

**Oregon Country Fair Board of Directors' Meeting
December 1, 2014, 7:00, NW Youth Corps**

Board members present: Diane Albino, Casey Marks Fife (Alternate), Paxton Hoag, Lucy Kingsley, Jack Makarchek (president), Indigo Ronlov (vice-president), Kirk Shultz, Jon Silvermoon, Lawrence Taylor, Sue Theolass **Peach Gallery present:** Staff (Charlie, norma, Robin and Shane), Officers (Hilary, Grumpy and Randy), and 31 members and guests.

New Business

Jon moved and LT seconded to move the following items from New Business to Old Business for action tonight:

Direct the personnel committee to update the General Manager job description.

Direct the personnel committee to develop a hiring process for the General Manager.

Amend employee probationary period for health care benefits to conform with the Affordable Care Act.

Approve Site and Facilities Manager as an at will employee

Motion passed 9-1 Lucy abstained

Lucy moved and Indigo seconded to move Juventud FACETA to December consent calendar Motion passed 10-0

Announcements

norma: The 1/5 Board meeting will be at 7:00 at NW Youth Corps and the Budget/Financial Planning meeting on January 26th at 7:00 pm will be at Central Presbyterian Church. Entertainment applications for the 2015 Fair are at oregoncountryfair.org.

Indigo: I want to extend a thank you to the Fair for all it's taught me over the years. I spent time in Bahariya Oasis in Egypt doing handwork with local women with no interpreter. It was an amazing experience and reminded me of how we value handwork at the Fair.

Charlie: We will be participate in the Veneta Light Parade on 12/11 starting at 7:00 pm. Please come out and support our presence and give the OCF entry a hearty, holiday "Yes, Yes, Yes" as it passes by.

Jen Lin: The Personnel committee is conducting staff evaluations; the information is available on the .net site and the deadline is 12/15 at 5:00 pm. You may send your completed forms to pc@oregoncountry.org. Hard copies are available at the office.

Reports Staff

Charlie: Our 2013 taxes (CT-12 and 990) are done, filed and behind us. We will will have most of the work for next year done well before the time we swing into event mode.

See Jen-Lin's announcement about participating in the staff evaluation process.

The Food Committee has put out a request for proposals from potential new food booths. Check out the www.oregoncountryfair.net site for more information. Proposals are due by 1/15. Those selected for consideration will be invited to do a tasting for the committee in February.

The Budget Committee will be finished with crew and staff budgets soon. Capital project proposals are due by 1/31.

Any proposed changes to the OCF guidelines should be returned to the Fair office by 12/29.

There is an SUP item on the agenda to get authorization to apply for a Parks designation special use permit for the vast majority of our property. Regarding LPFM, I want to be clear that as SUP, building or commercial applications take shape, those will be coming back to the Board of Directors for approval before they are submitted at the county level.

Shane: We are working hard on site to winterize to keep pipes from breaking. Have a happy holiday season.

Robin: Culture Jam will hold a Winter Reunion for youth who attended last year's Jam as well as any graduates who were not with us last year. It should be a very heart-warming day! Any grads that want to be there should call the Fair office for a Registration Form, 541-343-4298.

Reports Committees

Peggy: Elders Committee Meeting was held 11/23 at the OCF office.

A motion was made and passed to approve the minutes from the last meeting.

Announcements:

Happy Birthday Patricia.

Shower Crew calendars available for purchase

Charlie R is resigning his position after 2015 Fair.

there is a lot of debris in Elders Camp that needs moving.

Four Elder applications are in process, 1 was approved.

Elders Annual holiday party will be 12/9 at 6 pm at the WOW hall.

Budget was discussed and noted that a high percentage of elders have a state tag requiring handicapped accessible parking. The BOD is working on a motion made by Jon.

LPFM update – the last two quarterly reports have been accepted by the BOD. We can continue to move forward. Next report due in January.

Staff Evaluations –they are due at the fair office by 5 pm on 12/15.

SPRING RETREAT - Alice's is confirmed for our use April 11-12

NEXT MEETING – 1/22 at 7 p.m. at the Fair office.

Lucy: Could I ask that the Elders provide a report to the membership at the meeting in addition to the report that is provided to the secretary?

Kirk: The Path Planning committee is moving to both a written report and an in-meeting overview. The State of Oregon State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has new rules about what a historical site is and who governs it. The tribes have put pressure on the State because they are the stewards of the archeological sites. This could have an affect on future archeological studies.

Charlie reported on the work that he and Thom Lanfear have been doing on the Special Use Permit (SUP). He said they hope to apply for it before the end of the year. He also spoke on the progress that CLOG is making in placing new booths in the Craft Lot. Finally, he encouraged Path Planning to open a dialog with BOD on PP purview.

Kirk informed the committee that he and Paxton had been asked to continue on as liaisons for the PP committee. One of them will give the PP report to the BOD each month.

Path Planning reactivated the Craft Lot naming committee and will make a recommendation to the BOD at the February meeting. The Story Pole subcommittee continued to work with the Sauna folks to refine the process for Story Pole placement.

Path Planning continues to work with Community Village to encourage a decision regarding the creation of a second entrance off East 13th that would address the cul-de-sac problem in the Village. Next Path Planning meeting January 18, 1- 4PM. Path Planning committee is looking for another secretary, so anyone interested in being the PP scribe please contact Kirk.

CLOG: meeting and working through maps, cap proj, et el;

Jon: I appreciate that Path Planning is beginning to send meeting minutes to board members. My question is on the rationale for having someone other than the Fair archeologist dealing with the siting of the pole.

