

Board of Directors Meeting

June 2, 2025, 7 pm

(Subject to approval by the Board at the June 29, 2025, Board meeting)

Zoom remote online and live streamed on YouTube

YouTube recording link: <https://www.youtube.com/live/y1PKyjzazhU>

Board Directors present: John Alexander, Anthony “AJ” Jackson, (President), Sandra Bauer, George Braddock, Paxton Hoag, Kevin Levy, Arna Shaw (Vice President), Jon Steinhart, John Govsky, Teresa Vaughn (arrived less than 20 minutes late), and John Davis. Other Board officers present: Hilary Anthony (Treasurer), Jeffrey Rames (Membership Secretary), and Anna DiBenedetto (Recording Secretary). Staff present: Kirsten Bolton (Executive Director), Vanessa Roy (Marketing Manager), Norma Sax (Office Manager), Melissa Swan (new Bookkeeper), Alex Zabala (Office Assistant), and Steven Berkson (Facilitator).

Announcements

Arna: Sad news that Terry Patrick, one of the Fair’s founders, passed away a couple of weeks ago. He was an essential person at the Fair in the early years, plus a very wonderful man. Back in those days when there were very few staff people/Main Camp folks, there were a few men that did a lot of important tasks. He will be sorely missed by those that knew him.

AJ: Announced that the Board had a closed session on May 17 and a Closed Work Session on May 19. Decisions were made in the closed session.

Grumpy: He asked about the subject for the closed meetings.

AJ: Closed meetings are about legal, personnel and real estate matters, so it was one of those. The Closed Work Sessions have to do with Board work and they talked about committees.

John Alexander: He was at Fair last weekend and wanted to put out appreciation. It is amazing: Our volunteers, our artists, our staff — the wonderful patchwork and intentional chaos of our kaleidoscope of hope. Haiku: Miracle of all, our magnificent bright Fair, one love heal the world.

Minutes Review

(YouTube video: 0:03:46)

The Board approved the minutes of the May 5, 2025, meeting by unanimous consent.

John Alexander: Thanked the Recording Secretary for the very accurate minutes. Point of clarification, not a change: He wanted to thank the Board Giving team, John Davis, Jon Steinhart, Arna and Sandra for doing the Board Giving decision-making on the Board’s behalf.

Agenda Review

(YouTube video: 0:06:48)

The Board approved the June 2, 2025, agenda by unanimous consent.

Staff Report – Executive Director

Kirsten reported: **Administration:**

I am happy to report that we have made two new hires. Shawn Kilmer has been hired as a temporary site employee. He started on May 16. Melissa Swan has been hired as our new Bookkeeper; she will start June 4. She will train with Norma, who is retiring after this year's Fair. Melissa brings with her a wealth of bookkeeping experience.

Revenue is soft. We are holding off on Capital Improvements that aren't health and safety related. Construction is going to try to fit as many small Capital Improvements as they can into their Supplies & Services budget. Any Capital Improvements that aren't completed this year due to expense reduction efforts will carry over to next year. I ask everyone to reduce spending where you are able. These are uncertain economic times due to the actions of the federal government, and it will take great effort from all of us to keep OCF in a positive financial position.

We had a fire at the Winery on Monday, May 19; the red barn burned down. The Fire Marshall's report says the cause is unknown. We suspect the electric gator battery was the source, but will know more once we receive the report. We will not be submitting an insurance claim. The building wasn't worth much and it could compromise our ability to find an insurance underwriter because this would be our second claim in less than three years. We do have insurance, but it was hard to find, which is very important because if there is no insurance, there is no Oregon Country Fair. We are learning from this and are putting great effort toward identifying fire and safety hazards across the site and correcting them. If you see something that is a fire or safety hazard, please report it to Management immediately. It takes all of us to put on a safe event and we appreciate your help in identifying and correcting hazards on-site.

We now have membership data in the Sunshine Database. This is a major accomplishment and represents the first time we have had all of our data in one database. It closes July 4 at Midnight. The payment portal is now open for Crews and Booths. You can log in through the .net site: <https://sunshine.oregoncountryfair.net/login.html>. There are training videos on the .net site: <https://oregoncountryfair.net/sunshine-database-training-videos/>. Please email sunshinehelpdesk@oregoncountryfair.org if you discover a bug or something isn't working correctly. Contact Booth Reg or your Coordinator if you forgot your username. Coordinators and Booth Reps need to turn on the payment option, located under settings at the top of the screen, when they are ready for their crew or booth mates to pay for inventory assigned to them.

Culture Jam 2025 will be Thursday, July 31, to Thursday, August 7. Applications are now closed. We received a large number of applicants this year and there will be a lottery. Teddy Bear Picnic 2025 will be Saturday, August 16. Camping is allowed on Saturday night only, except for crews that are supporting the event; they can camp Friday night.

The Volunteer Team opened the volunteer application on March 1. If you know someone who wants to volunteer, send them to the .org site to sign up. If you need volunteers on your crew, contact volunteering@oregoncountryfair.org.

Event Management & Marketing:

Oregon Public Broadcasting's ArtBeat show about OCF will air on July 10. There is a screening on June 25 at McDonald Theatre. We will sell Fair tickets there. Oregon Public Broadcasting's Oregon Field Guide about OCF will air on June 19.

Teen Crew is actively doing their assignments. The deadline has been extended, so get your Teen Crew requests in soon.

Ticket Sales: We are about 30 percent off. It's too early to say how off pace we might be. The ads, social media and OPB stories could help us turn the corner.

Sales Update: Sales are soft. There is a lot of advertising in place and will hopefully increase tickets sales. Tickets change to full price of \$60 on June 16. Tickets may be purchased at the Eugene office. Tickets will be sold on Mondays and Tuesdays only of each week, from noon to 4 pm. The last day to purchase tickets through the Eugene office will be Tuesday, June 25.

Site Management: Main Camp opens Saturday, June 7. The site is closed except for pre-Fair working crews. The gates are open 9 am to 9 pm.

EAB — Reminder of the Guidelines on Invasive Species and Wood. Invasive species threaten our natural ecosystem and must never be brought on site. With regard to invasive species and harmful fungi and blights, please inspect materials, products, clothing, shoes, and vehicles for potential invasive insects and seeds and remove any potential vectors from relevant items before coming to the Fair. Non-native plants should not be introduced without permission of the Site Manager. To help prevent the invasion of the tree-killing beetle known as the emerald ash borer, and other harmful insects, fungi, and blights (e.g. sudden oak death), ash wood is prohibited, unless previously coordinated with and approved by the OCF Site Manager. Crafters or booth representatives who utilize wood or plants in their products should contact the Site Manager for discussion of environmental safety protocols and best practices. Firewood, plants, soils, woodchips, wooden booth construction materials and decoration materials (excluding de-barked, kiln-dried professionally milled lumber) can be vectors for disease and invasive species.

