

EDIB Work Group Meeting – 5.12.25, 7-9 pm via Zoom

Facilitator: Michael “Coyote” Connelly

Committee Members: Carla Herran, Samira Lobby, Hall Stuart-Lovell, Peter Mohn

Liaisons: Arna Shaw

Also in attendance: AJ Jackson, Jon Steinhart, Paxton Hoag, Steven Berkson, Heather Kent

(Silence till 6:20)

Meeting begins at 8:06.

Welcome and Coyote’s reflection meditation (8:30-10:07)

Samira reads the EDIB work group statement: (10:32-12:24)

Ice Breaker (12:33-28:01)

What was the year you graduated from high school. What and who were musical influences from that year on your life today? Why?

Agenda Review: (29:15-30:00)

Minutes Approval (30:00-31:30)

Passed by unanimous consent, Hannah absent.

Discussion of the work group’s revision of the Board’s Equity and Inclusion Statement (32:07-

Coyote reads the statement (32:29-34:36)

Arna asks whether the group has resubmitted the statement to the address mentioned at the listening session. Hall answers that the idea was to meet and fix a duplicated sentence and ask for input before resubmitting, since there was time to do so. (34:50-35:35)

Discussion of Samira’s suggested addition (35:40-39:01)

Jon Steinhart appreciates the work, but this isn’t the task the Board asked the group to do. Taking personal time. If the group wanted to return to the Board and add that task, that’s one thing, but currently not part of it. (39:04-39:43)

Steven Berkson appreciates what Jon is saying, but disagrees a bit. The mission of the group is part of the organization’s EDIB position. A little strange to have these forked. He would like to see these ideas put into a bullet pointed list. A general feeling of what our goal is. Let the event be what it is, a celebration of a value system, not necessarily everything to all people. It should be welcoming so that anyone who wants to participate can. The ideas would be better in a list of things we do to accomplish the goals. That gets lost. (39:51-41:10)

AJ Jackson agrees with Jon Steinhart. The Board has been working with a consultant on this statement for the organization. There is some confusion. The Board did not form this committee to do all EDIB work. The Board gave the group some tasks to do, but this statement was to be originated from the Board as a statement from the organization. As they worked with the consultant, the consultant wanted them to get feedback from everybody, not just from one group because it’s such a big statement to make. The Board will continue to work with the consultant on

this statement, getting feedback from all different committees, groups, and individuals and forming this as a vision statement from the Board of Directors. They are looking for feedback from everybody and will consider the sources of that feedback, but this is a statement that will eventually be from the Board and its training and work with a DEI consultant. He wants to be clear about that; this is something that will come from the Board and that the Board is continuously working on. (41:20-43:37)

Carla wants to balance what we are doing and what we are asking to do. On the one hand, she likes the idea of the Board reaching out for feedback from many sources so that they will have an equity vision that is rich and takes into account a multitude of voices. Second, our group is well positioned as any equity consultant to provide feedback and craft a statement. She believes that it shouldn't be the only one. This is a vision statement, dreaming about possibilities and taking us into a journey. What is the next step after the vision? What is our vision for the next 20 years? How will we refine the vision as we start moving? She is curious to hear about that. It will be enriching and she is thankful for this opportunity. She has more questions than answers. (43:45-46:02)

AJ says that there are clear answers for them if they want. (46:04-46:12)

Coyote as facilitator says that there are hands up.

Arna understands the Board process. She hopes that this is the Fair's vision, just not the Board. This is a membership organization and we need to represent the membership in something like this. She doesn't mean to be in conflict with AJ on this, but we need to understand what the membership wants. That's why they are requesting feedback. She did tell the group that the Board wouldn't just accept the group's version of a vision statement, but if the group wanted to do feedback in this way, they could. No one expected that the Board would just accept the statement, but she was hoping that the Board would read this and take some of the language into account. She thinks it's a good group and they work on their language and they are good with language. She hopes the Board will review the feedback from this group and others, but a lot from this group because they have some expertise. (46:25-48:29)

