen was a much harder puzzle to solve to determine how many square feet you would need. We began by trying to test layouts for the pieces of equipment you would want and the space for volunteers; the way you work with volunteers is very different from most commercial kitchens. We tried to look at those two things together and arrive at a square footage that would serve all the many volunteers that eat at Main Camp. That turned out to be about 3,000 sf of enclosed indoor space.

Finally, you had to have some support space. You need rest rooms, mechanical needs space, storage, hallways to connect things. That was about 1500 sf more. All of those together composed the enclosed part of the building. On top of that, we said we wanted a covered outdoor space both to augment gatherings and to add to the kitchen. That should be able to handle an additional 200 people. So if the CC were fully occupied and the outdoor covered space fully occupied, you could have 450 people at one time. That's about a shift at Main Camp at its peak, we were told, because workers don't come to meals all at once.

Once we had square footages we were able, even without a design, to test the program vision that you had against what it might cost. We took all the program totals, all the elements of the building, roads, parking, covered area, habitat restoration, buildings, sustainability measures and tried to create a construction cost estimate. There are two main components to a project like this. One is what you pay the general contractor or whatever entity you choose to build this, the other is called "soft costs", which include things like building permits, design fees, inspections during construction, insurance, management, a lot of other costs that go with building a building. When you add all that up you get a cost just under \$3M for construction and \$1.4M for soft costs – a total of \$4.4M for the project. This is, of course, a number that will be a struggle for people to think about. This is not the first number we came up with. The committee challenged us about the square foot costs numbers, can we make the

building a little smaller, do we really need all the parts and pieces? So we tried to refine this down to what we think is reasonably needed.

What I want to say about cost, is we see people have a hard time dealing with these big numbers all the time. It is part of the process going forward. I would suggest a way to think about this isn't to say the Board isn't going to approve writing a check for \$4.4M, but rather let's use this as a basis for going forward and doing more analysis of the project.

We put together some of the tasks we would need to do to move forward as a team. Phase Two would be take you as far as getting the conditional use permit, which is your big land use hurdle going forward. You need to get approval from the County so you can do what you're planning. To do that, you need to have a design, a true floor plan, you have to know what the building will look like, what it's made of, what the site improvements are, plans for how you get power, water, waste treatment. You have to have all those things figured out. You need a mechanical engineer, civil engineer, structural architect. You need a team of people to help you do all of that. So the cost would be \$91,00 for that part of the work.

#### **QUESTIONS** from the attendees **AND ANSWERS** from Pivot and the Committee

Why are you considering two buildings instead of one with two stories?  
Wouldn't one building use less area and cost less?

What you've seen isn't a design yet; we're not necessarily assuming multiple buildings. Because of accessibility, a large gathering space has to be one story. You could have some activities on an upper level. We don't rule that out. There's not a significant difference in cost. Multi-story buildings tend to be more energy efficient than single storied ones that are spread out because they tend to have a lot more surface area to contend with. Because you want a completely accessible building, you have a lot of investment in vertical circulation that you would be able to spend on getting space, so elevator, stairs, would increase costs. A second floor would be a little bit more expensive.

Would the washing area include capacity for what's served in the booths during our event?

We factored in washing and storage areas for durables we currently have. We didn't look at expansion.

Please explain the sustainable building premium.

It's an allowance to cover what costs there might be. There was back and forth on the committee on what percentage to use for a sustainable set aside. This is embodying our principles. This is an estimate; the cost could be higher or lower.

Is it possible to do this in two phases, namely the kitchen, then the outdoor community center?

It could be done in two phases. We could get permits for one project, but construction could be done in two phases.

Where's the funding coming from?

The committee is recommending that the Board get some advice from professional fundraising folks for a capital campaign and to explore what's possible.

On P. 54 – small print – “design fees for sustainable measures not included in this estimate” Is that part of the total costs? Is that likely to grow significantly? Is it quantified?