To obtain firewood for burning on-site, please contact Quartermaster or site employees. Additionally, in efforts to prevent the spread of pests and diseases, no firewood is to be taken from the site. Individuals observed bringing firewood from offsite or removing firewood from the site are subject to confiscation of firewood. Wooden pallets may also carry invasive species or be heavily treated with chemicals. Thereby, wood pallets are not to be brought to site for use in campgrounds, other personal uses, or for firewood. Operations will coordinate the removal of wooden pallets brought to site via product delivery as they arrive. This is not officially in the Guidelines, but they are encouraging people to wash their cars if they are coming from the northern part of Oregon (Woodburn, Hillsboro, etc).

We had a wonderful EAB tree sapling stewardship event on Saturday that was well attended. This was to identify and tag young saplings that will be future canopy. They had 24 sapling stewardship sites at Marshall's Landing, Recycling Camp and Recycling Dock, Traffic Camp, Lower Zen Achers, Community Village and South Woods. The range in site sizes was 100 square feet to 7,800 square feet. They flagged 130 saplings, including more than 40 oaks. Lessons learned: Focus on trees, don't spend too much time identifying, flagging, and counting shrubs. There were a lot more oaks in some areas than expected. Shout out to participants: Recycling, Community Village, Mothership, Marshall's Landing, Traffic, Lower Zen Achers and Task Force.

We need guidance for campers who find marked trees, posted on the website where QR code is linked. If you see a tree with a purple flag on it, that represents the Stewardship Sapling Tree Program and they ask you not to put a tent on top of that tree. You can put a tent next to it, but anything with a flag cannot have a tent on top of it.

Winery House: The foundation for the winery house is done. The manufactured home has been ordered. We anticipate installation in September.

2025 Contracts: All contracts are completed!

2025 Permits: The ODOT Permit is pending. The Lane County Right of Way is approved. Chela Mela Monkey Palace Building Permit is paid for and pending inspection.

Treasurers' Report

(YouTube video: 0:21:28)

Hilary: People with a financial role should communicate with staff, liaison and crew if they have any questions or concerns. Thanks to Kirsten for communicating financial reality. Due to Facebook posts that she has seen, she wanted to tell people that we are controlling the number of people that we have on site. Some people are saying the Fair is too crowded. Please remind people you know that we are controlling the number. There might be a few lines and crowded areas, but we are not continuing to grow. We have fewer people on site than 2018. The biggest year was 2019. We are controlling growth and conscious of it so that it's a pleasant experience, especially for those who are coming for the day.

She wanted to give a big welcome to Melissa. She is excited seeing Norma and Melissa sharing information. The system is very complicated and has a lot of players and charts of accounts and transactions. The accounting system is very important to the organization. She, Kirsten, Norma, Coordinators and staff have a lot of this key knowledge and now Melissa will too. Honors that Melissa is willing to take on this responsibility. It's very important to our ongoing ability. Big thanks to Norma for her tremendous and dedicated work over the years.

Echoing John Alexandar and Kirsten, Hilary was on site over the weekend working Monkey Palace and it was a fabulous feeling. There was a lot of activity and productivity. Crews are so devoted. The ones that work early are impressing her with how much they are doing, especially that they are on site with a great dynamic. She looks forward to seeing everyone on site. It's different than seeing people on the computer screen. It turns out that she was talking with Jeff, with whom she had seen in many remote meetings, and it felt really different talking to him in person. So, go out and help build our community.

Committee and Working Group Reports

Committees should send their reports to Vanessa (vanessa@oregoncountryfair.org), to be posted on the net site and included in the Board packet.

Budget Committee 2025 Capital Improvement Budget Committee Meeting Minutes: <https://oregoncountryfair.net/wp-content/uploads/bsk-pdf-manager/2025/05/OCF-2025-Capital-Improvement-Budget-Meeting-Minutes.pdf>

Craft Committee met March 12, 2025 and the minutes are here: https://oregoncountryfair.net/wp-content/uploads/bsk-pdf-manager/2025/05/3_12_25-craft-committee-minutes-1.pdf

Craft Committee met April 16, 2025 and their minutes are here: <https://oregoncountryfair.net/wp-content/uploads/bsk-pdf-manager/2025/05/4-16-25-craft-committee-minutes.pdf>

Diversity (EDIB) Committee met on April 14, 2025 and the minutes are here: https://oregoncountryfair.net/wp-content/uploads/bsk-pdf-manager/2025/05/EDIB-4.14.25_Approved.pdf

Elders Committee met on April 24, 2025 and the minutes are here: https://oregoncountryfair.net/wp-content/uploads/bsk-pdf-manager/2025/05/EldersCommMtg_042425.pdf

Elders Committee held a retreat on May 3, 2025 and the minutes are here: https://oregoncountryfair.net/wp-content/uploads/bsk-pdf-manager/2025/05/Elders_Spring_Retreat_Mtg_050325.pdf

Fixed Assets Committee met September 23, 2024 and the minutes are here: <https://oregoncountryfair.net/wp-content/uploads/bsk-pdf-manager/2025/05/OCF-FAC-minutes-sept-2024.pdf>

Fixed Assets Committee met October 29, 2024 and the minutes are here: <https://oregoncountryfair.net/wp-content/uploads/bsk-pdf-manager/2025/05/OCF-FAC-minutes-Oct.-2024.pdf>

Fixed Assets Committee met November 25, 2024 and the minutes are here: <https://oregoncountryfair.net/wp-content/uploads/bsk-pdf-manager/2025/05/OCF-FAC-minutes-Nov-2024.pdf>

Fixed Assets Committee met March 24, 2025 and the minutes are here: <https://oregoncountryfair.net/wp-content/uploads/bsk-pdf-manager/2025/05/Fixed-Assets-Meeting-Minutes-March.pdf>

Food Committee met April 23, 2025 and the minutes are here: <https://oregoncountryfair.net/wp-content/uploads/bsk-pdf-manager/2024/06/4.23.24-Food-Committee-Notes.pdf>

Path Planning Committee met April 13, 2025 and the minutes are here: <https://oregoncountryfair.net/wp-content/uploads/bsk-pdf-manager/2025/05/April-2025-Path-Planning-minutes.pdf>

Diversity Committee met on January 22, 2025 and the minutes are here: https://oregoncountryfair.net/wp-content/uploads/bsk-pdf-manager/2025/05/2025.1.22_Diversity_meeting_minutes.pdf

The written committee reports were accepted as submitted by unanimous consent.