Heather thanks Arna and is glad she spoke first. If she were a member of this work group, she would feel discouraged by some of what she'd heard. She would not expect the feedback of the group to be accepted as is, sounds defensive. She would expect it to be looked as other feedback, but a team of people's feedback. She would wonder why is there this distinction. Whatever the work group comes up with that the Board decides to use will become the Board's. The Board will have ownership of whatever it decides to implement and do. Be careful whether what you're saying might be dismissive and insulting to people who are working really hard on things and didn't even know that this was going to be on the agenda for the work session. She was surprised to hear that the EDIB group didn't know this was coming up. If you just want to work with a consultant, don't do a callout and have other people do work. (48:39-50:25)

AJ is sorry that people are taking his words the way they are. Since he came into leadership, he has been pushing the leadership of the organization to take some responsibility for our efforts in DEI. He has finally felt like they were succeeding in getting the Board to do some of the work on DEI and leading rather than putting the work of DEI on a small group of folks. You have two people of color on the Board who have worked really hard and have experience as well. We've made mistakes in the

past thinking that one group can do all of it. It's puzzling sometimes the offense taken. We can get feedback from many different places and also be responsible as a Board of Directors for the direction and vision of the organization. At this point, the Board has been through several trainings this year and one of the things the consultant asked us to do was to have many different people from the organization give feedback. The question came up with the consultant as to whether they should weigh the feedback of some over others. What was told to them was that they would get all the feedback and then meet up again. This is likely a yearlong task. They'll be meeting after the fair to go through all the feedback and craft a statement from that. There are many steps. As a person of color leading the organization, he is sick and tired of the Board not taking responsibility and the work that it takes to this. They have to do their part and that doesn't mean any disrespect to the group as a committee. It's the opposite. He respects the members of the group. They voted for the members of the group because of that respect, but that doesn't mean all the work that the Board does regarding DEI is going to do is being put on the group. He is a little frustrated now from what he's hearing because this isn't something that is supposed to be a task that they would engage this committee only. He apologizes if any disrespect is felt, but the Board needed to get its act together with some stuff and this is part of the process of the Board getting its act together and leading in this conversation and not passing it on to other folks. (50:35-55:01)

Coyote remembers that when the call for the listening session for the Equity and Inclusion Vision Statement, our original task was to come up with definitions for words and two of the words the group was to define were "equity" and "inclusion." What jumped out at him was that the Board was asking the membership to read this and discuss it, but that it was as though the Board had already defined those words as they went forward and that was confusing to him. Why were we asked to provide definitions for words that the Board has already come up with definitions for? (55:17-56:49)

Steven Berkson hopes that the sense of tension can be reduced. He doesn't think there's so much sense of offense being expressed as confusion and lack of clarity. He hopes we can look at it in that sense and see across perspectives. What he's hearing from committee members is confusion. In support of what Arna said, his experience with mission and vision statements in general for any organization, if they aren't created by the organization as whole then they don't end up grabbing hold of the organization's members much at all. It can even become a negative thing. He hopes that either the Board has a statement for this Board, period, or the Board has a statement for the organization. If the latter, then he agrees it's a year process and needs to not be looked at as the Board's statement, but as the organization's statement and created in a manner that gives everyone ownership. That said, talking about whether or not working on this statement is this committee's mission, he would hope that the input of people you have tasked with working on this subject would carry some special weight in consideration of what input to take. The other question that comes to mind for him is that there needs to be clarity on exactly what this committee's mission is if the statement of the organization that should be guiding their work is undeveloped. Should this committee's work be put on hold until the organization has an equity vision statement or is there a working definition in the interim or should they have any role in it. This should be the guiding light of the work, so how do those two fit together? That should be defined for people so there's less confusion. (56:52-1:00:02)

Jon Steinhart is a little disturbed by the direction this has taken. "First of all, it's an hour into your meeting and this isn't one of your assigned tasks and you haven't worked on your assigned tasks.