Kirk: The Archeology crew recommended someone from the outside to do the survey.

Jon P: When switching to new agenda format, we were asked to send in written reports and not provide them verbally.

Indigo: I'd like to clarify why we've begun doing it this way. The committee reports were taking a lot of our time and Old Business was getting pushed to the very end of the meeting. The goal was not to eliminate in-meeting reports, but to condense them.

Paxton: LUMP meeting 11/18/14. The mapping subcommittee met first, discussed the needs for GIS software and personnel, and addressed the need for inter-crew cooperation in generating maps. Jason Kelley plans to use his precision GPS units to set benchmarks this next year. LIDAR data covering the OCF site are now available from Lane County.

Eight members and our scribe (yay, Jain Elliott!) met. Dennis discussed his site tour with Shane and the prospect of installing a repurposed rail car as a bridge to the Far Side. Jason suggested getting a second bid. Bear Pitts discussed planning for changes in the Upper River Loop, where the river continues to erode the bank, threatening the path, Arch Park, and booths. Dennis pointed out it wouldn't be long before the river cuts into the backstage of Daredevil Palace. Jason pointed out that erosion threatens the footings of Jill's Crossing.

We discussed updates needed for the LUMP manual, including new maps for the web site. Members were urged to review the on-line HTML version of the manual, which includes the most recent revisions. Subcommittees were named to write the section on green zones and a section on tree and downed wood management.

Member Input

Joseph: Please move on the decision on hiring a new General Manager because we need a GM that has been there with the current GM through a Fair cycle.

Jen Lin: The board approved \$1000 for the Youth Empowerment Symposium, held 11/10 and 11/11 with theme of healthy relationships. There were workshops, followed by a presentation. Planned Parenthood taught having a healthy relationship with yourself. This sparked the youth asking each other 'what do you love about yourself?'

Donations/Secretary Report

Randy: There are three items on the Consent Calendar: Eugene Peace Choir \$1000 (Paxton) ; WOW Hall Membership \$1000 (Indigo); Juventud FACETA \$1000 (Lucy)

Patricia: Juventud FACETA is a human rights organization that's been in the community since 1993 including 3-year leadership program. Maria is a graduate and is president of the board.

Maria: The leadership development group was started 4 years ago. Many of our graduates have blossomed into leaders making a difference in the community. The money will be used for a trip to Washington, D.C to talk about students of color and college attendance.

Gweneth: The Peace Choir is in its 30th season. The money is for a Director and space at the 1st Congregational Church, as well as instruments and operational expenses.

Hilary: Regarding the WOW Hall, there is a budgeted amount for memberships. We don't have a way to have reoccurring memberships automatic.

Consent calendar passed 10-0

Treasurers' Report/Budget Items

Hilary: The Budget committee is working to finish up the budget process. January 26 we'll have all the budgets to present to the board. Capital projects are due by 1/31 and will be voted on at the March Board meeting.

Shane: I'd like to ask the board to amend the fuel and propane line item for overages for the propane in the amount of \$3606.48

Indigo moves and Lucy seconded to add \$3606.48 to the Site/Facility manager's propane line item.

Hilary: I support this. Shane is doing a lot to look at how the fuel is being administered, and the budget in general.

Motion passed: 10-0

Jon: I wanted to ask about the Traffic poles that were more than 300% over budget. Is this a one-time cost?

Steve: It was for the rebuild of the Traffic tower and is a Capital project.

Old Business

Jon moved and Paxton seconded the Board of Directors shall create a Diversity Task Force that is comprised of representatives from a broad cross section of all operational areas and other interested parties with knowledge and experience in all aspects of diversity. The Diversity Task Force is charged with the following:

1. To develop a long-range plan with measurable objectives to address the issues of racism, classism, and other forms of both real and perceived discrimination in our organization; this plan should include an educational and training program for Fair Family members, staff and volunteers.

2. To advise the Board of Directors on diversity issues as the long-range plan is being developed,

3. To research the available data on successful diversity trainings for staff and volunteers who work in non-profit organizations, including information on training templates that have been used successfully in order to incorporate diversity and cultural awareness into all aspects of our organization, and to develop a list of trainers in this field,

4. To develop a budget that will adequately fund the long-range plan including the education and training program that will be developed, and

5. To include members of the OCF family who are not mainstream in its research. (Mainstream is defined as white, western, middle class, heterosexual, able bodied, above the poverty level, etc.)

Joseph: This is part of the Vision Action Committee work. The VAC has not had a subcommittee for diversity.

Peggy: There is a lot of data out there we should take advantage of.

Jen Lin: Another piece of the Diversity Task Force is to bring in workshops for ourselves and the rest of the community to confront and explore our own racism and prejudice.

Paxton: The first of the Fair's goals is to develop diversity within our own organization. The VAC has had trouble in realizing the goals and this will help us move in the right direction.

Jack: This is the future of our organization and needs our highest consideration. We've had the good fortune through Culture Jam to be making inroads. It has shown in requests for donations and is a great vehicle for diversity. We have a lot of responsibility for making this as diverse an event as we can. This means we need to reach families and friends to get them involved. This is the closest step to home that we tend to not see.

Jon: I will take the lead on making sure this happens. If this motion passes, I would like to put on as New Business to appoint members of an initial task force. If we don't get enough interest to reach critical mass we can table. I'd say 3 people as a start.

LT: If it is not already obvious why we should address diversity, look about the room. In respect to economic and social class issues, they are not as obvious but are equally salient.