2025 Committee Annual reports were accepted as submitted by unanimous consent

Elections Committee report: Jeff Rames: He and the Elections Committee have been working to select a vendor for online voting. They looked at 12-13 vendors, only considering two to four seriously. They ended up with three that they focused on. The three were ElectionBuddy, EZVote and GetQuorum. They wanted a self-service option to have savings. They wanted to understand pricing, support and features as well as ability to customize a ballot and archive results, etc. EZVote and ElectionBuddy were pretty much the same. GetQuorum doesn't have a self-service option but he wanted to explore how it would look and cost if they handled the election. As predicted, it's pretty expensive. There are subscriptions or cost per election, which is the better option

for us. We can run the election of about 5,500 people for about \$750. EZVote was not far off, but was more at \$1,300 for a single election. We anticipate about 10 percent of our voting membership will receive a mail-in ballot, which will cost \$1,000 to \$1,500. We have supplies left over from last year so they don't have to buy a lot of supplies. If we go with one of these and do mail-ins for 10 percent, we will spend \$2,000 or \$2,500. If we do that, we'll give back (to the Fair) up to around \$7,000. Met with Elections Committee this week and sent questions to EZVote and Buddy and they reached consensus that they are pretty much the same so we are going with ElectionBuddy. This tool is interesting because we don't have to do anything. He has already done a dummy election. We need to log on and build our own elections. Eventually, candidate statements and pictures could be built in. We will fine tune and test it a bunch of times. We can have Elections Committee or staff or Board test it out. We don't have to sign a contract or pay anything; we just need to set things up and then give them a credit card number to send ballots to those with email addresses. He has checked on sharing information and obviously these organization have to have strict information sharing rules. They simply don't do that. He has documentation on both organizations about this. We are going to work with ElectionBuddy and test it. Data is going to be the huge work all summer. They have to make sure it's a sound list before they upload it to the system. They will also have to mail ballots to 400-700 people. They will pull the trigger in September or October. People can email any questions to Jeffrey Rames at elections@oregoncountryfair.org.

Old Business

(YouTube video: 0:34.37)

Amend Sections 4 and 9 of the OCF Data Privacy Policy (Jon Steinhart, Kevin Levy, John Govsky, Sandra Bauer and AJ Jackson).

Jon Steinhart moved and Sandra seconded to amend Sections 4 and 9 of the OCF Data Privacy Policy.

Section 4 currently reads:

4. WHEN AND WITH WHOM DO WE SHARE YOUR PERSONAL INFORMATION?

In Short. We do not share your personal information, unless required by law

Amended after May 5, 2025, Board Meeting Member Feedback

Recommend to read:

4. WHEN AND WITH WHOM DO WE SHARE YOUR PERSONAL INFORMATION?

We do not share your personal information except as necessary to conduct our business or as required by law. We only share your information with parties who agree to protect it according to our terms. We will not share your information with any party that does not agree to these terms without the consent of all affected individuals.

Section 9 currently reads:

9. DO CALIFORNIA RESIDENTS HAVE SPECIFIC PRIVACY RIGHTS?

In Short. Yes, if you are a resident of California, you are granted specific rights regarding access to your personal information.

California Civil Code Section 1798.83, also known as the “Shine the Light” law, permits our users who are California residents to request and obtain from us, once a year and free of charge, information about categories of personal information (if any) we disclosed to third parties for direct marketing purposes and the names and addresses of all third parties with which we shared personal information in the immediately preceding calendar year.

We do not share your personal information with third parties. You are still entitled to request the categories of personal information we collect about you. If you are a California resident and would like to make such a request, please submit your request in writing to us using the contact information provided below.

If you are under 18 years of age, reside in California, and have a registered account with our Services, you have the right to request removal of unwanted data that you post on the Services. To request removal of such data, please contact us using the contact information provided below and include the email address associated with your account and a statement that you reside in California. We will make sure the data is removed on the Service, but please be aware that the data may not completely or comprehensively be removed from all our systems (e.g., backups, etc).

CCPA PRIVACY NOTICE

The California Code of Regulations defines a “resident” as:

1. Every individual who is in the State of California for other than a temporary or transitory purpose and
2. Every individual who is domiciled in the State of California who is outside the State of California for a temporary or transitory purpose

All other individuals are defined as “non-residents.”

If this definition of “resident” applies to you, we must adhere to certain rights and obligations regarding your personal information.

What categories of personal information do we collect?

We will collect the following categories of personal information:

Category	Examples	Collected
A. Identifiers	Contact details, such as real name, postal address, telephone or mobile contact number, email address, and account name	YES
B. Protected classification characteristics under California or federal law	Date of birth	YES
C. Commercial information	Transaction information and history	YES
D. Sensitive Personal Information	Driver’s License number – only for volunteers who drive	YES

	OCF vehicles for their volunteer work	
--	--	--

- Category A – As long as the user has an account with us
- Category B – As long as the user has an account with us

How do we use and share your personal information?

We do not disclose your personal information with any outside service providers.

We may use your personal information only for our own business purposes, such as for undertaking the Oregon Country Fair event.

We will not disclose, sell, or share any personal information with third parties

Recommend to read:

9. DO CALIFORNIA RESIDENTS HAVE SPECIFIC PRIVACY RIGHTS?

In Short. Yes, if you are a resident of California, you are granted specific rights regarding access to your personal information.

California Civil Code Section 1798.83, also known as the “Shine the Light” law, permits our users who are California residents to request and obtain from us, once a year and free of charge, information about categories of personal information (if any) we disclosed to third parties for direct marketing purposes and the names and addresses of all third parties with which we shared personal information in the immediately preceding calendar year.

We do not share your personal information with third parties. You are still entitled to request the categories of personal information we collect about you. If you are a California resident and would like to make such a request, please submit your request in writing to us using the contact information provided below.

If you are under 18 years of age, reside in California, and have a registered account with our Services, you have the right to request removal of unwanted data that you post on the Services. To request removal of such data, please contact us using the contact information provided below and include the email address associated with your account and a statement that you reside in California. We will make sure the data is removed on the Service, but please be aware that the data may not completely or comprehensively be removed from all our systems (e.g., backups, etc).