Because other committees have done this, we've had to form the Committee Best Practices process so that we can keep committees on the tasks that we've assigned to them." He doesn't really know how we've gotten into this corner since he's been busy on other things, but one of the things that in his opinion damaged the existing Diversity Committee is that Board members came in and told them to do things and the committee members assumed that the Board had actually asked them to do that. The only way the Board speaks is by taking a vote and the only thing they voted on was the motion that gave the group their tasks to do. "The Board did not ask you to do this, even if some Board member asked you to do it and maybe you thought they were speaking on behalf of the Board." He is perfectly happy to have the group spend its own time outside a work group meeting to work on this and offer feedback as members of the EDIB workgroup, but it's not coming from the EDIB work group. "You're off track here as you actually have other work to do." He also has to say that "we're a twenty thousand person organization. Multiple things are going to be happening at the same time. You gotta get used to that. The Board is working on something. You're working on something. That's the way it is. These things will eventually get reconciled. You actually have work to do that we've asked to do and you have graciously volunteered to do. This isn't it. Speaking for myself, I would like you to do the work the Board asked you to do and not this. Sorry if that's a bummer. I don't want you to end up in the same position as the Diversity Committee by doing what you wanted instead of what the Board asked you to do and then wonder why you're not in good standing." (1:00:14-1:02:45)

Arna thinks that Jon doesn't have all the facts. The group mainly worked on this statement in subgroup meetings, not main meetings. All they were doing is giving feedback on the Equity and Inclusion statement, which members were asked to do. This is the longest this has been talked about at a regular business meeting. She thinks that if the Board members weren't here, it would have been very fast. Board members are holding the meeting up by talking about it so much. She doesn't think Jon had all the information when he was critiquing the group. She does not compare to the other Diversity Committee at all and thinks that is unfair. Saying that the group is going to be in bad standing is wrong, a threat that should not be made. All the group was doing was replying as members to the statement put out by the Board. They decided to respond to it with another statement and they formed it in a subcommittee meeting. "I'm going to shut up now and I'm hoping maybe the rest of the Board will shut up now so actually the committee can work." (1:02:52-1:04:17)

AJ – "Point of order. Please don't use that kind of language. We don't need to shut up. There's a nice way of putting that." (1:04:26-1:04:33)

Arna – "I would hope that the Board will be quiet now so the committee can work." (1:04:33-1:04:37)

Carla is grateful that the Board let us know that this is happening and that there is a vision. She wants to congratulate them on the work they are doing. Equity work is not easy work. It's easy to write a statement, but not that easy to carry forward as a vision. She thinks that is one of the main challenges and would like to ask the Board to share some visualization or tool that helps to see the milestones of the vision. A roadmap – we are here, this is how we will synthesize, when we will mail statements. We are doing this for this reason and this is what we hope to get. Where are we now in the time line? Most members will have the opportunity to chime in, including ourselves, and know where we are in the road map and in that process. She cares about equity, but doesn't believe her voice should be heard over other voices. She is grateful. She wants to know the plan with the

statement, actually it's a vision so she wants to hear more about what they will do with that and how will they integrate it along with the other mission/vision statements. She agrees with Steven that it should be done with many voices as that will make it very rich and people will feel that their voices were included and that will be inspiring. (1:05:15-1:07:32)

Paxton states that as a Board member, he is very confused and doesn't want the group to think they are the only ones. In the past when there is confusion about what a committee does, he looks up the mission statement when the committee was formed. He doesn't have it in front of him at this time. He is here to listen to the work group. He appreciates what the work group is trying to do and he wants to move forward with it. He doesn't necessarily think that the Board statement is what we're going to end up with. We need more participation and he hopes it leads to discussions amongst the Fair Family in larger and larger ways. He personally thinks that's a very important part of this process. He views the Board statement as an introduction to what we're thinking of and he also doesn't feel it represents the members as a whole, but it's more of a guiding thing. AJ says the Board trying to lead, but he's not sure they know where we're going. Actually, he does think we know where we're going. The Board is trying to create a better, more diverse, welcoming Fair. That's the goal. Some discussions in groups get off on side tracks. Personally he thinks that's okay. It brings up points that need to be considered. He is happy with the work the group is doing and he's sorry the Board members take so much of the group's time. He's here to listen. (1:07:38-1:09:39)

Samira has heard a lot of opinions that were surprising for all of us. From what she's hearing, this is something for the Board to talk about and then come back to us because we do have a lot of other things to talk about. She appreciates Arna pointing out that we probably wouldn't have spent this much time on this issue. Everything else we did was via comments and a separate meeting. She looks forward to hearing what the Board thinks we should do. For now, hopefully we can stay on track. (1:09:46-1:10:30)

