

Attendance: Paulette Richards, Alex Lanham, Kelly Durian, Maria Moule, Paula Gourley, Deb Schussler, Alan Pointer, Eli Mazet, Julia Garretson

Staff: Kimberly Cullen, Kim Still

Recorder: Diane McWhorter

Guests: Chris Clark, Tym Mazet, Rege Shaw, Teresa Pitzer, Colleen Bauman, Sheila Pointer, David Duckett

Introductions and Announcements: Intros around the room . Julia has to leave at 7:00. Paula will be gone for two weeks but expects to be back for the retreat. She asks that people be sensitive to those who do not have access to the internet and keep providing paper copies. There were reports of conversations with the EPD about the FSP, and parking violations by members.

Pressing Member Issues: David Duckett read a letter to the Board regarding a letter he received from staff about concerning his usage of space on Saturdays. He wonders if it is policy to enforce rules only in response to complaints, which he feels would be random and selective. He feels that some vendors may feel entitled to privilege due to their long membership and target newer members with complaints. He was unhappy with his treatment and the process. No action was specifically requested.

Agenda Review: Adjustments were made to the Bin, which was expanded to three bins: 1. (previous items) Overtime Reform, Low-end Fee Relief, Closing at 4:00, Agreement of members not to sell adjacent to Market, Consequences for leaving early, FSP. 2. (Items for today's meeting) Annual Meeting, Budget Committee Appointment, Personnel Committee Appointment 3. (Items added today) Banners on 8th St., Buskers

***Motion: Approve the agenda (Deb/Paula) All in favor 8-0-0

Minutes Approval:

***Motion: Approve the Board Minutes from August 3, 2016 (Julia/Alan) Motion passed 6-0-2 (Paula, Deb)

Discussion of CPW Presentation: (CPW representatives expected to arrive at 6:00 pm) What we will hear tonight will probably be a recap of what was talked about at the June final meeting. They asked two questions of SM: What further research could they do, and what are ways SM and LCFM could work together to implement the plan. Members do not see themselves co-managing a facility that was intended to improve LCFM space. Members don't welcome a "Public Market" but prefer to visualize and work toward two different solutions, one for the SM on the south blocks, and another for the LCFM Site Improvement (hopefully on the northwest block). This proposal seems to ask SM members to help pay for a building not requested by SM. Members of our organization seem inclined to stay autonomous, not confuse our mission of Maker/Seller by blending with them, and work in parallel without going as far as co-management. LCFM and the Public Market plan both involved "anchor businesses" which we assume could be commercial and not handmade products, and to which SM members would object. A

statement was prepared after the members' meeting and the Board was asked to approve forwarding it to the CPA.

***Motion: Adopt the statement as an official position (Alan/Alex)

Discussion: See the presentation first before making a statement. A meeting between the managers and chairs of the SM and LCFM indicated that LCFM had some problems with the model as well. The statement leaves things open at the end for further discussion but does give the CPW information they need to hear. There may still be other opportunities to give feedback to the CPW. It could be sent tomorrow if it is still what the members want to say.

***Motion: Table the motion (Alex/Kelly) All in favor 8-0-0

CPW Presentation: Tim Hicks (facilitator) Anne Fifield (Economic Development, City of Eugene) Sarah Means (Economic Development, Lane County), Bob Parker (UO Community Planning Workshop Director), Sadie Di Natale (CPW), Andrew Martin (CPW)

Please see the attached PDF file of the Power Point presentation, which summarized the work of the CPW since 2009 when they were engaged by Lane County to explore the feasibility of a concept now known as the "Public Market ". They began with a public survey, researched similar models in six locations in the US, and surveyed both LCFM and SM members. A Resource Group was formed from stakeholders to inform the process of the CPW. On the basis of the surveys and research and feedback from the Resource Group they analyzed the financial feasibility of three models and are presenting one model for consideration. Site location, design, ownership of the facility and commitment from existing markets are unknown. The CPW is now wrapping up their report, which they have forwarded to the city and county and will release to the public at some point for their engagement. Local governments will give feedback, stakeholders will weigh in.

They used a set of guiding principles which include:

The Eugene downtown public market will:

1. Be located in downtown Eugene and will serve both of the existing markets – Lane County Farmers Market and Saturday Market;
2. Operate year-round, with days and hours of operations potentially varying by season;
3. Be designed to operate in inclement weather, for flexible space use, and to allow for future expansion;
4. Retain the character of the currently operating markets, with a primary focus of selling and showcasing locally grown and produced products.

They studied financial feasibility, determined by assumptions about occupancy levels (number of vendors), seasonal variation, sales potential in relation to costs to operate, and booth sizes, and attempted to create an event which includes space for vendors, consumers, and amenities. Amenities would include restrooms, utilities, seating, covered spaces, outdoor spaces, and commercial spaces (anchor businesses).

The smaller facility concept was selected as the most feasible. The event is planned to encompass about 85,000 sq.ft. total, or about two acres. Indoor capacity would be about 15,000 sq. ft. with 39,000 sq.ft. of outdoor vending space and the rest open space (31,000 sq.ft.). It would be visually appealing, flexible and convertible, and expandable for future growth.

Governance and management : Partnership between Saturday Market and LCFM would allow the public market to leverage current organizational capacities. Fee structures could be of three types: a monthly fee based on sq. ft., a percentage of sales, or a combination of the two. Days of operation options ranged from 2-3 days (minimum) to 7 days (maximum) with expanded hours, with 2-3 days per week regarded as optimal.

