

**Oregon Country Fair Board of Directors' Meeting
January 26, 2015, 7:00 pm, Central Presbyterian Church**

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, Bear Wilner-Nugent. **Peach Gallery present:** Staff (Charlie, norma, Robin and Shane), Officers (Steve, Hilary, Randy), and 25 members and guests.

Agenda review

Bear: In addition to the budgetary items, we are going to vote to accept the General Manager job description. There will be votes on the mileage rate, conflict of interest declarations, staff and crew budgets and coordinator food voucher and expense proposals.

Announcements

Indigo: This meeting is being recorded and it will be posted on the site as we did last month. Those that are interested in receiving the URL for this meeting send an email to ocfbod@gmail.com. If you have requested the URL previously, you will receive the URL for this meeting.

General Manager Job Description

Jack moved and Lucy seconded to accept the General Manager job description provided by the Personnel Committee and printed in the January FFN.

LT: I'd like to propose a friendly amendment to the section on Essential Job Functions from "General Manager will be prepared to provide oral and written reports for monthly BoD meetings" to "General Manager will provide oral and written reports for monthly BoD meetings."

Jack and Lucy: We're OK with friendly amendment.

Motion passed 10-0

Bear: At next week's board meeting, we will be voting on the membership of the GM search committee, as well as the timeline for the search.

Conflict of interest declarations for board, officers, and staff – relating to contracts and payments in 2015 budget

Indigo: My family owns Café Mam and the Oregon Country Fair purchases coffee from Café Mam, uses it in the kitchen, and Culture Jam. We donate a lot of coffee, so to vote on those types of budgets I need to declare this interest.

LT: I do receive mileage from the Fair.

Paxton: I collect mileage as well.

Kirk: I receive mileage.

Diane: Ditto on the mileage.

Jon: I took mileage last year. Also, I am a coordinator is that a conflict of interest?

Bear: We have not historically recorded that particular declaration, but there you go.

Bear: I could take mileage, but I don't choose to.

Mileage rate

Hilary: In the past the budget handbook specified the mileage rate. This year we said in the handbook that "you will be reimbursed at a rate to be determined by the board." Operationally, we are prepared to continue the 35 cents/mile if you don't make a motion. It would be nice if you would verify what rate you would like people to be reimbursed. Traditionally, we've reimbursed

both volunteers and paid staff at the same rate that approximates the Federal rate minus the portion that the IRS calculates – the operating portion of the car rate.

Jack moved and Kirk seconded to accept the mileage rate the OCF reimburses volunteers and staff at as outlined by co-treasurer.

Indigo: I think it is great that people have the opportunity to be reimbursed, especially those that travel a lot. It is great to have volunteers who are willing to donate that aspect of their giving to the organization.

Paxton: I just wanted to again declare my conflict of interest since I get a lot of mileage.

Bear: We get a lot of mileage out of Paxton!

Jon: I think paid staff should be reimbursed at IRS approved rate. I don't think we should be asking staff to take less than what they are entitled to. And I'd like to offer that as friendly amendment.

LT: The Federal rate is 57 cents/mile.

Jack: If this is an accountable plan, I will take the friendly amendment on.

Hilary: With the employees, it is always an accountable plan. Employees can be reimbursed at the rate without it being income to them – unlike the rest of us – if we get reimbursed at 35 cents/mile the amount over 14 cents/mile (volunteer rate) is actually income to us.

Jack: I do accept the friendly amendment.

Bear: The motion as amended is to add: The motion as amended is to add: **Employees get mileage at the IRS approved rate and staff and volunteers get mileage at 35 cents/mile.**
Motion passes 10-0

Crew budgets

Jack moved and Lucy seconded to accept the 2015 Crew budget in the amount of \$759,332 as reported by the Budget committee.

Hilary: The difference in this budget and previous years is the Craft Lot development. The main budgets that we looked at in the Budget committee process were things like security, water, White Bird, all to increase the infrastructure for the Craft Lot. This is just the crew portion of that.

Jon: What are the Crafts Lot expenses on lines 495, 496 and 497?

Steve: These are the food voucher numbers. Crafts Lot is an entertainment lot like Chela Mela. This means we allocated 846 food vouchers for the crew. And 1709 for the entertainers.