Peter appreciates what everyone is saying. He hears AJ and respects what he's saying. He understands that tasks were split up and the group's task is to review the Oregon Country Fair's equity, diversity, inclusion, and belonging policies and recommend changes, in addition to some bullet points. The interesting part is that this actual meeting with consultants and coming up with definitions adjacent to another committee coming up with definitions is helpful. He would put it on the list of things to analyze in terms of policy. It definitely qualifies by his criteria for things that identify as policy, mission statements. He appreciates it. It's something to look at. The definition hangup is that the group was surprised that they were defining the same words and that caused little hitch in their giddyup. He appreciates the fact that people are talking about it. The group was creating something that was helpful to their work. It is all part of a process – identify the policies, analyze them, that's what we're doing. These policies do exist currently and there's a lot of stuff to talk about in policies. He appreciates the process. No hard feelings. He agrees with Steven and Arna's points about how this works. Increasing the access to voices and perspectives is all good. He is focused on the policies that exist now and analyzing them. Ultimately the group's task is to review the policies and this is part of it. (1:10:48-1:13:02)

Hall feels that is confusing to figure out, having been sent to do definitions, having spent lots of hours in conversations and reading about these terms, equity, diversity, inclusion, and belonging, and what they mean at the Country Fair, to then have thrust upon us a process. She understands,

the Board is doing its thing, but it involves the use of these words and it involves an approach to this work, based on the Board's work with the consultant, without the group getting the benefit of that work. The group has been doing its own work, which is parallel, but based on her reading of the statement, a little different. The group read the statement and had its concerns and thoughts, but a listening session with the Board... it's a big room and it's hard to figure out how to speak about some of these touchy and confusing areas. So the group decided that it would be helpful and appreciated that they "say some stuff" so they worked together in a subgroup meeting, not taking up scheduled zoom time, on her own zoom account. It was a good session and they felt good about the work they'd done. The group hoped to work with the Board. Hall feels hurt to be accused of possibly in bad standing when they're trying so hard not to be in opposition with the Board. The group has reached out twice with specific questions about what the Board wants, what the survey can and should be. They've received no response. It feels like the group has kind of been thrown away. The Board hasn't let it know, reached out, responded to questions, or had any real conversation. That's not happening. Instead they have come to the group to scold them and tell them to do their work, without wanting to understand how the people they've assigned to work in this space have come to the opinions they have. She is sad and discouraged and would wish that they would see the group as people working hard trying to do good work. (1:13:06-1:16:41)

Steven Berkson says that he had asked a question, not to be challenging or threatening or confrontational. It's a genuine question and he doesn't know that any one Board member can answer it. Perhaps the committee members are clear on it, but he does not see how defining equity vision for the organization can be separated or worked on in parallel with trying to implement a vision of diversity and equity in evaluating policy. He thinks that the confusion this creates just needs clarity. What is the expectation? What working definition to go with? How is this work to be done while simultaneously defining the term. If others share that confusion, if there are questions asked and not answered, that's one of the most important roles of liaisons, going back and forth and making sure that questions are answered. If there are questions that are not answered, when it comes to something like this, it creates an escalating level of division. He thinks a clear distinction is needed between what is expected of this work that doesn't involve the equity vision for the organization. (1:17:00-1:19:17)

AJ is concerned that this conversation continued and they were asked more question and then told that the Board members are taking up all of the group's time. He is confused by the questions if there is not time for them to respond. (1:19:29-1:20:11)

Carla addresses the data management plan. The group was tasked with doing a survey/census of the people with wristbands. As a group, we have been working on different parts of the work. She would like Jon Steinhart to address the privacy policy and what is ethical. This is an attempt to state how we will treat human subjects. When we collect data we want to reassure Fair Family members that whatever information they provide, the information will not be shared and the responses will not be attached to their name, there will not be consequences or retaliation. Some of this is the bare minimum, but it is all to make it clear that we will protect their data. She is not sure how the data management plan will align with the privacy policy and safety issues. It has components like the types of research we will do, some electronic, some remote meetings. If we do qualitative data, who are going to be the participants? There are questions and concerns about data access. Who is going to have access to the data once we get it? We want to be ethical, proactive, trustworthy, and

transparent. Transparency doesn't mean sharing data with emails. We talk about dissemination and how it will be shared, the findings and results. How long will we keep the data? The intellectual property and the analysis that will happen overlaps with the privacy policy a little bit. How is the Sunshine database going to help us? How will we leverage that database for our purposes? She discusses the survey options. The Sunshine database can see the email invites, or we can use another option. We will need approval of the Board and we need to consult with the team that is working with the Sunshine database as a group. We need to consider the privacy, security, cost, tradeoffs. Two things that are important to consider: the invitation to the survey and the hosting of the responses. When people start responding, what is the database or program that is hosting that? She offers options to consider, but some of them are costly. We also need to work out what the questions will be. She has more questions than answers. (1:20:51-1:27:47)