It's not quantified in We have an allowance for sustainable design. That line item will be carried forward as OCF sees fit. The sustainable measure piece is pretty fuzzy at this time. In the second phase we'll move that into more clarity. We'll have to develop the budget for Phase 2 a little more. Our intent was to show you what the design fees might be.

Should site selection be reconsidered since we bought Henderson's; can we use it for parking?

Slough between Zenn trailer and Aero Road is the highest flowing on site. Moving the facility west is not really feasible. We can use that area for parking. Main point of County requirement is impact on neighbors. Now we have only one neighbor anywhere near proposed site so it's a lower threshold to get through.

(To Jack, OCF Construction coordinator and experienced professional construction supervisor) Does the \$250 per square foot cost make sense to you?

There is an allowance of green features in the construction costs. There is design allowance; with that, then yes. It depends on how green we want I don't think we could get what we want for \$125 a square foot; I think the \$250 square foot figure is reasonable.

Pivot - Umbrella group for LEED, did a multi-million dollar study of LEED v. Living Building Challenge, ran into 11 – 15 % premium. That's where we got that figure.

Is there another opportunity to digest all this information and discuss these elements again?

We envision as a next step another, larger meeting to answer those questions and get more input in May.

Will it have a hearth?

There was a specific request from the kitchen crew to have a hearth with multiple sides to it so it could actually be warming for gathering and useful for cooking with that same flame for cooking, so it could be a fire for multiple uses. Of course, we haven't nailed down yet what that would actually look like.



How did you come up with square foot cost?

Costs are amalgamated costs of many, many projects where everybody involved in that project has done everything we're doing to press down on cost and maximize their value. These are unit costs built from tables, which are real costs. These are built from tables that have looked at all the data for this region along with all the data we collect ourselves from similar projects and we amalgamate that into these averages which everybody recognized. We looked at similar projects in this region.

Can we do this work with Fair volunteers instead of hiring it out? We have people who can do every aspect of this.

We're envisioning that a lot of this will be done by Fair family with Fair family skills. There's an underlying expectation of in-kind. We haven't started to break that out at this point in the process, but it's absolutely an underlying expectation. This is a starting point to tease those things out of an abstract concept. This project amount of what it would cost if we contracted out; we need to quantify it for grant makers. Part of what we can look at is getting good assessment of what labor and materials we can get donated and what we'll have to pay for. I think going forward we can get a raw assessment of what we're going to pay for, who's going to help us pay for it and what we can get donated in the way of labor and materials.

Could you design to \$1.5 million?

Yes. It would be a very different building.

I understand there's a two-tract undertaking. One is to rezone the land which is now a non-conforming use to a park through the Lane County Planning Commissions process and that requires a nomenclature of community center apparently to be eligible for that land use designation change. The question is if one can't rely on the political goodwill of Lane County, certainly in the climate of the Board Commissioners right now and the appointees to the Planning Commission, I don't think there's any kind of slam dunk for designation regardless of how well prepared we are for that application process to be approved. If that re-designation to a park is not approved at either the Planning Commission or Board of Commissioners level, I understand that the existing non-conforming use designation would be lost. Is that true?

Absolutely not. The original Fair property operated before there were any zoning laws in Lane County, Around 1984 the Country tried to impose some building permit requirements on the booths and at that point, the Planning Department said the Fair doesn't have any approval, so they ran the Fair through a process called the verification of a non-conforming use. What that is, is not a permit. What it is a validation that the Fair existed before the zoning laws and has a right to continue forever. We're looking for a way to use upland properties without changing zoning. It's grandfathered in as it was in 1984 on the original property. Nothing can touch that unless we open it up. We didn't own the uplands properties in 1984; we have no approval for any activities on those properties except for camping. If we want to fold them into the Fair's entire use,