Hilary: The entertainment will be under the Dance pavilion, piano lounge, and the Flow Zone. I would have used the phrase “trade passes.” The way that this and Chela Mela are structured, there are crew people, facilitators for trade people and entertainers and those coming on trade passes are putting in applications like entertainers – brought in for the event.

Jon: I see nothing for coordinator expense.

Hilary: There is no coordinator. CLOG is being the coordinator.

Jon: Who is getting the food vouchers and who are they responsible to? Are these food vouchers specific to entertainers? Are expenses going to be ongoing expenses?

Hilary: I would expect these to be ongoing expenses. There are several areas, including operations, support people, setup, stage managers, lighting, sound crews. Also, there are those coming in on contracts who are bringing art, presentations or activities.

Jon: Crafts Lot does not have a coordinator and Chela Mela does?

Hilary: We are trying to develop that staff so that we can say these are the coordinators that are going to come in and do it. Hopefully out of all these people, we will find one or more coordinators.

Jon: In the supplies portion of this budget, is this all ongoing expenses?

Hilary: There are a lot of initial expenses. So, this number will come down.

Kirk: CLOG has developed roles and responsibilities for the rollout of Crafts Lot and that document is on the Path Planning site. It explains that this year, there is no specific coordinator. It is the CLOG group with a heavy emphasis on Hilary and Sally. The goal is to find someone to take that role. A significant setup crew is needed due to there being a lot of removable items like shade cloth, poles, and ropes that go up and down each year.

LT: The 846 food vouchers are for the 47 people you mentioned?

Steve: Yes, they get 18 each.

LT: The reason I asked is 1709 is not divisible by 18.

Charlie: Five of us have made up CLOG for the last two years. This is the beginning structure for what we will eventually bring to the board for adoption as a crew. At this point we don't have an identified leader, and it is going to take all five of us to get it open and running. In the moment it is this distributed management structure.

Jon On the principle of trying defund that which I do not agree, again this year **I move to delete the food vouchers for the Misc. Fish Ladders.**

Motion dies for lack of a second.

Bear: Fish Ladders are after-hours sweep in targeted areas for people without wristbands.

Jon: Are the actual numbers the final actual numbers? Are they the almost final actual numbers? When will we get final numbers?

Steve: These were the final numbers, up to December 31, 2014.

Hilary: I would call them unadjusted December 31, 2014 numbers. Most numbers will not change, some could.

Indigo: As we approve these budgets, I want to put a call out to the coordinators to be mindful how they spend it and the sustainability at which the products and services come to us as per our 7th Generation policy.

Hilary: I received an email from Doug Richards who wanted to relay he really, really, really wants us to move to more durables, especially to replace one-use only water bottles.

Bear: In terms of commending, I want to recognize pre-Fair kitchen for being under budget last year. This is a monumental task.

LT: I would like to commend Jim Sahr for having his own line item and a zero budget.

Steve: There are some legacy line items. Because they were always on my spreadsheet, I have kept them on – someday I will take them off.

Motion passed: 10-0

Jack moved and Indigo seconded to accept the Board of Directors budget in the amount of \$114,950.

Charlie: My question is where to give a permanent home for the LPFM money line item funding. \$3,325 has been taken in in donations, therefore there needs to be a line item in either the board budget or my budget. Either the board or GM needs to have a way to approve expenditures.

Steve: I put this in the General Manager budget, but did not add it as part of the total. Both the LPFM and the Community Center money are dedicated money for those functions.

Kirk: If we move the LPFM to the board budget, does it place the disbursement to the board or to the General Manager? And further, collectively who do we want to handle the disbursement of the LPFM money?

Jon: The board is the license holder, so my preference would be for this to be in the Board budget. The Heiman Fund's much less than what was budgeted. Is this a finished number or is it still in process?

Hilary: It is not a finished number. The \$20,000 is the match. There is another line item that was spent that was not part of the match.

Jon: Under the mileage expense, is this to cover the travel expenses for board members – so if a board member were to live in Seattle and took the train or lived in San Francisco and flew it would be reimbursable?

Jack: I would say yes.

Jon: I have seen this line item increase over the years and wonder if we need to bump it to \$7,000.