Jon Steinhart says there are two things going on now that are important. There were three people objecting to the change in language in the data privacy policy. He thinks they are kind of out of line, but doesn't know what the Board will do, but hopes that they can still allow the group to conduct the census. One of the comments was basically, "Oh my god, you're collecting personal information," when that was the point. He doesn't know what the Board will do about that. In Sunshine, he has a list of the Fair Family and has email addresses for a large number of them. The group can use that to invite people to fill out the census. He also has unique magic numbers that go along with every person. The group can use those or he can develop an independent random set of unique magic numbers. There are two reasons those are needed: 1) to make sure that only people invited to take the census respond and 2) to make sure that nobody responds more than once. Otherwise validity is lost which was a big part of the problem with the Diversity Committee's survey. The only other use, if the group wanted to, is that since Jon can track those identifiers back to people, info like age in Sunshine could be retrieved, rather than being asked on the census. He doesn't know whether the group wants to ask people where they live, perhaps we want to map diversity to closeness to the Fair site. Those questions could be on the census or Jon could provide it from Sunshine. He doesn't want to go near any of this as he doesn't want to be accused of looking at people's data or looking at people's answers. He can provide an email list, list of people's names, something so that we know who was invited and who has responded. If we want some additional information about where people live or how old they are, he has that. He would not be comfortable sharing how people respond by crew or booth as a lot of those are so small that it would end up being personally identifiable anyway. (1:27:47-1:31:03)

Peter points out that the rhetoric of census is not what the group has been asked to do. We've been asked to do a statistically accurate demographic survey. That's not the same as a census. We don't need everyone involved. We need a representative sample of respondents. The mindset of a census is that everyone has to respond to make it accurate. He points out that statistically accurate is a little different than that. Also, a lot of the policy stuff doesn't require a demographic survey. We can actually analyze policy and all that other stuff. Policy analysis is something that can be done completely devoid of demographic survey. The work can be done regardless of that, but the rhetoric of census does kind of freak people. (1:31:05-1:32:04)

Jon Steinhart states that to be clear, he doesn't have email addresses for everybody so we're not going to contact everybody, but he knows how people he has addresses for and how many he doesn't which means that we can calculate a margin of error, which is what's important. He

recognizes that we won't get everybody, but if one has no idea how many people were contacted out of how big the family is then there's no statistical value, but he can give us that information. He can say, for example, that out of 40,000 people, he gave us 30,000 email addresses and we can do our math from there. (1:32:04-1:32:38)

Arna thinks that if we're doing it as a survey and use that term, we can use Sunshine which is free to us. That's really a plus. She thinks we do need to keep using the word survey. All the other options are expensive. We really have to reassure people that the Fair isn't going to be poking around in their information. And we have to make people careful with that. People might worry, for example, that the Fair would know their sexual preference. We have to make it really clear that the Fair is not going to know that. No one in the Fair will know that. She thinks that's a lot of PR work that we'll have to do and do well. (1:33:09-1:34:20)

Coyote addresses the issue of using Sunshine. He doesn't have direct experience but what he's hearing is a lot of disgruntled conversations about it. He is concerned that there is a reputation that Sunshine is not competent and people may not want to engage with the Survey because of Sunshine's reputation. (1:34:20-1:35:10)

Carla thinks this is good to hear about the trust issues that Sunshine may evoke. That is important for us to hear because that's why we've been thinking about the data management plan... which isn't as exciting as policies and equity and vision statements, but it's very important because we want to be proactive and actually assure people that whatever they share will be protected by the management plan. The management plan is the beginning, a document that will ground the way in which we can communicate, whether it is a survey or big quasi-census. We need to talk to people. How are we going to do that? She feels like when we talk about equity, a lot of people who self identify as POC or different cultures tend to distrust the systems because historically the systems have failed them. This is a good opportunity to build that trust and bridge. We need to be transparent and proactive in how we communicate this and what we assure them. (1:35:51-1:38:20)