Diane: I support this and I'll be the second person on the task force.

Motion passes 10-0

Indigo moved and Kirk seconded that the board create a volunteer team to be responsible for the uploading of recorded OCF BoD meetings each month. This team will consist of the recording secretary, up to two fair members, and two board members (one from each rotation), with the assistance of the staff as needed to accomplish the task. Initially the team will be Randy Turney, Miles Thompson, Peggy Fitzgerald, Paxton Hoag, and Indigo Ronlov. The team will be determined yearly at the board retreat. Beginning January 2015, this team will be responsible for uploading the meetings as either the secretary's audio recording or a video recording. A board page will be created on the OCF dot net site where the content will be uploaded no later than the Sunday night following the board meeting. Additionally, this team will monitor how this is being received by the membership, as well as explore the possibility of offering live interactive meetings in the future.

Wren: I have a hard time supporting this unless access is limited to our membership which will prevent our meetings from being put on YouTube and presented out of context. I don't trust media to not manipulate our message. Our members should have access, but if they cannot login it concerns me.

JonP: These are public meetings and anyone could come. This is a 501C3 non-profit doing its business in public. Being public on the internet is how we should operate in the 21st century.

Joseph: This is a step to fully interactive board meetings which should be something you have to login for. The board President should be able to strike statements that are out of order.

Steve: I agree 100% with Wren. It is a good idea to put the meetings on a site where there is control over how it is used. I wish you would amend the motion to include some research on how to keep it private. The way it is written anyone will have the ability to change or put words out of context. The fact that it is a public meeting means nothing. It's clear that we need control over the content even it is by copywriting the videos.

Bob: I would hate to be embarrassed in front of the whole world if I said something wrong, and everyone got a laugh out of it. If you say something wrong in the minutes, someone will clean it up. As someone who doesn't like to speak in front of a lot of people, this would make me more reluctant to do so.

Wren: I value my privacy, and it would affect my attendance and participation in these meetings. In my experience people treat each other in ways on the internet they would never do in face to face interactions – one example is the Discuss List. I drove three hours to this meeting and I'd rather do that than watch it on line.

Joseph: You can set files up so that people cannot copy them without permission. I believe Miles knows the formats for this. There are many committed members who cannot attend these meetings.

Lucy: If I am going to talk to someone – I want to look at their face, to experience the psychic vibe in a meeting where people are actually present. GoToMeeting sucks the life out of the meeting to be in a room with 2 people with 5 remote participants. I find it discouraging and disheartening. While I understand the theory is that it promotes participation, my experience is that it decreases people's willingness to be involved.

Paxton: Both Vimeo and YouTube have APIs to put on the .net website. We can set up registration, but the hard part would be verifying it against the membership list. Anyone registered could get the stream. We would hire a company that streams video to do this. You can set up permissions so that you have considerable control. I've been doing this for over a year and the meetings are boring. Be honest. Worrying about someone manipulating it is coming out of fear. I agree the Discuss List, that is un-moderated, has problems. This will be moderated. What do you do about someone that says something that is illegal – we can easily pull that out. We need to reach out to people beyond this area. Many committee meetings are holding 2 meetings a month. I travel 450 miles to this meeting. I'd rather go to a meeting and deal with people in person, but I can't always do that 5 or 6 times a month.

We are on the way to ironing out the problems. I'm not so concerned about meeting a January deadline. We will consider the controls and registration.

LT: We've been talking about some form of this motion and idea for as long as I've been on the board. I remember before we had absentee ballots everyone showed up at the annual meeting. I share Lucy's preference – it would be great if we all lived in Lane County. Half of my crew lives the better part of 1000 miles away. There is a weighing of equities we need to consider. I'm not certain that an objection of participation is a well-taken one. I think back to the effort some took to conceal their political donations and affiliations. Justice Scalia said it's the risk you take when you participate in a group in the public process. You risk dealing with people that don't agree with you. In weighing the equities, participation in our organization in this form is cultural transformation.

Indigo: I agree with what my colleagues have said. I am not comfortable with a camera blinking a red light. The candidate forum also makes me uncomfortable, answering questions that get broadcast out to the membership. I serve the OCF membership, not just the 17 people that are sitting in this room. It is the 18,000 people of the Fair, many of whom are not able to come to this meeting. I would like us to be able to reach out to the membership and share what we do here. If we are choosing to open our mouths, it should be with mindfulness. If we choose things that are inappropriate, then we need to check ourselves. In today's age, we are negligent if we don't reach out in a bigger way to get our family in another state, country or planet involved. I hope you support the motion. This is a motion to see how it goes; we have choice points along the way; do it, assess and change. Let's try this instead of talking about it.

Diane: I have mixed feelings about this too. I have wanted the .net to be a login site for years and I don't understand why this has not happened. I would feel a lot better if this did not go out until it was members only. I dread having live interactive meetings. How do you put time limits on? I will support this as a trial.

Kirk: I've adopted the idea in the new smarter than me phone world that I'm on a street corner all the time. If I'm not willing to say it on the street corner, I should go back inside my house. We are out in the public – we need to adapt to that. It is a motion of motion – it is how we get somewhere instead of talking more. Try the experiment. Membership login is something we all want and it is getting caught up in other projects, but we can start with this small step. Miles has stepped up to give very high-level skills to work on this. The most beautiful part about this is that it is a creation of a group to take the steps forward.