Jack: Either way it is speculation. If we spend this and we need more we increase it. I will not accept a friendly amendment to move to \$7,000.

Jon moved and LT seconded to increase the Board Expense for mileage, child care, postage, and phone to \$7,000.

Sheldon: With gas about half of what it was last year, this number less likely to go up. It is speculation based on the price of fuel. I don't necessarily see a reason to increase it.

norma: We don't reimburse mileage depending on the price of gas.

Joseph: Unless you see some reason that it will go down, this makes sense.

Paxton: I think we should increase it because of the amount of work we have coming up this year.

Indigo: I think it is important that an organization reimburses its volunteers in appropriate ways. I think that it is important to encourage our volunteers to give to our organization in non-cash ways is important too. I don't want to increase it unless we get to a place where we need to at the end of the year and adjust it at that point.

Bear: Board members who don't take reimbursements can deduct the appropriate amounts on their taxes.

LT: I think the expense reimbursement allows people of various economic means to participate. I would say if we don't pass the amendment our budget will be off more than if we do given our current numbers.

Jack: I will accept the friendly amendment.

Indigo: It continues to be speculation.

Kirk: It is a projection, not speculation. \$7,000 seems closer in a projection sense.

Amendment to the motion passed; 8-1-1 Lucy opposed and Sue abstaining.

Jon: Under donations, our actual donations were \$22,000, and we budgeted for \$20,000. Our donation requests are going up and the pattern is the amount of the donations is also going up. Either we bump it up or put the brakes on our generosity. My question is will a friendly amendment be accepted to bump this up to \$25,000?

Jack: Following the same logic as the mileage, what we are doing here is continuing to budget to actual. I do not accept the friendly amendment.

Bear: I think we should put LPFM in the board budget. I think we should manage this as a new rollout project. Particularly, since we are going through a GM transition.

Paxton: I wanted to point out the donation is \$20,000 with \$5,000 reoccurring. I think we need to look at our reoccurring donations.

Hilary: LPFM did not go through the Budget committee. The number in the line item is the amount that was donated. When I talked to Michael James Long about what the money needed to be spent on, he sent back the list from the business plan – which was \$9,000 to \$15,000. He did not narrow it down. I think it would be more efficient if the GM approved the expenditures instead of LPFM having to always come back to the board. When Kirk was saying that the budget is a projection, that is a piece of it, but it is also an authorization to spend. It is an important thing, someone getting a budget and asking for money – this is the authorization that means they can get that money back. They cannot spend five times as much and expect to get the money back. Also, the board orientation is the same as last time and there was talk about looking at that item too.

Casey: In terms of efficiency, our GM should be in charge of the LPFM. I think that having the board involved would draw us away from the tasks we have to accomplish for the 2015 Fair.

Steve: I agree with Casey, this should stay in the GM budget. This authorizes the spending when appropriate. You don't want the board to have to vote on every dime on any of these items.

Indigo: Coming back around to the donations, it makes me think that we should commit to working with Randy and putting an item on New Business to get a list of the reoccurring donations that we have been giving to over and over again, as well as our memberships. So that we don't have a situation like with Skipping Stones this last time and we can determine who we want to continue to fund long-term and who we want to encourage to find other funding sources.

Bear: I like what Indigo just said. We have this split up into donations, reoccurring donation/memberships. I would also like to take a look at the change line item. We instituted this after the DA's threat to the Fair in 1997. It was intended to, within the limits set by law, fund law reform activities. We have succeeded; we have passed forfeiture reform and legalized marijuana; we may want to look very seriously at how much of the budget we have on the change line item – not because there aren't things worth change, but ultimately this Fair was formed to give away money to other non-profits as well as other virtuous purposes and it may be that we wish to give away more money to other non-profits and have less earmarked for the change line item.

Jack: The history is a little bit longer than the "obey the law, change the law" – this actually evolved from the second event line, which for a long time we carried as \$50,000. When "obey the

law, change the law” came around it seemed appropriate to call the second event line item, the change line. Now, seeing what it’s been used for, it is what we could consider change. The change line is all part of that giving, however we want to deal with those lines – change line or reoccurring donations. The numbers that I’m looking at are the change, donations, recurring donations, board expenses and the Heiman Fund. Giving is a big hunk of our budget.