CCPA PRIVACY NOTICE

The California Code of Regulations defines a “resident” as:

1. Every individual who is in the State of California for other than a temporary or transitory purpose and

2. Every individual who is domiciled in the State of California who is outside the State of California for a temporary or transitory purpose

All other individuals are defined as “non-residents.”

If this definition of “resident” applies to you, we must adhere to certain rights and obligations regarding your personal information.

What categories of personal information do we collect?

We will collect the following categories of personal information:

Category	Examples	Collected
A. Identifiers	Contact details, such as real name, postal address, telephone or mobile contact number, email address, and account name	YES
B. Protected classification characteristics under California or federal law	Date of birth	YES
C. Commercial information	Transaction information and history	YES
D. Sensitive Personal Information	Driver's License number – only for volunteers who drive OCF vehicles for their volunteer work	YES

- Category A – As long as the user has an account with us
- Category B – As long as the user has an account with us

How do we use and share your personal information?

We do not disclose your personal information with any outside service providers.

We may use your personal information only for our own business purposes, such as for undertaking the Oregon Country Fair event.

We will not disclose, sell, or share any personal information with to third parties

Justification for changes: We need to do this for hybrid voting, and if the EDIB group wants to use an outside service provider to help them conduct their census.

(YouTube video: 0:35:37)

Jon Steinhart: He offered a summary of the motion. Three members spoke about the motion at the last Board meeting and he reached out to all of them via email. Thanks to Grumpy for responding with suggested language. As he has said before, he really appreciates it when people reach out when they see New Business on the agenda because they can't always stop what they are doing because someone shows up at a Board meeting and says to hold everything. A lot of what we do as a Board is on a tight schedule and he appreciates folks providing feedback as early as possible. This is a motion to amend our policy to allow us to share data with third parties, for example for the purpose of doing hybrid voting. Basically, the way we thought about rewording this said that we wouldn't sign a contract with anyone who doesn't agree our terms and conditions, which we really have no power to do. For example, we couldn't sign a contract with ElectionBuddy and tell them that they have to sign a contract with our terms and conditions, but, rather, we would have to accept theirs, so the language is changed to reflect that. There are situations where we cannot make any sort of agreement on terms and conditions. An example

would be folks that apply for Childcare crew have to do a background check with a third party that we don't have the power to tell them that they have to sign an agreement about our terms and conditions. In that case, we have to ask people who want to serve on that crew to share information with a third party. We have been doing this for years, and this clarifies it.

Jon Steinhart moved and Sandra seconded to amend the motion: 4. WHEN AND WITH WHOM DO WE SHARE YOUR PERSONAL INFORMATION? We do not share your personal information except as necessary to conduct our business or as required by law. We only share your information with parties whose terms meet our requirements. We will not share your information with any party that does not meet our requirements without the consent of all affected individuals.

John Alexander: Regarding the amendment, we can't control what their policies are, but we can control what kind of data is given to them. What changed with this amendment? How would we get the consent of all affected individuals?

Jon Steinhart: What this amendment says is that, for example, when we select a voting vendor, we are going to select one whose terms and conditions we like. That's what we'll do with any situation like this, such as doing background checks for Childcare. Maybe driver's license information of those that drive Fair vehicles for Fair may be shared with insurance companies. In those scenarios, we might need to ask for individual consent because we don't have any choice about what they are going to do. Regarding voting, he trusts that Jeff and the Elections Committee will select a vendor whose terms and conditions are acceptable. The last sentence is for other situations such as background checks and insurance, etc.

The motion to amend passed: 11-0.

AJ: This is a big thing. We are in June and he wondered how many of our members are paying attention in June. He was confused about what this is fixing. Wondered if this policy needs to be passed to run the election.

John Alexander: Regarding the sense of urgency that we talked about before, we have pushed a lot of motions through in the past when they were urgent. We could gather the data set that we are going to share and get that off. If this is something that people are concerned about, maybe we don't need to rush it. He doesn't think the election hinges on this. Maybe Jeff's report could be moved into a Work Session so we could have discussion there, and this complicated issue could be wrapped in there. It doesn't reference the original document, so you have to hunt for it on the website, which isn't a huge deal, but if there isn't real a sense of urgency, maybe don't do this, as long as we can release a data set to one company.

Kirsten: This data policy was passed by the Board years ago. The motion lists the old language and new language. The changes are minimal but are very important to legally release email addresses for hybrid voting.

Jon Steinhart: The whole motion was in the Board packet. The original privacy policy said that we wouldn't disclose any information with an outside party, so this amendment to the original policy provides certain circumstances under which we could do that, so we could do things like hold hybrid elections. It is urgent because even if we put something new on New Business and wait for it to become Old Business, we'd be right up against the election. He thinks this is

reasonable. Reminder that we discussed this whole thing at length at the last Board meeting, so there are no surprises except the amended language.

Arna: Jeff, does this need to be passed tonight or could it be passed in August if more Board members want more time?

Jeff Rames: He didn't raise this issue; it was bubbling around. Bylaws are pretty straight. We aren't going to be sharing email list until September. It needs to be done, so he doesn't see a problem waiting until September.

AJ: He is in favor of this, now that he's gotten explanation. He has heard a lot of chatter about it and was concerned that they haven't heard from one member about it. It's a big deal and that surprised him.

Paxton: He fully supports the changes in the policy. This really brings us up to date with the real world. He likes the changes.

Jon Steinhart: He would prefer not to push this off. What if somebody raises an issue in August? We need to be able to hold the election.

The motion passed as amended: 11-0.

OCF Board Code of Conduct (AJ Jackson, Sandra Bauer, Teresa Vaughn, John Davis and Kevin Levy)

Sandra moved and AJ seconded to approve the OCF Board Code of Conduct.

Oregon Country Fair Board of Directors Code of Conduct

1. Introduction

As Directors of the Oregon Country Fair, we recognize the trust placed in us by our members and stakeholders. We will uphold the highest standards of ethical leadership and accountability while conducting the business of the organization. This Code of Conduct outlines the values, behaviors, and responsibilities we commit to as stewards of the nonprofit's mission.

2. Principles and Values

Board members shall adhere to the following principles and values:

Ethics and Integrity — We act ethically and with integrity in all interactions.

Compassion and Respect — We treat each other and our stakeholders with compassion, respect, and kindness.

Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion — We actively promote these principles through our words and actions.

Openness and Transparency — We strive to make decisions and take actions transparently, restricting information only when necessary.

Leadership — We lead by example, upholding these values in our governance.