Casey: The most important thing out of this motion is that there is a group working together to make it happen. I don't see a great need to have it up in January. I hear the need to do something for our members – we are doing something for our members; we post our minutes every month. Posting a video is not doing anything different – except giving people the ability to sit down for three hours and watch a meeting. I agree with Lucy wholeheartedly – part of the beauty of our organization is the face-to-face interaction that we share. The most important problem to solve is registration for membership. I am supportive of the motion but don't see a January time line as necessary.

Sue: I need clarity on what Vimeo and an API are.

Paxton: API is an application programming interface, that gives you a button to click on for the .net site that gives a link to Vimeo without their advertising. It would look like it was coming from the Fair and could require login.

Sue: I've listened to audio of committee meetings and they are boring and sometimes hard to hear. I like the idea of getting an audio recording up, but would like more security in place. I don't want to inhibit our meeting participants. It takes a lot to come to the meetings. I'd like to hear more about the security aspects that are put in place before we put anything up.

Jack: Cyber membership started in 1982 or so. My wife and I rescued a cat and the owners tracked us down through a camera in Sweet Home to get their cat. I used to have anxiety about this post-Orwellian situation. The fact is that I'll not say a cyber member is any less relevant than a live one. Being as involved as I've been – I can't look at the fact that a cyber member is anyone I need to worry about. We still have this antiquated video policy at the Fair and I see everyone has their phones out taking video. They know everything and will do everything. What we are doing is trying to be human in a cyber world. We have to embrace that. It is really hideous out there on what is possible to be done with bits of data.

Jon: I want to get the Fair meeting online and interactive and this doesn't do it. I am not sure what incremental benefits this gives us. I have heard the concerns and would rather see a secure login and content that could not be modified incorporated in the motion. I, therefore, move to table the motion.

Jon moved and Diane seconded to table the motion.

Motion fails: 3 - 7 opposed Jack, Paxton, LT, Lucy, Indigo, Kirk, Casey

Indigo: In the sentence "Beginning..." I am replacing that with, "As soon as practical or possible, this team will be responsible for uploading the meetings as either the secretary's audio recording or a video recording in a secure or login only format." Will you accept that, Kirk?

Kirk: I do.

Randy: I think that having a login for membership is at the very top of the list. This will take care of challenges with the Elections committee, and allow us to have the audio and eventually the video, and then at end, in a phased approach, interactive meetings. We have to crack the nut that is a secure login for our membership – like a whole lot of other organizations have – to begin to be able to put up whatever content we want for the membership.

Jen Lin: Is the review portion of this motion still intact?

Indigo: I said that the meetings would be put up on the website by Sunday night, based on my assumption that the secretary is part of this team and already has authority to work with the minutes and he would be helping to determine what is appropriate to be online.

Jen-Lin: That is important too. My question was is there a timeline for when this group comes back and reports to the board about the process and how it is working. Is it being used, is it effective – how many logins are we getting for our efforts?

Peggy: This has been talked about for 8 to 10 years and we've had enough talk. This motion asks us to make the first step, so that we can start the process. This is to include our whole family. You have to do this project incrementally.

Joseph: I think the friendly amendment is a substantial change and it should answer all the objections. There are people on this team I have great confidence in who will filter what is inappropriate.

Indigo: In the last line, "this team will report back to the board quarterly with updates."

Paxton: I am working on a Capital project that will fund equipment to implement this.

Indigo moved and Kirk seconded that the board create a volunteer team to be responsible for the uploading of recorded OCF BoD meetings each month. This team will consist of the recording secretary, up to two fair members, and two board members (one from each rotation), with the assistance of the staff as needed to accomplish the task. Initially the team will be Randy Turney, Miles Thompson, Peggy Fitzgerald, Paxton Hoag, and Indigo Ronlov. The team will be determined yearly at the board retreat.

As soon as practical or possible, this team will be responsible for uploading the meetings as either the secretary's audio recording or a video recording in a secure or login only format. A board page will be created on the OCF .net site where the content will be uploaded no later than the Sunday night following the board meeting.

Additionally, this team will monitor how this is being received by the membership, as well as explore the possibility of offering live interactive meetings in the future. This team will report back to the Board quarterly with updates.

Jon: I wish you'd take the word "or" out.

LT: I'd like to strike the word "possible" because it is implied in "practical." Nothing that is practical can be impossible.

Indigo: I am not ready to take out the word "or" until we get clear on the process. I will guarantee that login would be the preference.

Motion passed 9-1 Lucy opposed

Paxton moved and Casey seconded to direct the Personnel committee to update the General Manager job description for approval at the January 26, 2015 Board meeting in anticipation of a new hire.

Jen Lin: The Personnel committee intends to post the current GM job description on the .net site. We invite members to send us feedback on updates or revisions. Feedback is due January 1, 2015.

Motion passed: 10-0

Jon moved and Sue seconded that the Personnel committee is directed to formulate a recommendation for the General Manager hiring process for approval at the January 26, 2015 Board meeting.

Motion passed 10-0

Jon moved and Sue seconded that we modify the employee probationary period policy to shorten the term before which a new hire becomes eligible for employer provided healthcare benefits from 90 to 60 days in order to comply with the Affordable Care Act. All other probation items will remain at 90 days.

Motion passes 10-0

Jack moved and Paxton seconded to change the status of the Site/Facilities Manager hire from contract to at will employee at the end of the contract, December 31, 2014.

Jon: As a matter of process I think we should have waited to make this change until after the employee evaluations were completed.

Motion passes 10-0

Lucy moved and Sue seconded to appoint Crystalyn Autuchovich to Budget Committee.