Jon: I’d like to see more change in the law than was done so that one could smoke in public, but I’m happy with the work that has been done. As far as LPFM, we have other items in the budget that we are not requiring people to come back to us when they want to spend money. I’m OK with it being part of the GM budget. I feel as the license holder, I would like the Board to have reports on how the money is being spent.

Jack: It seems what we are doing is moving LPFM over to a dedicated line item.

Paxton: I prefer to have LPFM in the board budget. We are the authorizing body. I am happy to have it in Charlie’s budget. I’m happy to have it anywhere. I want to point out we are working toward the FCC deadline. The LPFM group is going to be raising between \$4,000 and \$9,000 and spending it by July. We have to do this to meet the FCC deadline. It doesn’t mean we have to have an entire broadcasting station. We need a transmitter, equipment room, an antennae site, rigging, cabling to get us on the air by July. LPFM needs a way to get money into the line item so that it can be spent on the equipment we need to build. In February, there will be new proposal for the location of the station.

Diane: I am with Jack and Jon on the change line item. I definitely want to keep it and we still need to change the Federal law.

LT: First, on the LPFM, as a practical matter it is a matter of executive action and I support keeping it with GM, and the board be kept in the loop. On the change line item, we have made a lot of progress on personal freedom issues, legal protections, but there are enormous issues around climate justice.

Casey: For Jon and Paxton, I hear you saying you want to do what makes it the most easy with regard to the LPFM. There is only one day a month that the board comes together as a group for LPFM to payments made. They have access to the GM more days of the month. On the change line item, in my time on the board I’ve seen it used for a variety of useful things.

Hilary: Two suggestions about LPFM, make a motion that up to \$20,000 that gets donated can be spent in accordance with the business plan that has been turned in. And have a monthly transaction report for the board so that you can see what’s being spent.

Motion passed 10-0

Jack moved and Indigo seconded to accept the General Manager’s budget in the amount of \$697,204.

Sheldon: Are we going to put the LPFM in here now?

Hilary: I think we should put the LPFM in the total of the GM budget.

Dean: Is this authorizing the \$3275 for LPFM? And, if more money comes into that line item will it be able to be spent out of this line item?

Bear: That will be subject to the board’s direction, usually we have a budget adjustment agenda item at every board meeting from the March meeting through the Fair.

Dean: Practically speaking, Hilary’s suggestion of putting that line item in at \$20,000 would be enough money for us to get started this year, build the transmitter and get the site up and operational. The \$3,000 is just enough to purchase a transmitter, but will not get us installation of the antennae, and auxiliary equipment in the order of \$8,000 to \$9,000.

Hilary: That is not exactly what I said. I understand that you want to be able to spend money that is donated. My suggestion was to make an upper limit of \$20,000 to spend without coming back to the board.

Dean: That would be great.

Sheldon: I thought the money Paxton said we had donated was \$7,000. Is that true?

Paxton: \$3,300.

Sheldon: Sorry I misunderstood.

Steve: Unless the board has decided on LPFM, I would suggest you not take Hilary’s suggestion. I do not think the board has decided to go forward on LPFM. Putting more money in the budget

than has been donated, is not the thing to do. There has only been a board motion that accepted the plan.

Bear: The motion before the board right now, with the friendly amendment that has been accepted is for a GM budget of \$700,529.

Joseph: LPFM should be in the GM budget for the flexibility.

Indigo: I don't think we should be putting any money beyond the donations that have come in as restricted funds for LPFM. As they say, all funds for this project will come outside of the Oregon Country Fair. If we are putting funds above the \$3,325, then we are saying we are committing those funds. I will not accept that as friendly amendment.

LT: The current amount the LPFM has to spend is \$3325. That number could increase and we can fashion an authorization that if the number increases, that is the spendable number. I agree with Indigo that it should not be more than has come in. I would say any dedicated funds will be available as what's already come in.

Paxton: I view the February board meeting as a critical meeting on this vote. If it passes, I will follow Hilary's suggestion to make a motion to allow LPFM to raise and spend \$20,000 according to their work plan.

Steve: I agree with what has been said and I believe this is a matter for the February board meeting.

Indigo: I would be willing to make a motion to the effect that any dedicated funds that come into this line item are accessible and spendable by the project.