3. Duty of Care, Loyalty and Obedience

Board members are entrusted with ensuring the financial and operational health of the organization and must uphold the following legal duties:

Duty of Care — Exercise reasonable care in decision-making as a responsible steward of the organization.

Duty of Loyalty — Place the interests of the organization above personal gain and avoid conflicts of interest.

Duty of Obedience — Stay faithful to the nonprofit’s mission and ensure compliance with laws and bylaws.

4. Ethical Conduct and Conflict of Interest

Board members must disclose any personal, professional, or financial interests that may conflict with those of the nonprofit.

We will act professionally, fairly, and without bias, ensuring that our actions align with the mission and values of the nonprofit.

5. Financial Oversight and Stewardship

We ensure financial resources are used efficiently and effectively.

We provide oversight for budgets and financial statements.

6. Meetings and Participation

Board members shall actively participate in meetings and discussions.

We will come prepared, having reviewed relevant materials beforehand.

Respectful listening and constructive communication are expected.

Avoid misrepresentation, personal attacks and divisive behavior

7. Public Representation

Board members shall represent the organization professionally and accurately.

Directors shall not speak on behalf of the organization unless authorized.

Public statements should align with the nonprofit’s mission and values.

Board members shall maintain the confidentiality of privileged or sensitive information.

8. Applicable Bylaws section for Directors not in compliance

The Board may suspend a Director with or without cause (requiring the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Directors) for a maximum of 60 days or until voted on, as provided in this article. The Director in question shall be excluded from such a vote. Article VII Section 3 Removal of Directors.

9. Acknowledgment

By signing below, I acknowledge that I have read, understand, and agree to abide by this Code of Conduct.

Name: _____ **Signature:** _____ **Date:** _____

Sandra: The organization has a Code of Conduct and the idea of a Code of Conduct for Board of Directors has been floating for a while and it is finally drafted. This is a living document that can be adapted as necessary. This is pretty basic but it’s important that we hold ourselves accountable.

Member Input:

Spirit: Good job- it’s about time! This came up when we spent many thousands of dollars on a consultant and at that time the Board wouldn’t consider it. It’s so important. She hopes the Board passes it.

Board Discussion:

John Alexander: He doesn’t think this Code of Conduct is ready for approval. He is concerned that there is a lack of accountability measures. He thinks we need to revisit the process that led to

this draft and he believes we need more input. In 2022 there was a subcommittee formed, including Tom, Arna, Paxton and him, and they drafted a Code of Conduct. They had a well-attended public meeting about it and there were good questions for the Board to address, but the topic was dropped. During a closed Work Session that happened recently, this issue resurfaced. He believes we took a step backward in that situation. After two years, we need an open session to talk to members about their feedback about the original Code of Conduct. The committee that drafted the original Code and facilitated the open session was left out of drafting this version before the Closed Session and they weren't consulted in the session's agenda, which resulted in the session, in his opinion, not adequately addressing the key question from the public meeting. Even if we had, we don't have adequate minutes from those discussions. For example, we still haven't figured out models of accountability, so the subject appears to be missing. This needs public discussion with our membership about how we as a Board are going to hold ourselves accountable to this Code of Conduct. For me, accountability means individuals and the Board acknowledges repeated violations of Code of Conduct violations in a transparent and complete way. We are being asked to vote on something that we can't all agree on and they don't have enough information on where there is disagreement. He hopes this motion will be withdrawn until we can have a public session and more discussion, especially about accountability and the other issues that came up in the well-attended work session we had during the 2022-'23 term.

(YouTube video: 0:57:46)

Paxton: Most of this Code of Conduct was taught to them in Board training, particularly by Russell, who was a Fair lawyer in the 1990s and into the 2000s. This codifies what we have been trained that we should be doing. He disagrees with the accountability problem. Over the years, having served on the Board a lot, if somebody messes up, we take them to task, but you don't hear about that because it's a personnel issue. It's worked well in the past and he doesn't think we need to define how violations and penalties will be handled. This is what is and should be expected. He supports the motion.

Arna: She was on the original group that wrote the Code of Conduct for the Board. It definitely needed a rewrite. She was also unhappy with how the revision was made and how original writers were not consulted and instead if just went to the Board. Some original things were lost such as having to wear the Board hat at all times. Your Board hat comes before Booth or Committee hats. That's not emphasized here. She also thinks there is a lack of accountability. It feels performative. They struggled in the original one with accountability measures. She was disappointed that it was discussed in a closed session. Many members gave us comments and suggestions that weren't passed along to the re-writers. She is not trying to be critical, but didn't like the process. She has thought for years that there should be a Board Code of Conduct. She isn't sure how she will vote. In response to an objections written in the chat, Arna said that she was speaking to the motion because she was speaking to how the motion was formed. She just really wishes there was more accountability.

Teresa: She is open to further conversation about accountability but that shouldn't preclude passing this and getting this going. If we want more, we can make adaptations. It's time to start the process and have Board accountability from having signed the Code. It would be the beginning of clarity of what we can agree to. She urged passing the motion.

Jon Steinhart: He feels like the Code of Conduct discussion is reactive to a very divisive Board some years ago. Accountability is already in the Bylaws. If we were to add some accountability with a lower threshold than a super-majority, half the Board would have been called up at every single meeting for something or other and it would be counter-productive and would have given people a place to perform at Board meetings. The Code of Conduct sounds great but he doesn't support this because he doesn't expect this to change behavior. There are too many undefined terms that need to be defined. This is largely performative. He is not a Director to do performance art. Most of this code just restates the law and the Bylaws and we are already obligated to do that, so restating them again doesn't change anything. The Code creates unresolvable conflict. We all have a legal duty of care to the organization, independent of the Code of Conduct, because it's the law, but this Code says we can't engage in divisive behavior, such as calling someone out for doing something that is against the interest of the organization. He can't abide following a code that says he cannot do his duty of care because it might offend someone because he and the Fair could be sued. Number seven in the Code where it begins "Board members shall represent," that's a new power for the Board members; we don't actually represent the Fair. He is not looking for a Code of Conduct to give him that authority. He wants to serve on a Board where everyone conducts themselves and works together but the only real way to make that happen is for the members to make those decisions at election time. He cannot support this because he doesn't see it accomplishing anything.

(YouTube video 1:06:24)

AJ: He fully supports this and doesn't think it's performative. He doesn't think what's in the Bylaws is working or we wouldn't be having this discussion. He thanks the people who have cycled through the many conversations over the years to come up with something to have the Board acknowledge to move it forward. If we don't pass this we're back at the beginning. Nothing hasn't been working for us. This is an effort by the Board to move us forward and work together and how to treat each other and their responsibilities. If we are waiting for perfect, none of us will be here when that happens. This could acknowledge the responsibilities to the organization and each other to abide by, which is important.

