

ELDERS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES – Approved at 05/27/21 meeting.

Thursday, April 22, 2021

**LOCATION:** Online (Zoom)

**MEETING TIME:** 7:08 p.m.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:** Diane Albino, Alan Cohn, Jain Elliott, Robert Jacobs, Heather Kent, Kay Kintzley, Michael James Long, Robert “Mouseman” McCarthy, Eric Nicholson

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:** Ann Rogers-Bennett, Patricia Van Esso

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Roberta Austin, Sandra Bauer, Darlene Colburn, Katie Cousins, Peggy Day, Kehn “mambo” Gibson, Carolyn Gsell (scribe), Nancy Hafner, Percy Hilo, Paxton Hoag, David Hoffman, Chris Howe, Anthony “AJ” Jackson, Spirit Leatherwood, Mark Pankratz, Jon Pincus, Licia Schultz (facilitator), Jenny Wilson

**AGENDA:**

- Announcements
- Approve February and March minutes
- October Retreat - Jain
- June Meeting – Kay
- Website – Carolyn
- Winery Meeting Report - Mouseman

**Approve February 2021 Minutes:** Jain made a motion to approve the February minutes. Alan seconded. Motion passed 9-0.

**Approve March 2021 Minutes:** Alan made a motion to approve the March minutes. Mouseman seconded. The motion was approved 9-0.

**Announcements:**

Katie – The outing to the fair site planned for this Saturday is postponed due to rain. Jain said that she will be out to visit the site with Sue Barnhart to celebrate Sue’s birthday.

David H. – Promoting Measure 20-219 to continue the Lane County tax levy that supports OSU Extension Service. The election is Tuesday, May 18, 2021. Find more information here: [www.friendsofextensionlane.org](http://www.friendsofextensionlane.org)

**OCTOBER RETREAT** – Jain is reporting on behalf of Ann. Shane said he is no longer in charge of scheduling Alice’s and referenced a directive from the Fixed Assets group. Apparently, there is a move by management to monitor staff’s time communicating to the membership. Membership has been directed to cc the Interim Executive Director when contacting staff. Shane said we might be able to use the campfire circle outside and rent a porta-potty.

Robert asked Jain or Paxton why Alice’s is now under the jurisdiction of the Fixed Assets Committee. Paxton doesn’t believe the FAC has made any moves to date to exercise authority.

Chris attended the Sunday meeting where the winery property (a fixed asset) was discussed. Chris came away with the sense that everything discussed was only recommendations. Nothing concrete was established. It seems that recommendations are being misunderstood as decisions.

Paxton said that he understands Sandra and AJ have been directed to find additional members for the Fixed Assets Committee. They have been directed to find people with experience in real estate in asset management. The FAC is a developing situation. Paxton has not yet seen the committee meeting notes. It’s a wait and see situation. He expressed concern about the selection process.

Mambo – Centralization of power leads to a disconnect with the membership.

Heather informed meeting attendees that Sandra would be joining this meeting to explain what is going on. In the meantime, there was no intention by the FAC to charge rental fees for Alice's. Sandra messaged that the FAC never made any directives about scheduling Alice's.

This conversation about scheduling the October retreat is on hold until Sandra joins the meeting.

#### **JUNE MEETING: Kay**

Kay has invited us for a gathering on June 17. She suggested we gather at 5 p.m. and assumes we'll have our normal meeting. She is providing the gathering space. We will be meeting outside and follow some Covid safety rules. We'll need to rent a port-a-potty.

Kay asked that we discuss whether to have a potluck or bring our own individual food. She wants to keep the meeting outdoors, and she requested that we rent a porta-potty.

Peggy suggested we gather earlier, maybe 4:30 or 5 and that we each bring our own food. She would like to limit it to people who are vaccinated.

Kay would be willing to put a cap on the meeting and asked if we would come to a consensus on what a reasonable number would be. She suggested a cap of 40. There was general agreement. Kay felt that if someone has a medical reason for not being vaccinated that is fine, but aside from the exception, she prefers that only vaccinated people show up.

Kay said that in the past we've had up to 70 people at the June meeting.

Nancy asked if we could do a poll on how many of us are vaccinated. It looks like everyone in the group either already has been vaccinated or will be by the time of the meeting.

Licia mentioned that the group had already decided not to have a meeting in June – just to keep it social. Mouseman expressed that there's a huge benefit to having a meeting, even if we make it informal. It gives everyone a chance to be together in a conversation. Having a structured time where we can have a discussion helps maintain a focus.