Bear: The motion before the board is to accept the GM budget as presented at \$697,204 with the proviso that the dedicated donations to the LPFM may be spent at GM authorization in the amount that they have been received.

Steve: The only reason that I object to that is this is a budget process. And we are not talking about the budget now, rather something completely different.

Bear: I will say that \$697,204 plus or minus \$3,325 is still \$697,204.

Charlie: I think we should authorize the \$3,325 for LPFM which covers the immediate things that need to be paid for, would be allowable and that I'd sign off on. I would leave it this way.

Bear: The motion is for \$697,204 with the LPFM being its own thing to spend what it gets in donations. We are not including the LPFM in the total.

Jon: Question for the treasurers', this money has been donated to the LPFM station. If this money is spent and the station does not come on the air, are we liable for returning the money?

Hilary: No, if it is not spent, then we are liable.

Motion passed 10-0

Jack moved and Paxton seconded to accept the Site and Facility Manager's budget in the amount of \$119,800.

Shane: The increases in this budget are reflected in the fuel overage and we are working to put processes in place to limit the amount of fuel given to volunteers. The temporary employee line item will allow us to tackle some of the structure problems onsite.

Jon: The mosquito control BT – was there nothing spent on that last year?

Shane: That is not correct, we spent \$500.

Indigo: I want to thank you Shane for everything you have done this year. The site looks better than I've seen it look in years and this is because of your hard work and management.

Motion passed 10-0

Jack moved and Sue seconded to accept the Administrative Assistant's budget of \$38,770.

Jon: There was a copier overage?

norma: In the past I had asked to split it up into the copier lease and the copies. The company we use now has both lease and the copies as one price. And yes it is an overage.

Jon: Is this a five-year lease?

norma: We are in the first year of the five year lease.

Jon: The \$6,000 is lease amount?

norma: Yes, and the most expensive ones we make are the color copies.

Motion passed: 10-0

Jack moved and Sue seconded to accept the Operations Manager budget in the amount of \$147,250.

Charlie: I assume that I am now responsible for this budget and I'll continue to track it.

Steve: As of now there is no money in the Barter Fair. If we do the Barter Fair, we need to include a number at that time.

Paxton: I thought we asked for a placeholder.

Lucy: We did and it was denied.

Bear: The Budget committee recommended denying the placeholder.

Indigo: I want to thank Charlie for increasing the t-shirt budget because there seems to be something that comes up each year with product.

Kirk: I was looking at items for website, web and data management, telephone and IT. There are line items that are website related but are zero'd.

Charlie: We pulled them out of the GM budget and they went to OM budget.

Kirk: So everything that we have working towards the website is now in the OM?

Charlie: Yes.

Bear: In order to keep historical data in place, we do not delete rows in the budget.

Kirk: Are the numbers we are voting on maintenance for the website or new developments?

Charlie: They are both. More of the maintenance falls to web and data management, the website \$4,000 is more for the development for the upcoming websites. We will be having a summit around the website and web and data management. After this summit, I may come back with a budget adjustment if it is warranted. There will be a review on where these disparate projects are connecting.

Paxton moved and Diane seconded to make a friendly amendment to add \$4,000 to the Barter Fair line item as a placeholder.

Paxton: We are moving forward planning on having a Barter Fair this year. In a week we will be interviewing managers and it seems wrong to me to strike it out of the budget. We don't know what the costs are going to be. We are looking at Dragon Plaza for a simplified event. It is hard to pull this off without budget.

Hilary: I can't think of a time we've just had a placeholder for a line item. The Budget committee gets a proposal – here's what we are going to do. If you had said, here are the five things that we want to spend money on, the Budget committee could have dealt with it.

Paxton: We won't really know until later in the spring.

Hilary: And that is the time to add it to the budget.

Joseph: Unless there has been a decision to not have this event, this is an act of good faith.

Steve: If the task force develops the budget, that is the time to vote on it. It is pure speculation now; there has not been a vote to have the Barter Fair; when the task force comes to the board with a proposal to do it, that is the time to put the money in the budget.

Charlie: Simple enough, when there is actual numbers for a budget, we will do a budget adjustment. It is not an act of good faith to not put a dollar value in here – it is simply not how we budget. When we know what we're being asked to spend it on, we spend it.