that would require opening up the non-conforming use. We don't want to do that. So we're looking for a way to get these upland facilities under the current zoning we have. We don't want to change the zoning because under the current zoning we have, we can ask for a permit for a community center, We can also ask for a permit for a park. We can basically ask for approval to do what we do on the rest of the property in the uplands without changing the zoning. We just have to meet the criteria that it doesn't affect the neighbors, so that's a lot easier than asking for a rezoning. We're not trying to rezone to a park. We're going to get a permit to act like a park in the residential zone. That's a much lower threshold to get. We're not trying to change any zoning and we're not opening up what we have. We're not going to put the Fair in jeopardy. That's what's driving this basic problem we have with the kitchen. There was no provision for a kitchen in the uplands unless we were to fold it into the rest of our grandfathered use. We don't want to do that. So we have to marry it to this community center concept and ask for a special use permit. A community center is not defined by the County, so it's defined by whatever we tell them it is.

It could be this project doesn't get off the ground for 2 or 3 or 4 years. In the meantime, our immediate priority we need to feed a lot of people without overworking cooks. Couldn't we rent, make or buy an 18-foot kitchen trailer, single or triple-wide?

That option has not been considered by the committee. Our charge from the Board was to look at building an upland kitchen and community center.

Isn't it more likely we use a certificate program as road map to create our building?

One of the things we asked is how green do we need to be? There's a full spectrum of opinions here of what the value of this cutting edge, certified, Living Building Challenge type of certification? One thing we agreed on is we want a stick to use to measure ourselves by. Whether or not we attach ourselves to it and say we absolutely have to achieve this from the outset and say we have to achieve this or we decide not to do any of it, we at least decide what we're going to use as our measuring stick. That's where the Living Building Challenge jumped out as the most in line with our values as a measure stick. I don't think there was any kind of agreement or decision made that we would try to achieve those goals but we would see how far we were out of the gates by our own values by the basic value of having as efficient a building as possible and how we would do things smarter, leaner, more low tech that could actually achieve some of those things with much more long term infrastructure livelihood. E.g., to do thermal transfer in the ground, those types of things, although they have an archaeological impact and may cost more up front, over the long haul, they can pay huge dividends. All of those things we've been weighing but we did not set out at the beginning of this process that the goal was we would have that certification to wave to the world. We were much more concerned with doing things our way, in a way that meant something to us and serve us for the longest time with the most return environmentally, emotionally and fiscally.

Why should anyone donate to this?

We've been working in the community with organizations like the Ford Family Foundation. We've been doing a lot of outreach in the last couple of years to lay the groundwork for just this type of relationships. There's a ton of wherewithal out there in the Oregon grant-making world for capital campaigns, especially around community space in rural areas. One of the conversations that keeps coming up around this is all the A lot of the meetings we're talking about having in this space are not out at the site and the additional possibilities for our large or smaller co-centric rings of community to use that space are potentially huge relationship builders in the community. There's no space like this in our part of the woods. There's no place to hold a meeting for 200 people in Veneta. One of the organizations we would reach out to is the Ford Family Foundation which regularly gives large amounts to capital investments like this. We know the next step for this committee is dive into fundraising feasibility and to do that with some professional help and consultation to see what the real fundraising possibility is within the Fair family, within granting foundations and other sources as well as the community itself.

Is this facility designed for day use and not overnight use?

This facility is initially for day use. The committee did do some outreach with a marketing professional from within the Fair family to give us some of their expertise on how to capitalize the long-term costs of operating through the operations of the building. One of things made clear to us is that buildings like this in terms of creating significant revenue streams really need a lodging component. At this point, in the summertime we have plenty of camping space on site for folks that want to do multi-day events, but at this point we haven't envisioned a next phase of lodging. We may get there over time but that's not the initial design for this. This building is primarily for us to use to put on our event and to fulfill the needs of the organization on site. Some of that is day use; some of it is overnight. There will be opportunities for community organizations or Fair family to use the center in the off-season but we're not building it as a giant events center. This is primarily a place for us to meet and gather and make food for us to sustain the event.