Jon: Obviously the criteria for a committee member is a willingness to serve. I am wondering what skills and expertise she will bring to the Budget committee?

Hilary: Crystalyn stepped up to a leadership role in the Kitchen cabinet position. I was her budget liaison and that crew spends a lot of money really quickly. It is tough and Crystalyn did a spectacular job. She is a quick study who is interested in other parts of the Fair. She has been coming to the Budget committee meetings – driving down from Portland. As many of you know, Chris Brown can no longer serve on the Budget committee

and we had an additional resignation last month from Leslie Yudin. We are short-handed and would love to have Crystalyn.

Jon: I will vote for the motion, but want to say for the record I attended the last Budget committee meeting and though I may not agree with all the decisions made, I truly appreciate the time and diligence the committee members give to the budget process.

Kirk: Crystalyn, thank you!

Motion passes 10-0

Jon moved and LT seconded to adopt a found cash disposition policy. Cash with a value of \$100 or more turned into Lost and Found shall be dealt with in a manner consistent with state law including:

- 1. Giving notice in writing to the Lane County Clerk that the money was found and**
- 2. Within 20 days after the date of the finding, publishing a notice of the finding a newspaper of general circulation in Lane County once each week for two consecutive weeks. Such notice shall state the general description of the money found, the name and address of the Fair, and the final date before which the money may be claimed.**

Cash with a value of \$100 or more will be retained for at least three months and if unclaimed after that period 10% will be made available to the finder of the cash so long as the Fair has their contact information and the balance (90% or 100%) will be donated to a 501(c)(3) charitable organization of the Fair's choosing with consideration being given to the wishes of the finder.

Cash with a value under \$100 turned into Lost and Found shall be retained for at least two months. If unclaimed after two months, cash with a value under \$100 will be donated to a 501(c)(3) charitable organization of the Fair's choosing.

Codi: I am a traffic coordinator and I understand we are a part of a magical team. We are all a part of the deal, and I believe in that. A lot of our volunteers believe in that. I've talked to a lot of people about this because the cash (found) was significant. Ultimately, the owner should be the one to get this money. If that is not happening, why are we not following the Oregon statute? The board decision is for it to go another place. Why are we not keeping it in-house? The intent when I turned it into a Backup Manager was that it was to go back to the owner. Hopefully, we are making a good magical choice.

Julian: I think that it's outrageous to expect people to turn in over \$100. The person that had the good faith to turn in a large sum of money should be awarded something.

Cher: I am from Traffic camp as well and I agree with what Julian said. Since the money was found and the Fair didn't acknowledge Codi's honesty in turning in that large sum of money, I think it is creating a reason to be dishonest. People will say that they didn't even give her 10% of the money. For the Fair to keep it, doesn't promote honesty and the family unit that I thought the Fair was.

Steve: In doing this, there is 10% that goes to the finder of the money. There are laws to live by in Oregon. The law is what the motion says. Anything over a value of \$100 that is found, for the finder to get it, there is a process. That process is exactly what is in this motion. You have to notify the Clerk of the Court in the county it was found in. If you found money and put it in your pocket, you would be basically stealing that money if you did not do the process that is the State law. Codi should have a gold star because she did exactly what a Fair member should have done. As we are out there as volunteers of the Fair, I view it that we are all agents of the Fair. Someone left a substantial amount of money lying around and no one claimed it. I determined what the law was and we followed it. We put a note in the Eugene Weekly regarding the found money and no one claimed it. This motion follows the law. I would rather the Fair got the 90%, but this motion covers that. The Fair can say we give it to ourselves. This is a pre-cursor to reevaluating how we are doing lost and found for things, too.

Hilary: Part of the concept here is that volunteers are agents of the Fair onsite. When Codi handed the found money to Grumpy he continued to act as an agent of the Fair, securing the money and going through all of the procedures. The expectation is that the Fair will handle found money responsibly. If you lose money at the Fair, it would be really nice if you could trust people and you can look for it and it can be found. We are trying to make it work for everybody.

Joseph: We should make every effort to follow our policies in accord with the law.

Jon: On the issue of what percent should be given to the finder, I chose 10% for the motion, I've no feedback that it should be more or less. I wanted to get the motion out tonight to find out how my fellow board members feel about the finder's fee. My personal preference is that the money be added to our philanthropic efforts. The motion is such that it could be retained by the Fair.

Indigo: Included in this paper is the Oregon Statute Chapter 98, Section 98.005. The first point in this is that if it is over \$100, this is the process. The second point says, "If no person appears and establishes ownership of the money or goods prior to the expiration of three months after the date of the notice to the county clerk under subsection (i) of this section, the finder shall be the owner of the money or goods." This cash disposition policy is saying that the finder shall not be the owner of the money or goods – they will get 10% and the rest goes to the Fair. In order to follow the law, what I am reading is that the finder becomes the owner of the money or the goods – it is not the Oregon Country Fair. The other issue I have is the policy is being created after the fact of some found money. The policy is going backwards to address something that has already happened. I don't think that is right. I have a hard time voting for this. What the finder chooses to do with the money or goods is up to the finder. If the policy is that people are going to get 10% of \$100, that does not motivate them to be honest.

LT: In the paragraph that discusses the 10% finders fee and the 90 or 100% -- I recommend we insert, so long as the Fair has their contact information the balance – and make 90 or 100% parenthetic.

Jon: I will accept that friendly amendment.