Kirk: The board voted to postpone the Barter Fair until 2015. We are not having a vote on whether to do it or not.

Bear: From my point of view, there is no such thing as Barter Fair momentum that it automatically exists every year. I think it is the opposite, we have a Barter Fair if the board votes to have one and the staff and volunteers can carry it out. I am against the Barter Fair, I don't think we should ever bring it back and I'm glad that there is no money for it.

Jon: I assume that if the task force is interviewing managers, they are going to come to the board with a recommendation that someone be appointed as the manager of the Barter Fair. If I were to be appointed as the manager of anything before I accepted that I'd like to know what my budget is. I would hope that when the task force comes to the board with a recommendation for a manager, it also comes with a budget on what you plan to spend. It is my understanding that the BFTF is supposed to be working with operations to come up with a 2015 solution. I don't recollect if that solution has to be approved by the board or not, but I'd like to know what the solution is.

Putting it in the budget is an authorization to spend. If you don't need the \$4,000, I don't want to spend money you don't need. I think you should develop a budget and bring it when you come with a recommendation for a manager.

LT: I share Kirk's recollection of the Barter Fair. I think we're having it, but the general rule is we don't make up budget numbers is a good rule. The concern I have is that the task force proposes the budget and it is voted down by board to kill the Barter Fair. I am not convinced that we need to add to the line item or in this amount at this point.

Paxton withdraws the amendment.

Original motion: Jack moved and Sue seconded to accept the Operations Manager budget in the amount of \$147,250.

Motion passed 10-0

Jack moved and Lucy seconded to accept the Culture Jam budget in the amount of \$34,550.

Charlie: This is a \$1050 increase over previous years.

Sheldon: Culture Jam is great thing, has done a lot for us, and we have the organization to do it.

Charlie: Robin just completed a budget for a year-round programming event in partnership with the City of Eugene. This will necessitate a small amount of money and we will work that through the budget adjustment process for this second year-round program.

Jon: For the budget, I think it would be good to have all the youth programs under one budget and Culture Jam could be a subset of that. The more we do year-round youth programming, I'd like to see it in one place.

LT: I am a supporter of Culture Jam. It is impressive that Culture Jam always stays within its budget.

Indigo: I'm going to go out on a limb and ask for a friendly amendment to double this budget and have two Culture Jams every year! OK, just joking...

Motion passed 10-0

Steve: The total budget is \$1,912,856. The total with the endowment is -\$26,606. The total without endowment is -\$1,606. This budget is still pretty good for us. We've always had a little bit of a negative budget. A big reason for this is our volunteers and coordinators spend less than they are allotted.

Sue moved and Kirk seconded that the number of coordinators who qualify for maximum food vouchers be determined by the number of crew and trade passes the crew administers. For crews with fewer than 50 passes, 2 coordinators will qualify; for crews with 51 – 100 passes, 3 coordinators will qualify; for crews with over 100 passes, 4 coordinators will qualify.

Hilary: The Budget committee got schooled this year on how the budget handbook was not clear on how food vouchers were calculated for coordinators. We apologize that this has not been more clear to people in the past. There was confusion on how many coordinators should get the maximum number of food vouchers. We have 64 crews, including Community Village and Energy Park as crews. Of the 64 crews 35 have less than 50 people and will not be affected by this motion at all. 10 crews have between 51 and 100 passes, and 15 to 20 crews have from 100 up to 400 passes. There is not a direct relationship between the size of the crew and the number of coordinators. This is an effort to recognize that larger crews take more people to administer, and the coordinators are volunteering all they time they are out there and this is trying to acknowledge they have a ton of time in and giving food vouchers commensurate with that.

Charlie: This is a difficult issue and Hilary has done great work in the way it is broken out. Looking at the overall cost and what we are getting from the folks that are doing this work for the Fair, this is a good place to make an investment to help our volunteers. There is a substantial inequity for some of the larger crews and their coordinators and I support this.

norma: If this passes, does it mean we will increase budgeted number of food vouchers?

Charlie: Where it applies, yes.

Hilary: We will have to look crew by crew at the number of coordinators.

Timothy: I support this motion. When you move up to some of the larger crews, there is no way to do it without the coordinators.