This discussion is on hold so that Sandra can speak.

#### **OCTOBER RETREAT DISCUSSION – PART 2**

Per Sandra, the Fixed Assets Committee has been subject of a lot of misinformation. We put the FAC together because we have various policies and no vehicle for determining what the highest and best use and maintenance is for each asset. It is a board responsibility that assets are well cared for. For example, we bought the Winery a few years ago and nothing has happened with it. The committee is to be a clearing house for investigating properties and talking with various stakeholders so the committee can report to the board. There hasn't yet been any work done or any decisions made. There are no pre-ordained outcomes. Sandra thinks this committee will help develop policy for the properties the Fair owns. She noted the office has been empty for a year. We have the winery with no specific plan in place. Sandra's opinion is that Alice's should be available for use by Fair family. There are no plans Sandra knows of for renting Alice's out. She is not sure where that rumor came from. Sandra said that Shane was never advised to not schedule Alice's by the Fixed Assets Committee. FAC is not a governing committee. It was formed to make recommendations to the board.

Jain explained how this subject of the FAC came up. Sandra was clear that the FAC never directed Shane to refrain from scheduling Alice's. Sandra said that nothing the FAC does should be a surprise. Sandra said she would talk to Shane.

Paxton is guessing that perhaps the interim ED directed Shane to hold off on doing anything with Alice's. Paxton said we should resubmit our request to schedule a fall retreat.

The group expressed appreciation for Sandra's willingness to pop into our meeting to explain what is going on.

Licia capped off the discussion with a Happy Earth Day greeting and announced that Spirit and AJ had just joined the meeting. Spirit shared that other groups had received similar responses to their request to book Alice's.

Licia – recapped that Jain should forward those emails to Sandra and AJ, and cc: Paxton and Spirit. Jain should communicate with Ann what was discussed, and she or Ann should resubmit our request to use Alice's for our October retreat.

## **JUNE MTG. DISCUSSION – PART 2**

Licia said we need to get more clarity on whether this gathering is a potluck or bring your own food, and to determine the start time.

Kay said she is open to all suggestions. If we want to start at 4:30 p.m. that's fine. Anyone is welcome to come at 3:30 to help set up. Bring your own chair if possible.

Kay asked about the food situation.

Carolyn asked if we wanted to schedule a regular Zoom meeting the following week, or just have the June 17<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Peggy mentioned that if you bring your own food with your own dishes, it won't impact Kay's kitchen. Mouseman suggested that we have the option to bring extra food for those who may not have an opportunity to bring their own food. Jain reminded that Covid is spread mostly through the air, not on services.

Carolyn mentioned that the science shows that Covid is extremely hard to spread outdoors and that we should be able to relax a bit. Jon Pincus said that the state mandates wearing masks outdoors in groups. He is happy to wear his mask outdoors. Jon likes the idea of having a general group discussion but not a regular meeting. He has been to other events that had food served, and any sharing of food should be pre-wrapped.

Kay understands we will have a porta-potty. She will have a hose available for hand washing and hand sanitizer. There will be tables for anyone who wants to share food.

Carolyn will put directions to Kay's in the minutes. Kay Kintzley, 84674 Hill Top Drive, Pleasant Hill.

*Scribe's note: DIRECTIONS TBD. Need to discuss privacy concerns with Kay, including posting her address in the minutes which end up on the .net site.*

Jon and others want to have a Zoom meeting the week after on the 4<sup>th</sup> Thursday. Licia asked if anyone was opposed to having another Zoom meeting on the Thursday after the in-person gathering. Nobody opposed.

We will have another regular meeting on the 4<sup>th</sup> Thursday. *Scribes note – scribe will be out of town and unavailable to scribe for a Thursday 6/24 meeting.*

## **WEBSITE UPDATE – Carolyn**

We've made a little progress on the website. There are some new things on the website. The goal for Still Living Room is to get all the content completed so we can contribute it to the 2-D Fair. She asked if Paxton would be the point person for the SLR.

Paxton said there will be a Peach Pages meeting next week. He will let us know who to connect with and what will be needed.

Carolyn shared that what has become apparent through working on this project is that the oldest of Elders, those individuals who started the Fair, are moving up in age and that the next wave of younger elders need to step up to the plate to carry on the traditions and stories of those who got the Fair started. A big Thank-You went out to Jain and Alan for submitting photos.