Kevin Levy: He likes this document. Accountability is built in. If we add more accountability, it makes it a different document that could be abused. The point is about us being in agreement to work together whether they agree or not, even if it feels performative to some. This sets a precedent and gives an expectation to future Boards. This is a good start. This is a living document that we can change over the years, but we can get it started now.

John Govsky: He doesn't see anything objectionable. To get this in place is fine. This is an iterative process. We can amend later and add more accountability later, if appropriate. He doesn't have all the history and sees it as face value and thinks it's good enough, even if we could improve it.

John Alexander: Having worked on this for three years, he would hate to see it go. Would like to pass it as a working document and commit to looking at it during the yearly retreat. Regarding accountability, in the past accountability has looked like, "oh yeah, I will talk to that person." But then we see repeated violations of regular meeting norms even when the Facilitator talks to them about it. Sidebars don't work. He doesn't want to burden Fair Cares with our petty Board

problems. We should acknowledge to ourselves if a violation occurs. At the membership meeting, the members wanted accountability. We came out of our last meeting with questions that needed more discussion.

John Alexander moved and Arna seconded to amend the motion to require that the Board Code of Conduct be revisited with membership within a year.

Member Input:

Ann Bennet-Rogers: Supports this amendment. Sometimes things pass to a different group and a lot can be lost.

Spirit: This is one of those things where it was posted and there was time for member input. The Code will really come in handy with new Boards and upcoming hybrid voting. She does not support this amendment.

Board Discussion:

Arna: She likes this amendment. This is a living document, and this could be the first step. We could decide in a year if we like it and get membership feedback. This would make us do that. We may never take this up again unless something terrible happens. This would get us going and then within the year we would look at it with fresh eyes and see what membership thinks.

Sandra: She doesn't support this amendment. We don't have to make policies too complicated. We elect a Board to do the job, and we have to trust them to do it. If we are working with the Code of Conduct and find issues, the Board can bring it up. We don't need an amendment to force the issue. We are adults and can do the work. We should pass this Code of Conduct. It's a good one. If you look at other organizations, this measures up. After this draft, this Code of Conduct was presented to the Board and there was plenty of time for other Board members to give feedback. We were asked to put it off for a month, and that was granted, but we didn't get feedback, so there were plenty of opportunities. We don't need to drag this out anymore.

Paxton: He agrees with Sandra. Would like to pass the original motion. If there are infractions, they will not be dealt with by the membership, it would be handled at the Board level. He would be happy to review this in a year but doesn't think this is necessary.

John Alexander: He agrees that infractions won't go to membership but disagrees with the Code being discussed in private. Why don't we want to talk about accountability in front of membership? That is concerning but he did everything he could do.

Motion to amend the OCF Board Code of Conduct failed: 3-8; Sandra, George, Paxton, AJ, John Davis, Jon Steinhart, John Govsky and Kevin opposed.

The motion to approve the code passed: 10-1; Jon Steinhart opposed.

(YouTube video: 1:23:05)

Amend Article V.2.a of the Bylaws (AJ Jackson, Sandra Bauer, Kevin Levy, Jon Steinhart and John Davis):

Jon Steinhart moved and Sandra seconded to amend Article V.2.a of the Bylaws from:

Any individual is eligible for membership if the individual is registered with the OCF and has received either a wristband, other Fair camping pass, or verifiable worker day pass in one of the three previous Fairs, or is a verified elder in accordance with OCF Elders policy.

to (change highlighted and in all caps):

Any individual is eligible for membership if the individual is **AT LEAST 18 YEARS OF AGE**, registered with the OCF and has received either a wristband, other Fair camping pass, or verifiable worker day pass in one of the three previous Fairs, or is a verified elder in accordance with OCF Elders policy.

Steven Berkson: He said that Jon Steinhart wanted to do a presentation and asked the Board if there was any objection to receiving the presentation.

Arna: She opposed the presentation because she knows Jon has a viewpoint on it and it's unfair to put it on them at the last minute. She didn't know and didn't have chance to prepare her own presentation on an opposing viewpoint. A lot of times people think something is factual but it is still biased. No offense to Jon but she doesn't like how it's been done.

Steven Berkson: This came up at the last minute. It seems unfair to allow someone to provide a presentation on a motion when the other viewpoints haven't gotten the same opportunity, so the Board should have to approve such presentations. This has happened before and we are now trying to have the Board approve presentations first.

AJ: He didn't receive notification about this presentation before the meeting. Whether he agrees or disagrees doesn't impact anything. It's important as facilitator to know ahead of time. One of his sole responsibilities is facilitator of the meeting.

Jon Steinhart: It's not a PowerPoint presentation. It's data that hasn't been shared before about the ages of the folks that vote. It's a single chart, rather than a presentation, but he can spend 15 minutes talking about the data instead.

Teresa: She is frightened as a teacher and a person that has provided presentations to the Board that there is hesitancy to look at data. Presentations are the standard these days for sharing information.

Arna: She is curious if this is data from Sunshine and how long Jon has had the data. If it's brand new data, why hasn't it been presented to the Board already. She feels uncomfortable with how this is playing out, even though she is always interested in getting new facts and data. Jon has access to information that none of the rest of the Board has. The information about voting ages should come from our Membership Secretary.

Jon Steinhart: He is happy to drop it and talk through the whole thing rather than share his single chart, but what Arna said is not correct. Directors have the right to see membership data. He condensed the data and he should be thanked for providing the information.

John Alexander: He is all for numbers and data but he's not sure how relevant it is to the motion. He sees this motion about whether we disenfranchise one person or many.

Kevin: Jon is going to tell us what is on the chart, so maybe it will be easier if we just let him show it.

George: He wants to see the presentation and doesn't see any harm.

Jon Govsky: The suspense is killing him, let's just see it.

Paxton: He is uncomfortable with the source of the data. Generally, election databases are not public instruments and shouldn't be dealt with in public. He is interested in the data, but it should be shared amongst the Board before it goes to wider distribution, particularly a Board meeting.

AJ: People want to skip by this, but we have an established procedure. If you want to do a presentation, you have to let the President know. That is fairness and it's his responsibility. We cannot overlook that fact.

The vote on the request to make a presentation about the motion failed: 6-4-1; Paxton, AJ, John Alexander and Arna opposed; John Govsky abstained.