LT: In addition to the statute that is cited, in Chapter 164, which is the property crimes statute – 164065, it is in fact a crime to keep property that you have reason to believe was lost. One would hope that if honesty doesn't

work, due concern for the law would be sufficient. In respect to Indigo's statutory interpretation of 98.005 paragraph 2, the question is how we define 'finder.' The suggestion has been made that when we are acting in our official capacity at the Fair we are in fact all agents of the Fair, making the Fair the finder. I share the practical concerns. Not everyone at the Fair or even everyone in this room is Codi. People might find it very difficult to pass up a pile of thousands of dollars. I suspect that most of the money will not get turned in anyway.

Lucy: For about 30 years I was the mother of the Country Fair Lost and Found. At the end of the Fair there would be more than a pickup truck of stuff. There was a variety of items of considerable financial value and items of great emotional value. Stuffed bears, a live pet rabbit, a hand annotated copy of the Koran, and 8 inch hunting knife to name a few. Over the years, a substantial amount of money was turned in. Stuff does come home, there is a good process in place. When people lose something they fill out a form, and the Lost and Found faeries match the forms with the pickup truck of stuff and send it home. It is rather astonishing. It does happen.

Kirk: I would prefer if the number were 20% for the finder. I am also taken with the definition of the finder. It is a nice sounding argument that we are 'agents of the Fair' as a finder. My question would be how would that stand up in court if someone wanted to challenge it?

Charlie: When this came up part of the calculus was, "what is the liability and exposure once you find this money?" My take was once it passed from Codi, in her capacity as a volunteer, into a Backup Manager's hands it became the Fair's responsibility. That limited Codi's liability and put us on the hot seat for the liability and we were acting as the finder. I did consult Russell and would be willing, if we don't vote on this tonight, to take it back to him for further clarification of 'finder.'

Casey: When Codi gave the money to Steve, it became the Fair's responsibility. I have no qualms with Kirk saying that the finder's fee should go up to 15-20% which adds incentive for people to be open and honest. I read this as the Fair trying to reward people with Codi's generosity and honesty. This is the Fair rewarding the finder and taking the rest of the money to do something good in the community. I think this motion could use some revision and have Russell look at it again. I don't see this as the Country Fair being greedy. I see it as us having consideration for the honesty of the finder.

Jack: When dealing with goodness, we need to go big or go home. If we are thinking the OCF is the finder, then I guess we get the 10%, and we are making that decision as the finder. It happens that I have knowledge of the amount. It seems like we are doing the right thing but in my heart if I did what Codi did I'd just think I was doing the right thing and at the end, I was the finder. Not to speak for Codi, the \$11,000 might be more impactful to Codi's life than the Fair's. This sort of honesty and trust is worth more than the amount of money to distribute.

Jon: I'm willing to bump the finder's fee to 20% and I'm willing to table. There are a couple of things that need to be addressed. I'd like the attorney to take a look at it to determine if volunteers are agents of the Fair and indeed it is the Fair finding the property instead of an individual. I would like to figure out another word to use for finder so it is not confusing in determining the law. Is it the expectation that if volunteers and staff find stuff on the Fair property, it gets turned into Lost and Found? If a Fair member finds something, posts their own notice as per the statute and attempts to claim what they found as theirs, then is there an issue if that person continues as a volunteer of the Fair?

Motion tabled until January

Jack moved and Sue seconded give \$500 net (year-end bonus) to all the staff including Robin, Shane, Charlie norma, Andy, Jeff and Tony

Motion passes 10-0

Kirk moved and Casey seconded to appoint Melissa Davis as Cart Central coordinator.

Charlie: David will stay on as co-coordinator. He feels that Melissa is the right choice.

Motion passed 10-0

Kirk moved and Paxton seconded to accept the draft Parks Permit SUP concept and map presented by management to the BOD and to Path Planning Committee and to direct management to proceed to determine application fees and prepare and submit the application for County review.

Kirk: This is based on work done by Management and Thom Lanfear as presented at the Board retreat. It was further presented at the Path Planning Committee where a motion to accept and proceed was passed.

Joseph: We need to be able to manage the Fair as one property. This does that and helps the ecosystem.

Charlie: Several years back potential issues around permitting of campgrounds in the rural residential around the Fair came to our attention. We have our non-conforming land use verification that covers the Fair, the original property purchase, for the event, for Main camp and for slightly after Main camp. It does not extend to the uplands properties that we've purchased since. This park permit will be an overlay that will extend to those parcels and some other areas. There are some exempted areas that we cannot apply for like the Out of Site Lot, and sections of the Far Side. There are also more things afoot at the county level on new outdoor gatherings. This is an effort to get us ahead of the curve of compliance, particularly around our camping for our three-day event, but additionally for year-round use. We don't have a clear guideline for the many ways that we want to use our property year-round. When we went to the county almost 15 years ago to help neighbors to establish a platform for their campgrounds we went under the same consideration. Alice's and Dahinda Acres are allowed to be camps because of those permits. With the park permit it would not change.

Hilary: The park permit is available to land owning non-profit organizations. It is not available for neighbors. This SUP does not include anything about the Community Center. It describes uses we are already doing. It is very important for ongoing compliance.

Charlie: We've had permits for temporary campgrounds for years and renew them every year.

Motion passes 10-0

Kirk moved and Casey seconded to accept the Community Center Committee's recommendation that the refined building square footage from the Charrette process (shown in the FFN report and on line) be used by the CCC as their approximate target sizes for further development and study.

Kirk: The CCC has reached a progress point in solidifying the size needed for the Community Center. It needs acceptance from the Board to be able to proceed with further committee studies that are size-based, like parking, gray water, energy use and preliminary construction estimates.