Could the indoor kitchen and the covered outdoor space potentially be a phase 1 that would comply with the community center with a full schematic drawing for phase 2 being an outdoor kitchen and a community center? Would the indoor kitchen and the covered outdoor space be enough to satisfy in good faith the permit process with phase 2 being the outdoor kitchen and the community center being phase 2. Is that a kind of logic where the board could tweak that trajectory?

There is no clear answer to that. The planning permit could propose all of it to be done in phases and the question the planners would have is what if we never get to phase 2. We wouldn't know if phase 1 satisfies their need to call it a community center and not just a kitchen until we tried to get that permit, It's all about the definition of a community center. It's a strategic question for the permit process.

Will we welcome other organizations? The site is cheap to rent (for weddings, etc.) out now. Will this make it a lot more expensive?

We can set whatever rate we want and have control over who we would let use it. The committee hasn't done anything about making recommendations as to who can use it. We haven't suggested policy on that.

This is first and foremost for the Fair's needs.

## COMMENTS

Cynthia – Thanks to the CC Committee. It's useful for us to think about how to come together to collaborate and cooperate to serve all of our interests. I'm concerned about the scale and cost and have some suggestions.

1. Go through process of defining alternative scenarios
  - a. Phase one as kitchen and outdoor seating area
  - b. We should have cost cap and build backwards, e.g. \$2 million.
  - c. Have comparative options
2. Explore market research by outside organizations
3. Access to info from the CCC has been very difficult. Minutes need to be accessible.
4. Very unusual for staff to sit on committees with a vote
5. Board might consider adding 3 additional position
6. There should be more than one meeting

The permit process, if one can't rely on the good will of the Lane County Board of Commissioners, no slam-dunk to be approved. Would non-conform

Bill Ganser – Tim said a lot of what we talked about. This is a lot of money. It looks like a lot of these costs are driven by building codes and standards. Maybe some things shouldn't be in there. I'm not sure what building's vision is and the vision drives the costs. What exactly are looking for? I'm concerned we'll dump all our resources toward this project and will forgo other opportunities.

Paxton – I personally think we shouldn't apply for green certification. It's too expensive; we don't need outside approval to do what we want to do. We should not consider it in the design. It's not really germane to us.

The funds we're going are going to come mostly from us and not foundations. So we need the approval of Fair family.

Joseph – I'm concerned that sustainability is an add-on rather than being an integral part of the design. In terms of local design resources, I wonder if we've ever tapped into Aprochevo Institute. They seem much more in tune with our values in their approach, making the best use of local resources.

Jack – We haven't bought anything yet. We have in place a very good trajectory goes across many things and is correct. We want everyone's ideas. We are looking toward the health and well being of this organization. There is value we can't ignore. Work is not free; it's in-kind. My perfect world is no money for this

project comes from the event; it comes from a capital campaign. I think we should have a high percentage of the money in hand before we start.

Dean Middleton – I appreciate the work and energy what went into this document. It looks like you were able to capture the dreams that e put out there. I understand the concept of sticker shock, but my experiences tells men a building this size with all of the elements coming in at \$4 million is not excessive. I believe if this community gets behind the project, it is well within the abilities of the Fair. I can't agree that those donations of talents within the Fair community are free. They all have value. The number is realistic regardless if half of it is donated or contributed in-kind.

Jain Eliot – I don't think the men's bathroom should be the same size as the women's bathroom.

Martha – One of the first things we have to ask ourselves is how green do we want to be. That's a huge part of the zero. If we want a million dollar facility than we need something much smaller or we need to be less green. We have to keep ourselves open to what the trade-offs are.

Dennis – Thanks to the committee and the architects. If everyone who gets a wristband pays \$250, we can pay cash. If one out of four of us gave \$1000, we could still do it.