Jon Steinhart: Some years back the Board hired a Nonprofit Association of Oregon consultant to recommend changes to our organization. Some of those recommendations have been implemented and some ignored. Setting a membership age was recommended but not implemented. As you may have noticed by now, I am a fan of getting things done and off of our plate instead of kicking them down the road. I have more to say on this but would like to hear from the members first.

Member Input on motion to change voting age to 18:

Heather: She urged all to support his motion. People who are voting for BoD members are voting for responsible people for a lot of things for the organization. Since people who are under 18 cannot be responsible for those things, they shouldn't be voting for the people who are responsible for those things. It's important for lots of things such as contracts.

Spirit: She supports this. It's OK to have more informed voting. Youth can be informed, but when she was on the Board it was very rare to hear from them, maybe only one or two times in her four years (not sure how many voted). It's important that the Board puts checks and balances in place. In 2019, membership found loopholes and crews were going to overturn an election by having youth crew vote (10 and younger). Knowing that, it's irresponsible for the Board not to put protections in place for our organization. We want informed voting, not abuse of our Bylaws.

Lawrence Taylor: There is a procedural issue: This motion, as proposed, would be in violation of Oregon Law, ORS 65.1442(a), which requires a vote of membership for any action or amendment to the Articles of Incorporation that would reduce or eliminate a member's right to vote. The term action in that statute is a distinct portion separate from amendments to the Articles of Incorporation. So, two types of things require a membership vote under that provision. One is amendments to Articles of Incorporation and the other is actions. This would, in fact, be an action that would eliminate voting rights of some members. It's also pretty clear that action has to have a meaning distinct from amendments to Articles of Incorporation by the general rule of construction of statute, which is ORS 174010, which requires that where there are several provisions or particulars, such construction is possible to be adopted, as will give effect to all. So, to pretend that ORS 65.1442(a) applies only to amendments to Articles of Incorporation is to simply strike out the word action. This isn't just my interpretation, I consulted with David Atkin, who is the Director of the Center for Nonprofit Law in Eugene. He concurred entirely with my reading. He also pointed out that there's no reason why a nonprofit can't have members under 18, many organizations do. He even pointed out that Directors could be under 18, but probably not the President or Secretary. To Heather's point, some years ago when I was on the Board, a young woman under 18 ran for the Board. The Board determined that because of the legal responsibility issues that Heather raised, that Board members should be over 18. There was some pushback from the membership who thought that was unfair. At that time, not one person suggested that that young person shouldn't

have the right to vote. The first problem is that passing this would be a bold-faced violation of Oregon Law. I am not sure what legal advice you're getting because the Bylaws Committee was cut out of this process. If your lawyer is telling you that ORS 65.1442(a) doesn't apply to this action, you're getting bad legal advice. And if you haven't asked them about ORS 174010, you might be poor consumers of legal advice, which is a problem with not having any lawyers on the Board. That being said, there is lack of merit and legal issues with this motion.

Ann Bennet-Rogers: Agrees with Lawrence Taylor. There was more than one thing in the NAO report that the Board didn't feel like voting for or were applicable. She believes a 16-year-old can vote and you need to be 18 to serve on the Board.

Lisa Parker: To finish Lawrence's statement, the Teen Crew Coordinator is opposed to this. Even if this were not illegal, which it is, for the Board to make this decision, it really cuts the membership out of something that they ought to be included in. They should be the ones to decide this issue, regardless of what the law says, even though it says it cannot be done without their vote.

Board Discussion:

Paxton: He opposed the motion. He believes it will disenfranchise younger members. He would love to see this sent back to Bylaws Committee. He personally believes that 14-year-olds should be able to vote. Many of them grow up at Fair and understand it. Sixteen could be OK. Eighteen is a good age to qualify for being on the Board. He would like to see more discussion on this.

Jon Steinhart: This is not really something he wants to be doing or a hill he wants to die on. His highest priority as a Board member, especially with the Code of Conduct, is to look out for the interest of the Fair. You don't have to look very far today to see how bad actors can take over an organization. His legal duty of care, irrespective of a Code of Conduct, obligates him to try to prevent that from happening at the Fair. A few years ago, he was saddened when what he would consider bad actors were encouraging people to sign up their minor children to sign up for membership and vote on their behalf to sway an election. While this may have been in the selfish interest of those folks, it was not in the best interest of the OCF. For this reason, he supports the membership age of 18, so that those voting are more likely to be independent. This is a situation where you have to say "sorry, kids, some adults messed this up for you." Additionally, there is somebody who shows up at Troubleshooting every year and purchases about 50 teen wristbands for their church group kids. Under current policy, they are all allowed to become voting members. While they haven't yet, he doesn't think it's in our best interest to allow those who are not really part of our event on a lark to go vote for people who have no idea what they're doing. It's not good for our organization. There are no kids here telling us what they want. In his time on the Board, he hasn't seen a single minor show up. Parents are saying that they want their kid to be able to vote but he doesn't see the kids, so he questions their engagement. He could show us a nice chart. He could show us how many would be disenfranchised. Jerry Garcia could count them on one hand and have fingers left over. As for the scary-sounding TV lawyering Gish Gallop stuff, it's completely off base. This interpretation is coming from the person who wrote the protected section of our Bylaws

Steve Berkson: Let's avoid characterizing individuals here, please.

Jon Steinhart: Alternative interpretation is that we didn't need to write the protected section of the Bylaws. One position is right and one is wrong, he's not sure which, but fundamentally, what we are doing is not illegal because we are changing who gets to become a member, not voting rights. So all these scary-sounding Gish Gallop arguments are just scare tactics and have nothing to do with what we are doing tonight. Free legal advice has no accountability, so he prefers not having a lawyer on the Board and it's preferable to pay attorneys.

John Alexander: A point of order needs to be addressed about personally attacking or going after individuals that are trying to participate in this process. It's not personal. Just the question about whether this is legal or not should give us pause. If you look at New Business, there is something on there that is doing the right thing, to take something to the membership. We have had a joint committee working on this and it sounds like they were not involved with the most recent version of this. During two Work Sessions about this, there was considerable discussion about eligibility vs. voting rights. At the end of the day the intention of the Bylaws is to ensure that when anybody might be disenfranchised, that it be decided by a vote of the membership, so he doesn't understand why we are even talking about this. It should be sent to the membership if there is any question about the disenfranchisement of people currently able to vote. This is Bylaws related, so any amendment would not be appropriate right now because it would need to be published for another month or whatever our rules say. I am a total NO on this and this needs to go to membership. Our kids and my kids work hard, and I want to encourage them to get involved although he hasn't gotten them to attend these meetings yet. Hopefully one day.