Joseph: I hope our gray water calculations will go beyond the square footage of the building.

Jon: One of my concerns in voting for this as the size presented is the uncertainty around the requirement the county has for parking spaces, intersections or road improvements. I would feel more comfortable making this decision with the information from the traffic engineer that the Community Venter committee has secured. I can't vote for this without that input.

Jon moved to table the motion.

Motion failed due to lack of a second

Jon moved and Diane seconded to offer a viewpoint counter to the majority opinion of the Community Center Committee. I will focus primarily on the proposed size of the facility although I do have significant concerns about other aspects of the project.

The primary driving force for sizing the facility appears to be Main Camp meal use. A review of the three meal count graphs prepared by the committee will show that the daily meal count generally stays below 1,000 except for the week before the Fair. Except for the week before the Fair, in 2011 no day reached 1,000 meals, in 2012 one day reached about 1,250 meals, and in 2013 about four days exceeded 1,000 meals with the highest being about 1,500 meals. When you consider that these are daily meal counts and the highest meal count of the day would probably be lunch, it is likely that other than the week before the Fair the maximum single meal count would be somewhere around 600.

The week before the Fair in 2011 most days were under 1,250 meals with a peak of just under 3,000 meals. In 2012 the peak was also a little under 3,000 with most days under 1,500. In 2013 the peak was about 3,750 just before the Fair with most of that week being between 2,000 and 3,000 meals.

The proposed indoor and covered outdoor seating area proposed by the committee majority will seat about 591 people banquet style. Historically the need for that much seating has been seen only in the week before the Fair. If there are three eating shifts, that amount of seating would be sufficient for nearly 1,800 people. This does not take into consideration the proposed provision of additional outdoor seating that would only have a temporary covering as needed.

Rather than designing for maximum use, I believe we should design for optimal use. Reducing the indoor space by 50% to 2,000 square feet (1,300 Square feet meeting space and 700 square feet auxiliary space) while increasing the outdoor seating space by 33% to 4,000 square feet will still provide banquet seating for 482 people. This will also reduce construction and maintenance costs.

This smaller indoor and larger outdoor space will also seat about 757 people auditorium style and two spaces could easily be configured so that one could easily flow from one into the other. During the few days immediately prior to the Fair when meal counts spike, we could easily provide additional outdoor seating area that could be temporarily covered in the event of rain at a much lower cost to construct and maintain.

As for kitchen size, I think we can reduce indoor kitchen space by 58% to 1,250 square feet while increasing outdoor covered space by 80% to 2,250 square feet and still meet our core needs. That outdoor covered kitchen space would be similar to our current screen kitchen. Industry standards for "a minimal 'fresh food' production kitchen to serve 200 meals up to 1,000 meals would be 1,000 square feet." (<http://www.ecoliteracy.org/essays/answers-basic-facilities-questions>) Beyond that amount, one square foot would be added for each additional meal served. A 3,500 square foot indoor/outdoor kitchen could easily meet our meal production needs even at their peak.

The indoor/outdoor configuration I have set out will also significantly reduce construction costs. The only cost formula we currently have is that used in the PIVOT Report. With that formula, the configuration in the PIVOT Report was estimated to cost a little over 4.3 million dollars. With the configuration proposed by the committee majority and factoring out the "green construction" premium no longer being recommended by the committee, the PIVOT formula yields an estimated cost of a little more than 3.4 million dollars. With the configuration I have presented above, the estimated cost is a little more than 2.3 million dollars. Since that configuration also has less year-round indoor space, maintenance and operational costs will be less than the other configurations.

The gist of what I have presented is that rather than designing for maximum use (the highest, biggest, largest), we should design for optimum use (that best or most favorable).

Hilary: Jon presented this idea to the Community Center committee and we said we do not agree you can take a few of Pivot's numbers out, extrapolate and give square footage. Therefore, I hold no faith in a calculation using the original Pivot report and the \$3.5 million is not a reliable number. The sizing for the kitchen is quite good due to the participation of the kitchen coordinators and the size of the kitchen described in the original report is about the size of the kitchen that we have right now. I would hesitate to have less square footage for the kitchen than we have now. Indoor and outdoor seating is debatable. Jon, I wish you had worked over more of these things with the committee.

Steve: I think we should put faith in the committee that is dealing with this. It is time we do something and stop putting up objections at the last minute. This is a way to try to get the Community Center stopped rather than proceeding. We need to deal with the fact that our kitchen is inadequate and we need to deal with some indoor meeting space, which would foster the interactive meetings we've been talking about here tonight.

Charlie: I appreciate the minority opinion. The numbers in terms of money is speculation. The goal of the entire charrette was to set the size parameters so we can move into the next phases of development. This will be where we put dollars and cents to what it will cost. Many things have changed since the wide hoop that was the Pivot report came to get focus on this project. It is hard to look at those numbers and have anything but a certain amount of frustration. One thing we forget about the size of the kitchen, is that we rely heavily on volunteers in the kitchen for our food production. This is not some slick commercial kitchen where you have trained chefs – we take 50 or 60 volunteers who work with donated vegetables. It is a very labor-intensive process that takes space that we don't have an abundance of to be clean and sanitary. We have to look beyond today's uses – this is for 20 years down the road. Our trajectory has not shrunk at any point in the last 20 or 30 years – it has only grown. If we do a mealtime in 3 sittings it stretches the meal time out to up to 4 hours and the kinks with that for the crews are substantial. There was a lot of effort in the charrette and a lot of people came out and participated. This is a collective finding and the committee presented the charrette findings in the sizes presented.