A few people mentioned they weren't sure how to navigate the website. She is happy to set up a Zoom meeting and give a tour of the website for anyone interested. The link the website is [www.ocfelders.weebly.com](http://www.ocfelders.weebly.com)

## **REPORT ON THE SUNDAY WINERY MEETING**

Licia asked about who attended the Winery meeting on Sunday and what happened.

Mouseman attended and asked if anyone else from the group was there. Chris H., Mark P., and Paxton H. indicated their attendance.

Mouseman stated he had nothing to say at the winery meeting, but he voiced at an earlier time that the winery was a questionable purchase. His take was that nobody was there to hear the membership ideas. There was little opportunity for anyone to contribute. He felt that a "massive amount of smoke" was being blown, and that key players were happy to receive the smoke. He feels that there was little opportunity for attendees to contribute to the meeting. There was talk about renting the house at the winery. He said it became evident 15 years ago that the Fair should not be in the landlord business. Now we find ourselves hemorrhaging cash and concerned with money not coming in due to Covid, while at the same time we have money going out. He was concerned about the idea of rebranding wine when we are officially a drug and alcohol-free event. Mouseman was interested to what others who attended heard. He felt very much that he was being pontificated to. He recalls that the former owners were not the best of neighbors.

Licia asked about the format of the meeting. It was a Zoom meeting and there were 47 in attendance.

Mambo said he did not attend the meeting. He heard from two different people about some things that were said. He was very bothered about a blackberry issue that is invading some space. The person concerned was told she had the people and the tools to clear the blackberries in a day, and she (Aaron) was told not bother. We will let you know if we need you. Mambo says the magical thinking about the winery was that since it already had a permit, we'd be grandfathered in. The original owners purchased grapes from other suppliers to press their own. Mambo said the bottom line is that what we purchase is parking. He referred to the centralization of power that produces lack of accountability and input from the membership to think of what is best for the entire organization. Mambo referenced another situation where he and two other people contacted Shane about getting into the Farside to assess damage and put together a work schedule, and they were told by management essentially "don't contact us. We'll contact you." Mambo emphasized there is not a personality problem. There's a centralization of power problem. Mambo feels that the Fair cannot survive under this power structure. Licia encouraged Mambo to keep the faith.

Jon P. agreed with Mambo's analysis and acknowledged Mouseman's graphic description of the meeting. Jon brought 3 questions to that meeting. They were 1. Does getting into a commercial enterprise (e.g. winery, campground, events center, etc.) compromise our 501C3 status. Jon suggested the Fair consult an attorney. 2. What is the projected net potential of the various wine enterprises being described. The answer was that there was currently no information and that it would take a lot of work to get that information. Jon felt this was a basic business plan requirement. 3. He asked what was the current sale value of the property? If we are looking for revenue, we might consider selling the property and hopefully get a net gain in revenue. He was told it would take a lot of work to determine the value and ramifications of such a sale.

David H. – Has not kept up with any of the winery issues. What struck David was the idea of making wine and putting a label on it goes against our Fair craft code. That was a red flag for David. *Mouseman offered the following clarification to David's point after the meeting: If you didn't actually make the wine, then, according to Fair Craft policy, you cannot put a label on it and sell it. With that being said, the whole "shiner" concept is against our crafter guidelines.*

Paxton - Mambo is correct in that we did buy the winery for parking. Hillary worked out the numbers based on revenue from parking to justify the financing. The purchase was based solely on the revenue from parking. The purchase was not based on any other income. The meeting about the winery was a BOD working Assembly. The meeting was originally scheduled in April 2020, and it took another year to get it rescheduled. The blackberry patch that Mambo referred to was originally a Secret House garden. Currently the blackberries are 12 feet tall. There is interest from garden crew and flower crew to reestablish the original garden once we can get around to it. As far as selling wine, that is a board agenda item. He encouraged us to show up to a meeting and express our opinion.

Paxton thinks that the motion is really, do we want to do this so we can develop a business plan. Currently it is completely up in the air.

Part of the problem with selling the winery is the necessity of parking. According to aerial photos at the last Fair, the winery property was 80% full – over 1600 cars. There has also been discussion of renting campground space. Many other ideas were floated. Paxton personally thinks there is potential for doing something in the fall there that will generate income, but we'll have to get past Covid to do that.

He added that if we did sell the property, we'd have to rent it back for parking. Paxton talked about turnout for work parties. He also heard that there were a larger number of people visiting the property last weekend, and there was a concern about too many people gathering on the property, especially given that Covid is ramping up again in Lane County.

References were made to the abundance of wildflowers onsite. It's a good time to visit the site.