Motion to extend the meeting 15 minutes passed: 8-3; John Alexander, Teresa and George opposed.

Arna: She understands that very few teens have been voting but this motion would disenfranchise those who have been voting. People under 18 are very rational and could reasonably vote. She has grandkids this age and she understands their intellect. She is not into disenfranchising people and believes that this is a membership question and should be referred, which is on New Business. Membership elects us to make decisions, but some decisions should go to them and this is one of them. We want younger people to take over the Fair so we have to get them involved and thinking about all of this. A lot of schools don't even teach civics anymore, so this would help teach them how to run nonprofits. She will vote no on this.

Sandra: She has thought about this a lot. There is a big difference between running a nonprofit and being involved in the Fair. Running the nonprofit takes sophistication and life experience to form full opinions about it. Eighteen is a common-sense age. We treat kids differently when they are under 18. They get a cheaper pass and don't have to work and if they do, they are supervised. They cannot be on a crew until they are 18. According to our attorney, their parents have to give the permission to become members. Our attorney, whose advice we pay for and has advised us on our Bylaws all the way along, is of the opinion that this does not have to go to the membership. The Board can make this decision because this isn't a voting right, but, rather, voting eligibility. She is in favor of continuing to use legal advice of the attorney that knows our organization best. When people sign up to become members, they agree to abide by the code of conduct, but at 16, they cannot be held accountable to that because they cannot sign contracts. A lot of problems go

away if we do this. There are a lot of exceptions for minors. This is the smart, sensible and normal thing to do. She hopes we pass it.

Jon Govsky: He has vacillated on this but thinks this is something we should give to the membership to vote on, so he will vote no on this right now

Kevin: He has also gone back and forth on this too. Age 16 or 18 makes sense, but echoes what Sandra said about differences of what kids and adults can do at Fair. This should maybe go to the membership. There is a lot of finger-pointing about disenfranchising so maybe we let the membership disenfranchise each other? That could be divisive. Boards have to make decisions that aren't always awesome. He thinks we should stick with 18.

Arna: She wants to clarify a couple of things in response to Sandra's comments. When you get a wristband, you are agreeing to the Code of Conduct, regardless of age. Our attorney said that any age can vote. She recommended that we might want minors' parents' permission to become members, but it was not required. Those are not good arguments for this, but she thinks the biggest argument against it is that it's a membership question that should go to the membership.

AJ: He agrees with Kevin's comments and doesn't like the direction this conversation has been going, that if you're for this, you're disenfranchising people. People younger than 16 (possibly 10) could vote because they get wristbands. What is the message that we are sending here? Do we agree that 16 is the youngest? He is leaning toward 18 and he has skin in the game. He has a 16-year-old son that has come every year of his life and has gotten a wristband and he knows things. Would he consider him an informed voter even though his father is the President? No! He is a child and not aware of governance and how that works. It's important.

John Alexander: It's OK for us to disagree. Disenfranchise is a hot term but villainizing individuals is different than a heated conversation. If this motion passes, people that voted last year will not be able to vote this year. Citing our lawyers is important because we seek an opinion to support what we want to do. This attorney previously told us that this might need to go to membership, so sometimes, how you phrase things will get you different answers. I love lawyers and one of my children is a lawyer. Maybe we put a clause in that says that anyone who voted last year can still vote. We should not be taking voting rights away, even if only one person.

Steven Berkson: The motion could be amended even though it's about Bylaws because everyone knows which Bylaws subject is on the agenda.

Sandra: It's important to keep in mind that to be on site, 16- and 17-year-olds have to have an adult or parental party sign for them. The same goes for voting. If our attorney recommends something, it's a good idea to do that. We treat them differently. We are trying to engage them; we want them there and participating but also in a safe and careful way. Just voting doesn't make you a good voter; it takes a lot of education. Stephen Diercouff said that 35 or 40 kids had signed up to be members and none of them voted, so she doesn't think there is a great push by the kids to vote. Last year about five youth voted, but three of them will be 18 by the next election, so this rule would only make two people ineligible under this policy. Every time you pass a policy it's restricting or making something new available. Disenfranchisement is a trigger word. We want to expand the number of votes with hybrid voting, which might increase younger turnout, so that's unfair to say that we're trying to restrict voting.

Jon Steinhart: AJ asked what the message is. He knew this would be an unpopular motion, but he is there to serve the Fair, not to be popular. The message is that protecting OCF is more

important than any one person's vote. Bad actors are out there messing other organizations up and he doesn't want that to happen to OCF. He has worked closely with Teen Crew for almost 20 years, including handling all the Teen Crew applications. There used to be a question on the application about whether anyone was interested in Teen Governance, and nobody was, so they took that off. Teens are not voting. As to an amendment to allow anyone who has voted to retain that right, that would create a second class of membership, which our Bylaws preclude. He is not there to disenfranchise anyone; he wants to protect OCF.

Paxton: The rumors about age 10 voting never happened. Historic age of membership is 14, the age at which you can get a wristband, so that's a specious argument. He trusts young people and would be happy with 14-year-olds who want to get involved. He doesn't like to act out of fear. He thinks this should be on the ballot.

John Alexander: He fears that this might be illegal, so we need to vote this down.

Motion passed to extend the meeting by 5 minutes: 10-1; John Alexander opposed.

Jon Steinhart: Spirit put in the chat that right now you can become a voting member at 13. It used to be 11, back when we sold Youth wristbands. He asked that if we don't finish this, that this move to first order of Business at next meeting.

Motion failed: 6-5; Paxton, John Govsky, John Alexander, Teresa and Arna opposed.

New Business

(YouTube video: 2:16:15)

Appoint Tash Wesp to the Craft Committee (Arna Shaw, John Govsky and AJ Jackson)

Place the following questions before the membership for a vote in the 2025 Annual Election (Arna Shaw, Teresa Vaughn, John Alexander, John Govsky and Paxton Hoag):

1. Shall Article V, Section 2(a) of the Bylaws be amended to establish a minimum age for membership in the OCF? Yes ____ No ____

2. If a minimum age is established, what should it be? 16 ____ 18 ____

The results of this vote be treated as binding on the Board of Directors.

Next Board Meeting will be Sunday June 29, 4 pm via Zoom

President's Peace

(YouTube video: 2:16:48)

Thank you for participating. Have a lovely night and be safe.