Mouseman: I thought the charrette had parameters that were laid out before we got there. I've been in the food business and you don't build a kitchen to meet peak need.

Crystalyn: The current kitchen is not big enough to feed the number of people we fed in 2014. Shrinking it or even keeping it the same for a building we want to use far into the future is not feasible. We already have volunteers starting weeks before Fair working all night long because there is not space to do the baking during the day. Please don't make our kitchen smaller.

JonP: In setting the parameters, what if we decide we want to be scalable? How flexible does setting these numbers allow us to be?

Tomas: I have problems with the flexibility and cost. It would be nice to know cost in a flexible way. I've thought of part of it being mobile.

Heather: Jon was not the only one at the charrette who wanted a smaller size. You might need to build a building as big as the committee is proposing if you are also willing to double the population of the Fair.

Lucy: The space we have is not adequate to plan for the future. We need to consider there has been exponential growth at the Fair within the last 10 years. We need to consider this a gift to the community, not only the Fair community, but the greater Fern Ridge community.

Diane: I want a Community Center and an upland kitchen, but I share some of Jon's concerns. I have expressed them at more than one charrette. We need to do it at less cost. I have other questions: who's building it; do we need to hire more staff to maintain it? I would like to hold the Community Center committee to a high standard – there is no business or financial plan.

Paxton: I appreciate the minority report. It gives a distinction in size and a reduction in costs. But the Community Center does need to be bigger than the amendment is proposing.

Kirk: In multiple arenas, these kinds of numbers have been looked at, considered and regarded as too small. The Pivot report numbers were larger than what came out of the charrette. The numbers from the charrette are averages of all the participants' input.

Casey: Jon, you telling us we need a smaller kitchen does not take into consideration a lot of the work that has been done. It is like me saying you have to work in a 4 x 8 space for dog crew. It is absurd. I don't need us to spend \$4 or 5 million on a facility, but to blindly cut everything in half because you don't like the price tag does not take into account any of our actual needs. If you want to do this, fine, but you should probably eliminate Kitchen crew and hire 8 full time employees to feed our volunteers. With the size space you are proposing, that is the only way that it is going to get done.

Jack: What Jon is presenting is really speaking to a bigger issue as Heather said. I have been unabashedly pro-growth. We've kept the Fair successful and its capacities up to handle our families and future families. If I have to pick people that have pushed for this kind of growth – I am definitely guilty. I get most of my information from the people that come to the event, and what they think about it and what they bring back to their community when they leave. My motivation when I first stepped up to do more, was to make sure the capacities we have are adequate. The reality of this is about growth and the Community Center committee has understood that from the beginning. This is the path that we are on, a path we have been on and there will continue to be opposition to anything that is moving us further in a growth direction. As a family that participates both as patrons and volunteers, you are looking at really basic stuff. This is the first basic infrastructure we are talking about doing for the future of the OCF and the local community. The realities all point to us having a successful future and growing along with the communities around us. We stripped out most of the environmental advantages for a reason that I'm not quite sure of – I'm assuming it's cost or appeasement. I think the position of our capacities looking into the future define us. I'm not saying spend money we don't have. We are a volunteer organization and we need to build for that. If our volunteer organization needs this and the people want to look at the OCF as being on the edge of where growth is going in the world – we need to make it efficient, which is going to cost money. It also means we have a volunteer base that is not calculated into any of the costs of the building. If it costs \$400 a square foot to build this, and it takes us a longer time and with volunteers to put in X amount of labor, this will still be reflected in the value of the building. It is not going to be reflected in the cost of the building. Twenty years ago no one in this room even remotely dreamed we were going to have all that property. I don't want to counter the opposition on this, I understand the significance of a conversation of growth. We have to confront growth and be realistic about what that means to us.

Jon: I am not proposing this to oppose the Community Center. I would like to vote for a Community Center. I can only vote for one that is fiscally responsible and one that is not going to sit empty. The price figures are more for comparison. I know the actual cost may not be what the Pivot report yields. It is the only formula we have and the only way I can present comparative information. Both configurations are going to need three sittings to feed 1500 people. It is more expensive to build indoor space than outdoor space. Every time I try to bring things up on the committee I get reasons why what I propose is not feasible or practical rather than any serious consideration of exploring it as a possibility. I have been very frustrated with the committee process. The

committee is filled with boosters and has not, in my view, seriously considered anything than what it set out to consider in the first place. I consider the charrette to have been structured to come up with the answers it came up with. I would prefer to realistically discuss this kind of a thing at a different point in time than now.
Amendment fails 2-8 opposed Jack, Paxton, LT, Sue, Lucy, Indigo, Kirk and Casey

Original motion:

Kirk moved and Casey seconded to accept the Community Center Committee's recommendation that the refined building square footage from the Charrette process (shown in the FFN report and on line) be used by the CCC as their approximate target sizes for further development and study.
Motion passed 8-2, opposed Jon, abstaining Diane

President's Peace

Jack gives Charlie a big hug!

Draft Agenda for January meeting

Sound policy revisited (Chewie/Indigo) **tabled to January**
Select Barter Fair Manager (Sue) **tabled to January**
Direct By-laws committee to review membership criteria (LT)
Marijuana policy (Bear)
Appoint members of the Diversity Task Force (Jon)
Found cash disposition policy (Jon) **tabled to January**
Support Scribe tribe (Kirk)
Volunteer time summary (Kirk)