Paxton says that Kirsten is dedicated to making the database work. She has a greater group working on it than just Jon. One of the things they're working on this year and next is the front end, how the crews and booths work on it. It was thought to be a three year project, but it looks to Paxton like it will be a four year project. More and more of is being moved to the workgroup away from Jon's supervision because he's overloaded. It's a bigger task than originally expected. Kirsten is dedicated to making it work and he believes she will. (1:38:28-1:39:35)

Hall really felt what Hilary was saying in the Board meeting when she talked about her concern about sharing this information with a third party, but as Carla just pointed out, vulnerable people, particularly at this time in history, are less and less likely to want to share this information. She thinks that this will skew our information in an unfortunate way. The people we most want to hear from are going to be the least likely to want to participate. She doesn't know what to do about that, but thinks it's a fact. (1:39:38-1:40:33)

Arna would want to make sure that with immigration the way it is, our records couldn't be subpoenaed. She doesn't think they could, but with things going the way they are in this country, who knows. Her bet is that there are illegal immigrants at the Fair and wouldn't want anyone to be getting in trouble. Trans people may be hesitant to put anything out there with this really negative

attitude towards trans people. She doesn't see any way our records could be subpoenaed, but we should find out legally if there's any way that could happen. If they can't be, then we can reassure the membership that our records can't be subpoenaed by any government. No one is going to see these. We really have to make sure people can trust us. It's a big ask these days to get people to give up this information. There are other things to think about as we think through this and how we're going to convince the membership. She would rather us have the information than a third party who not fight as hard to keep that information confidential. We have a vested interest in it whereas a third party might not. (1:40:40-1:42:56)

Steven Berkson states that the Fair's records can be subpoenaed. That's a fact. There's no way to have it not subpoenaed. So when you collect the data, you mark the person who provided the data as having completed it, with no connection to the data provided. That's how you keep someone from going twice, but have no connection to that data. So, if they subpoena that information, they can't bring it back to individuals. Then you also need to do stuff to not keep logs of IP addresses when the records were created. So there's a bit on an evaluation process to ensure you're doing that. But there's no way to prevent it from being subpoenaed except to either a) give nothing to subpoena or b) fight the subpoena and win in court. Otherwise your records can be taken. Lastly, on the third party thing, any reputable company that does this already does those things so their stake in that is probably greater than ours because they'll be out of business if they do it. And they know how. (1:43:10-1:44:43)

Heather says that the whole discussion brings up for her is the question of what is going to be done with this information. How is this information going to be useful? What is the plan? (1:44:52-1:45:15)

Carla thinks that's a good question. The Board set up the group and we have some deliverables. What we hope with this survey is to ask people about how they perceive their belonging and ability to feel included and welcomed. That survey may be one survey that asks about their well-being, their perceptions of belonging, and it may include some demographics or that may be separate. We don't know that yet. We want to make it sure that we hear from those voices we don't usually hear from. Why do we want to hear this? We hope that as we review policies we want to see how well these policies align and have some data to bring recommendations to the Board. What are the perceptions and what are ways in which we can improve what it means to belong and feel welcome. We hope that is tied to some groups that usually don't have the opportunity to participate or feel that their voices have not been invited to the table. That's why we're talking about the database now because building trust is important. She has been asking for a roadmap to the consultant and the equity vision. We need to provide a road map too. This is what we mean. This is what we're going to do with the data. This is what we hope to do. There is a trust issue and a survey overload issue. People don't want to do surveys because they go into a vacuum. They don't know what is being done with the information. They give their time and their insights and they want to know what is being done with that. We hope that our team can articulate that and close the feedback loop. (1:45:17-1:48:32)

Arna asks whether it is time to put articles in the Fair Family News, introducing the group and talking about what it's doing. This is just a question, but one of the ways to build trust is to let the members know who the group is and what it's doing. (1:48:47-1:49:44)

Carla says this opens a can of worms for her as several months ago she had suggested that. Says the group needs to discuss that internally. What pieces could be shared that are a little more clean and polished? (1:49:57-1:50:03)

Arna suggests that it could be just a two paragraph narrative, “we’ve been meeting... this is what we’re thinking...” It doesn’t have to be finished, just an introduction to the members so when the group is ready to a survey, they will know who the group is. (1:50:26-1:50:57)

Coyote suggests moving to the issue of a time extension for the group.