Fire DIC – attended the winery meeting. The idea of a shiner operation (buying wine and putting a label on it) was put forward to preserve the SUP (Special Use Permit), to preserve the Fair's option to how the Fair could use the property. He feels that if we were to do this, we'd want to meet the crafter code.

Only 10% of income that the property generates can be generated from doing events. The other 90% revenue would have to come from generating income from some other activity or product. There seemed to be a lot of discord amongst the group. His biggest concern is that seeking solutions will become disjointed. Facts and ideas are getting confused. Agrees with Mambo and Jon that there is too much overhead control. He's seen instances where people have come out to the property to help and have been turned down. He's not sure if the structure for managing the Fair is headed in a good direction, and said that if we sold the property, we'd have to think about how profits from the sale would get used.

Mouseman – One of the general concepts that he's heard tonight and at both a Path Planning meeting and the winery meeting is that we bought the property for a parking lot. He feels that we don't need more parking. We need to figure out how to bring people out to the fair and reducing carbon footprint. The Fair population was discussed at a Path Planning meeting, and it was brought up that the Fair owns 500 acres which is plenty of room for the population, but we've dedicated a large portion of acreage to automobiles. We need to figure out a way to stop driving our cars and figure out alternative ways to bring Fair family and the public out to the Fair.

Mambo – Selling the property is not a good option. Amelioration on the number of vehicles has been ignored. Our Elders should be ashamed. Personalities are not the issue. It's the structure.

Spirit – We talk about being carbon neutral, and at the same time parking does bring in revenue. THE SUP doesn't necessarily need to be fulfilled by using the winery to sell wine. Having events on the Outer Limits/Winery property is not contingent on the SUP. Eventually if we don't use the SUP. we'll lose it. However, we can still produce 3-4 events, at

least 90 days apart annually with a sizeable attendance (1-3,000 people). We are not bound to the agricultural permit to do fun stuff. The winery gives us opportunity to do more events. She thought some good ideas that came out of the meeting and at the same time there are a lot of issues to deal with.

Jon P. – Not necessarily advocating selling the property, it's just something to look at. We could consider leasing it. A contract for sale or lease could have a covenant that allows the Fair to use the property for parking. Jon concurred with what Spirit stated about the property, but he thinks there may be a bigger land use question and more clarification is needed. Whoever is consolidating the information for the winery needs to produce a business plan. The answer he keeps getting is that “we don't know, and it would be too much work to figure things out.” Jon argues that it is necessary to do the work to explore the potentials for the property.

Fire DIC – The SUP offers other alternatives. The SUP is specific to winery operations. However, you can do other agricultural things in addition to winery activities to generate income. We would be complying if 10% of property earnings is generated through events, and 90% by ag. Grapes do need to be grown on the property, but they don't necessarily need to be used to produce wine. Sustainability and education could be tied into the use of the property. We need a business plan but right now we don't even know how we will use the property.

Licia expressed her appreciation for all the contributions that were made to this conversation.

From Heather in Chat: SUP Approval: <http://apps.lanecounty.org/LMDPro/FileViewer.aspx?ID=513866>.

Paxton – There are lots of ideas we can do out at the property. Growing Hemp would require a separate SUP or license from the state, whether it be cannabis or hemp. The Winery Tourism Act ties winery events with selling wine. Wineries need a minimum of 10-12 acres in fruit. Paxton said we could work with LCC or OSU to work the land and potentially plant one acre. The old grape vines could also be rehabilitated. Hemp and cannabis growing was not discussed at the workshop. The primary discussion is, do we want to maintain the SUP. Paxton thought about creating Peach Wine, which would be a natural for us. The winery came with enough equipment to make wine, but the equipment hasn't been used in 15 years. Can we generate some revenue here? The big question is, do we want to sell alcohol? That will be addressed at the next board meeting.

From Heather in Chat: Events at Wineries Handout:

[http://lanecounty.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server\\_3585797/File/Government/County%20Departments/Public%20Works/Land%20Management%20Division/Land%20Use%20Planning%20Zoning/Land%20Use%20Planning%20&%20Zoning%20Handouts/Winery\\_Events\\_Handout.pdf](http://lanecounty.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server_3585797/File/Government/County%20Departments/Public%20Works/Land%20Management%20Division/Land%20Use%20Planning%20Zoning/Land%20Use%20Planning%20&%20Zoning%20Handouts/Winery_Events_Handout.pdf)

Nancy H. mentioned that winery logistics are complex. Cannabis and hemp are worth considering.

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday May 27, at 7 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 9:01 p.m.