LT: This motion as written does not authorize any coordinators to receive the maximum food vouchers who have exactly 50 passes.

Bear: The way that Hilary wrote the graph it should have said 50 or fewer. Sue, will you accept "50 or fewer" as a friendly amendment?

Sue: Yes

Bear: The motion will be for crews with up to 50 passes, 2 coordinators will qualify; 51 to 100 passes, 3 coordinators will qualify; over 100 passes, 4 coordinators will qualify.

Jon: 50 and 100 passes seem like nice even places to make marks, but if you look at the pattern there are other places that are more logical. I have some logistic questions – if I was coordinator of Kitchen crew and had 50 passes, and if I went to 51 I get more – I'm curious how this will affect people's budget requests next year. For crews with only one coordinator, who decides how many coordinators are on a crew?

Bear: The board.

Jon: Entertainment at Main Stage has one coordinator, but we are authorizing up to 3. A crew could come to the board and say we want to increase the number of coordinators. This would be up to the board to decide. You have included in the Entertainment coordinators, the entertainers.

Hilary: Correct, that is in the trade passes.

Jon: The number I would like to see is how many are actual crewmembers and how many are entertainers.

Hilary: That information is on the Back Pages and both are a huge administrative responsibility.

Kirk: I want to say thank you to Hilary for this work. It is very complex and tackles the sense of larger crews taking more energy. As we look into this, time is part of it too.

Jack: This is a formula that will self level. If this is the intention, what is the difference in a coordinator getting 32 or going through a formula that is self-leveling.

Hilary: I am not sure what you mean by "self-leveling" but the financial impact of this is \$3,500.

Jack: Self-leveling is metaphoric. My question was rather than having a formula, what would be the difference if every coordinator got the same? You don't have to answer – it is a rhetorical question.

Final motion: Sue moved and Kirk seconded that the number of coordinators who qualify for maximum food vouchers be determined by the number of crew and trade passes the crew administers. For crews up to 50 passes, 2 coordinators will qualify; for crews with 51 – 100 passes, 3 coordinators will qualify; for crews with over 100 passes, 4 coordinators will qualify.

Motion passed 10-0

Sue moved and Kirk seconded that the number of coordinators that qualify for \$250 expense allowance be determined by the number of crew and trade passes the crew administers. For crews with less up to 50 passes, 2 coordinators will qualify; for crews with 51 to 100 passes, 3 coordinators will qualify; and for crews with over 100 passes, 4 coordinators will qualify.

Bear: This will map the crews and coordinators to what we just did with food vouchers.

Steve: I oppose this motion. It is one of the few places that Hilary and I disagree

Timothy: This is more of a necessity, when you have a larger crew you have more expenses. We take our coordinator and our expense budgets and we spend them on the crew. We do not use anything for coordinator budgets as far as fuel reimbursement. We could get what we need for the crews and maybe still help our coordinators out.

Steve: If we add this amount, you will have different crews doing different things. As we have expanded the crew appreciation, each crew does their own thing. It is very inconsistent how this is being done. The more money you throw at it the more inequity you have.

Hilary: We ask that volunteer appreciation items, like the extra logos on t-shirts and crew meals come out of it as well as coordinator expense. The coordinators do not have to spend it on themselves, they can spend it on their crews. For some crews there is a lot of demand on this money, on some crews almost none. I would like us to have a more consistent way to appreciate volunteers. I would love to pull the volunteer appreciation out of this, but we can't right now. I'm comfortable with crews using it differently.

norma: I want to clarify, if this passes. For crews up to 50 passes, with 2 coordinators it will be \$500. For crews with between 51 and 100 passes with 3 coordinators it will be \$750. For crews of over 100 passes with 4 coordinators it will be \$1,000.

Joseph: The Fair runs on discretion. I don't think it is good to have volunteer appreciation be standard because it takes all the meaning out of it. Pass the motion.

Crystalyn: We spent \$496 on crew appreciation. Would it be possible to have it based on crew size?

Timothy: It sounded like there was concern about mismanagement of the money, in other words, if you increase it they will spend it. The concept of the motion is if you have crew over 400 people, everything costs more. It supersedes the crew budget. I am in absolute support of this, I like Crystalyn's idea for doing it on crew size, but this is a good first step.