Carla wants to ask Arna and the other Board members. June is a tentative date for recorded meeting. July she thinks no one will meet. And then there are August and September, after which the group should dissolve. We do have some pieces we have been working on. That work needs to be organized. We need to set milestones and keep working. We need to ask for an extension. She wants to hear from the Board members what would be a good idea, also from the other group members. What are their perceptions on asking for an extension? What seems reasonable and then the group can discuss internally. (1:51:45-1:53:36)

Peter thinks the most immediate thing is that the scope of work says a statistically accurate demographic survey of 2024 participants, so that’s an obvious change. If we are waiting, are we to look at the 2025 participants? include the 2024 participants and the 2025? That’s a semantic scope of work issue. (1:53:37-1:54:10)

Paxton states that the 2025 survey at the Fair this year is an external demographic survey. He talked to Kristi just the other day. (1:54:16-1:54:24)

Coyote inquires whether that means we’d looking at 2026 survey.

Paxton clarifies that he referring to what the survey crew will be doing this year for their work at Fair. If the group is to use the database, the survey can be done at any time. He knows how to do it at fair – have them fill it out at Fair before they get their wristband. He suspects that the demographic survey will be done at a different time. (1:54:36-1:55:40)

Arna thinks the group should decide how long they need and recommends over estimating so as not to have to go back to the Board repeatedly. She doesn’t think the Board will object. She thinks most will be expecting the group to need more time since nine months wasn’t much for this project. She has no problem going to the Board and asking for more time, but the group needs to agree on it. She’ll say that it will be a 2025 survey and make sure that’s okay. The sooner the group decides on a time frame, the sooner she can ask them. (1:55:51-1:56:50)

Coyote suggests that the work group can discuss this further amongst themselves. (General agreement and head nodding.) (1:56:51-1:57:16)

Carla asks Arna how long the Board will take to approve. (1:57:20-1:57:49)

Arna says that if she has to put it on the agenda, it takes six weeks, but if she can just ask the Board. She and Paxton agree that because it is a change of the original motion, it needs to be on the agenda. Paxton recommends putting it on for an extension and making it open ended. Paxton remarks that it takes more time to do things at the Fair than you even considered. Hall points out

that we're really not sure how long it will take to work out the technology with Sunshine. Arna requests a rationale for what to tell the Board. She will put a motion together and when it comes up at the meeting, the members of the group can come and comment. Discussion of putting the motion on for the June-ly meeting, new business in June, addressed in June-ly. Deadline of May 19th. She will say that it is to be a 2025 survey and an indefinite extension. She will take care of that, but for the meeting, she will want information from the group. Hall points out that the June-ly meeting has no zoom component. Steven Berkson suggests that if possible it would be better to push the consideration of the motion to August since the June-ly meeting is supposed to be light on business since the lack of a zoom option limits participation. He recommends bringing it up as new business and scheduling it for August. He says if there is tension within the Board or controversy within the Fair Family, he wouldn't recommend passing anything at the June-ly meeting. General agreement to do it in August. (1:57:55-2:01:44)

Steven Berkson states that "until the work is complete" is a normal thing to have in motion like this, perhaps with a schedule of progress reports every six months so that the Board can decide whether progress is being made adequately. That means it's not an open-ended forever thing because you have to come back every six months, but doesn't have a fixed date. (2:01:44-2:02:34)

Steven Berkson responds to an inquiry from the chat about subpoenas. The only documents that are protected from subpoena are protected by law which mean if you go to court, the court will say no, because the law says you can't have it, like doctor-client privilege for example. Under certain circumstances the judge can override that. Basically records can always be subpoenaed. The question is whether or not the person trying to subpoena them prevails in court. Having to fight anything like that costs money. That's why he recommends not having records that you have to worry about giving up. The biggest trick is someone having gotten tagged as having completed the survey, but not being able to complete the survey because it crashing or them getting locked out. There's a balance managing the security of collecting the data accurately against the security of keeping people's anonymity. (2:04:25-2:06:00)