Jon P. – I would like us to reconsider siting. Acquiring Henderson's changes the game. I believe it's important to keep this in perspective. This building is a wonderful adjunct to our primary purpose, I believe our original land purchase was vital to our existence; this is not.

Charlie – We have to feed an awful lot of people for a long time to be able to open those gates on Friday every year so the importance of that capacity is paramount as we set up to do this Fair every year. It's not a dissimilar leap of faith than the original land purchase.

Ruth – The kitchen is a burning issue. We have to have a sanitary place to feed a lot of people for a couple of months every year. How we do that is the question. When we talk about just a couple of months a year, maybe look at different angles. I agree with Paxton that certification is all that important.

Tony – Regarding getting out information, we've had a few people take minutes. Committee reports to the Board have been in the Board minutes. I was tasked with putting a blog together. A lot of work involved dealing with compliance issues and a hiring process for architects. We'll try to get more info on the web ASAP.

Dean – Focus on the kitchen is crucial. When I looked at dreaming, a lot of that came from our vision. This report helped put it together.

Paxton – We could build the kitchen now on or grandfathered status if we built in the warehouse area. It's not a suggestion I'm inclined to flow but from what I understand we could do it.

Thom – In the 90's, we told the County we needed to move things around within the Fair and not have to go the County for approval. If we want to take a booth from Strawberry Lane and move it to the Left Bank, we don't have to go to the County and get approval for that, If we want to take an operations piece and move it from one operations area to another, we can do that. We can move the kitchen and move it to an area that's designated for operations and get a permit to build it there, but it would only be usable during the Fair. So it's possible to move the kitchen to the warehouse area, but it wouldn't be functional all year round, it would have access problems during the flooding and I'm not sure there's room up there.

Jon P – There are lots of ways to get to net zero. With fundraising, basic question is what's more valuable, more facility or more service.

Anna – Please go to a Board member and tell them and what it is you want from committees like ours.

Hilary – David Helton, professional economist and Fair family member does feasibility studies, talked to us. He said if we wanted to pay someone like him to do a feasibility study, it would be \$20,000 and his methodology would be to get a list of organizations that typically rent facilities and ask them what they usually pay and what kind of place they are looking for and compile that information. He said if we wanted to do it ourselves he could give some guidance to volunteers. It's mostly phone surveys and putting the information together, He said in all the years he's been doing this, the results that tend to come up is that you won't be able to recoup the capital costs with what you're doing. You can pay your day-to-day operating costs and where you get the profit is in the food service and the lodging. He said that was fairly consistent, We did not have the energy on our committees, as volunteers, to go out and do all that work but that is available to us and that would be one of the in-kind, volunteer driven types of activities that we could do and not pay \$20,000.

I see there is a lot of overnight use of Alice's right now and there are a lot of people either sleeping in tents or in their vans or the floor of Alice's and staying out there all weekend. I don't think that will change. I think we'll have a lot of Fair family who are willing to camp and rough it just like they do because they want to be able to stay out there and they're used to sleeping in a lot of conditions, I can also see weddings out there and lots of day use. I can see retreats of organizations that have a lot of overlap with us like Saturday Market. If the Board wants to have a feasibility study, I suggest you take David Helton up on his offer and get some volunteers to get guidance from him and do the phone work and compile the information.

Wren – There's a lot of controversy out there and there and there not being lodging in the area to support retreats. I know Alice's is busy almost every

weekend. To have the ability to sleep on the floor on something like this will be a whole lot easier on the crews than at Alice's.

Thom – We did a survey and found out there are 280 to 430 crew meetings a year.

Cynthia - The Fair has no obligation to provide a facility that can fit 200 people from Veneta and the surrounding area when they have 2 other facilities that may meet their needs. Typically, foundations do not fund capital campaigns. A \$20,000 investment for a feasibility study might be worth the money and it can be done for less and blaming volunteers for not participating is not appropriate. It would be worth the investment to figure out what the potential for the revenue stream is and what it can support. Maybe you want to re-think the responsibility. People shouldn't have to call every Board member to express their concerns. This committee has a responsibility to collapse those concerns, comments issues and relay those to the Board and make a recommendation.