Sheldon: It is based on the crew size. A lot of coordinators come from a long ways away.

Mambo: I support this motion. The amount of investment and energy and pride the crews take in spending their own money is reinforced by the t-shirts and the additional logos, hats and suspenders they get.

Steve: I said nothing about irresponsible coordinators. The more we spend, the more we should be taking in. In the revenue projection, we decided to not increase our income. We will have to increase what we take in to equalizing what we are spending. There are a lot of capital projects. We cannot deficit spend for very long.

Jon: Volunteer appreciation needs to stay with the crews. I would not want to centralize that. I am inclined to disconnect the allocation for coordinator expenses from the number of coordinators and connect it to the number of crewmembers.

Jon moved for crews less than 100 members, \$500 for coordinator expense, regardless of the number of coordinators; for crews 101 to 200, \$750 for coordinator expenses, regardless of the number of coordinators; for crews over 200 members, \$1000 for coordinator expenses, regardless of the number of coordinators.

Amendment fails for lack of a second.

Jon moved to increase coordinator expenses for crews with over 200 people to \$1,000. Amendment fails for lack of a second.

LT: I support the motion. I think we can revisit this in the next budget cycle. As Sheldon said, this is a rough approximation of coordinators and number of crew, but it is not entirely precise. The suggestion is to make it closer to the number of crewmembers. The suggestion was to make it closer to the number of the crew. Coordinator expenses, crew appreciation and esprit de corps are two different things. As Mambo put it, my crew is very proud of our Peach Bio-hazard suits.

Jack: If you are over on things like printer cartridges, we are going to pay you. That is what it costs to run the crew. Don't mix crew appreciation with the actual expense.

Casey moved and Jon seconded to amend by detaching the number of coordinators from the crew members and there is a break down for fewer than 50, it will be two coordinator expenses -- \$500; 51 to 100, it will be three coordinator expenses -- \$750; and 100 or greater, it will be four coordinator expenses -- \$1,000.

Hilary: Do you want to talk about how much this costs? That will be an additional \$13,000.

Steve: I don't support this. Why did none of these proposals come in while the budget committee was meeting for 3 or 4 months? This really needs to be analyzed. I would ask you to be real and go through some sort of process, rather than acting on a knee jerk reaction.

Casey withdraws motion.

Kirk: The reason that this did not come up in the budget process was that I made the motions and Charlie suggested they should be postponed pending further conversation. I suggested at a subsequent meeting that our projections were a little low, and Hilary said there were smarter ways to get to this and a longer period to study was better and I agree with that. I want to say thank you again for pursuing these items, and I believe they are the right kind of starters. Included in this I hope by next year, we can get better numbers from coordinators. One of the things I'm also hoping for is an estimate of the amount of hours our crews put in. I think it is more than just crew numbers, but crew hours. It is size and time.

Sue: My first 21 Fairs I was a volunteer, I want to find even more ways to support our coordinators and our crews. This is a good idea.

Indigo: I want to point out that the additional printing on t-shirts that many of the coordinators do, is one of the ways that our organization supports our local economy. The Fair only employs a couple of screen printers to print our 4,000 plus shirts, When 64 crews take their shirts to have their own logos, they take them to a whole number of screen printers in the community that become part of the income cycle.

Jon: I am going to vote for the motion, but I hope that prior to next year's budget we can look at some of the questions that Kirk has raised and look at crew size as a factor in allocating resources.

LT: I echo what Jon said. I support the motion.

Jack: I believe this is a good move forward. If we are going to deal with accounting by formula, ultimately what is it we are trying to get at? The logical next step in the equation would be time. I am glad that this is going to pass, there is a deeper discussion here as to what is the end to this. On one hand the revenue is the most important part of this picture. Our revenue is being more and more driven by us. We are paying more to give ourselves more. What is the end that we are talking about here? I cannot discount what Steve is saying. Eventually it will not balance out. Until it supports itself through revenue, other than what we charge ourselves, there is an ultimate imbalance there.

Lucy: From the 10 years I've been working on the Budget committee and working with the Fair in one capacity or another since the beginning, this growth is not sustainable. The issues of growth and sustainability in very concrete and specific terms are not something that this body of board of directors has been willing to address. This is of great concern to me.

Motion passed 10-0