Ruth – We could provide platforms for teepees and yurts for overnight accommodations. We could have a unique alternative for overnight accommodations. We don't necessarily have to provide a lodge. To make it work we might have to think outside what we originally thought it would be used for.

Charlie – There's the temptation that came through this process in every step that we went through for people to throw every need that they have and that they place upon the fair on this one structure. We really tried to get away from that and say what does this need for its program design, acknowledging the fact that it would be certainly augmented if there was some basic accommodations, be it huts, yurts, platforms, that would have low impact and fit with the land. We didn't want to take that on as part of this process.

Ruth – An economic feasibility study justifying this much money for this type of facility. To get the use out of it that we'll need to cover operating expenses, may mean that we rent it out not just for day use. We have other options, going down the road, right?

Dennis – Anyone who wants more transparency should volunteer to be a committee scribe.

Tony = Let's pretend we're all going to come up with the money somehow and we're all smart enough not to put anything in jeopardy that we and our parents have spent 45 years making sure is here and that we'll put some pretty sincere thought in to whatever that looks like and raising that money and doing whatever is required to build that building.

Chris – When we build this, we'll end up growing into this as we have with Alice's and Chela Mela, for example. Our descendants will complain 20 or 30 years from now that it's too small.

Jack – Are these numbers for a 50 year building or a 100 year building, maintenance wise? That's definitely something we should consider.

Jon Silvermoon (Community Center Committee member– Absent from meeting but asked that this minority opinion be read.) I do not and cannot support the scale of the of community center project as presented in the Pivot report. I do not think enough effort was made to consider a full range of alternatives to meet both real and perceived needs, I would like to recommend the following: (1) phase 2 with Pivot not be authorized; (2) the project be referred back to the committee for reconsideration (3) the kitchen be designed for the operational needs of our 3-day event with a minimum of indoor space that would require higher operational and maintenance costs; 4 – eating and sitting areas in conjunction with the kitchen be designed primarily for seasonal use; (5) the need for a year-round indoor meeting space be supported first by empirical evidence with a corresponding business plan outlining anticipated use revenues and operational maintenance costs. As part of this process an assessment should be made of the potential effects, such a year-round facility might have on nearby facilities such as the Applegate Regional Theater and Fern Ridge Community Center. (6) If it's determined there is a need for on-site year-round meeting facilities consideration should be given to expanding our existing building at Alice's. (7) Additional members should be solicited for the community center committee so that a broader range of viewpoints can be represented. \*8) an upper limit budget to be set by the board to guide the CCC,'s deliberations.

### **ENDING POINTS**

This is not a finished proposal. This is a product of a lot of work to take an abstract idea and give it detail and substance so we had something to work with. This process has been open; we've invited people to participate through the whole process. We'll get to the building we need to build. We have a need for our family and our organization to continue to sustain what we do, This is no small feat. We know that our next natural step is to work through fundraising feasibility work and to do additional more work around potential revenue streams and uses. We want some direction from the Board on that, It's our intention to ask the Board to participate in a public meeting for our next scheduled meeting, May 20. It's a public meeting to go through more in depth with this plan, people's concerns. Come be part of the process. We're asking the Board to consider a work session with us for our September 23 meeting to review some of the results that we hope to have by then from the feasibility work. At that point a real process taking so much of this work that we've done that isn't going to change (gray water needs, siting needs and regulatory issues) can ensue. A lot of this work has lasting value for us whether or not this is what we build. We don't think is a finished project.

We want to thank everyone who came out tonight and giving us your input. Stay involved. We can use more folks on the committee. Please, we want your help.

Thank you to our team from Pivot.