Fee structure: The survey showed an average income of \$450 per day for vendors, so based on that, fees would range from \$.78 to \$1.16 per sq. ft/month (\$78 per 10x10 per month) on the flat fee model, 1.9% to 3% for the percentage of sales model, and \$ 0.07 /sq.ft/mo plus 3% to \$ 0.45 /sq.ft/mo plus 2% for the combined model. Commercial spaces would pay \$1.25 per sq. ft. Any of those three models would provide feasible revenue for the facility operational expenses.

Conclusion of the study is that the Public Market concept is financially feasible, but there are other considerations.

Next steps would be: 1. Agreement by the existing markets to move forward, 2. Site Selection, 3. Determination of Governance Structure, 4. Develop Business Plan, 5. Design Process 6. Seek Additional Funding, if applicable. (Urban renewal funds are available to begin) Steps 1 and 3 would involve meetings between the two markets.

Process update is that both the city and county have received the preliminary study, and after government feedback a public engagement process would be initiated.

Members were assured that this is a preliminary study and no decision is immediately required. The location selection process is just starting and all of the building projects are in play. Saturday Market is a critical stakeholder and Lane County is very interested in hearing about all of the possible alternatives for City Hall, the County Courthouse and the Farmers Market site improvement. We will be invited and informed about all of the opportunities for public engagement.

Discussion: Would anchor business be in addition to what is already operating at the two markets? (Yes.) Location would matter greatly and could change all the dynamics. Parking is a huge consideration. The two markets are so very different. Saturday and Holiday Markets are very different as well and sales are very different, so maybe some of the questions in the survey were not the right questions. The \$450 per day average seems wildly inaccurate to members present, but it was explained that it was based on survey information which included percentages from both SM and HM, and varying rate structures were included. Commercial business parameters would be critical. Concerns were expressed about blending the two markets, with the response that the question posed to the members was whether the benefits of co-location would be enhanced by co-management, but no assumptions were made about blending the two organizations. Building ownership is important, and whether or not long-term leases would be available. Location is not set, with several properties in play, and building costs are not set. Fundraising may be necessary to cover costs beyond the building costs (covered by Urban Renewal funds). This

model addresses operating costs. The organizations' regular expenses are not addressed in this model. Some funds were included for promotions, staffing and insurance. If Saturday Market is not interested, there is not a clear answer of how the project would move forward. The assumption was that the markets would continue to operate much as they have, but the question is how the future of the two markets will be determined by the partners which include us. Our history shows what tenets we were founded on and hold tightly to, which include Maker is the Seller, so to get to know us it's important to know them.

The presenters asked us to let them know what would make this a desired product for us and what we'd be absolutely opposed to, so the process could move forward based on our feedback. Our Market supports the Farmers Market and their site improvements, but ours is not facing the same challenges, so the focus should go back on the farmers and what they need. We are the oldest continuous weekly craft market in the country, and we want to keep that designation. We are also committed to being low-cost as a business incubator for our members as they begin to build. Even \$20 a week would be out of reach for many of our members. Farmers have needs we don't have, which should be addressed. What would the feasibility be of a smaller project that would address their needs without bringing in commercial businesses or competing with us by adding craft booths? Unintentional undermining of our market could happen with these additional businesses.

The question the CPW attempted to answer was that if the community wants this public market, would it work? One of their guiding principles was to not impact negatively on what was already in place. They are trying for a long-term solution that would dovetail with the plans from the City for the Park Blocks, to work together and coordinate all of the projects for greater understanding of the future of downtown. It is complex and all has to work together.

Members are interested in possibilities such as office and storage space, meeting rooms, and space for other arts organizations. Anchor businesses often seem to drive out the smaller independent businesses so would have to be carefully chosen. We are microbusinesses in most cases and won't be able to afford this. One difference between the two markets is that we have an umbrella liability insurance policy that LCFM doesn't.

Members were asked to measure the costs and benefits, be good partners and creatively look at the whole issue to explore what would be a good future. We should stay tuned for the public process to be taking place soon, check the websites of the two governments for meetings, and continue to give feedback. The representatives were thanked for keeping us informed and being open to our input.

Advertising Update: Kim reported that Food Network came to Market and filmed at least part of an episode of a show called "My Drunken Kitchen" with Hanna Hart. Market ads are focusing on paintings, fall fashions, and the "Meet your Marketeers" spots on social media, which will be picked up soon by Julie Chan of KVAL. Kim will start talking about Holiday Market as people are asking when we go indoors. It was suggested that large banners be placed saying "This is the Saturday Market. The Maker is the Seller," to distinguish ourselves from FSP, with nametags and signs in our booths identifying us (Placed in Bin 3). Strolling vendors have stickers that should be visible, so if they don't, tell Security.

***Motion: Accept the Ad Update (Alex/Deb) All in favor 7-0-0

Administrative Report: Members presently 531 not including those new today, 80 new members as of 8-17-16. Membership totals for the last five weeks compared to last year: August 6: 217 this year, 225 last year (down 8); August 13: 179, 237 (down 58); August 20: 118, 215 (down 97); August 27: 219, 178 (up 41); September 3: 225, 236 (down 11). Holiday Market is 86% booked, currently booking 1-4 points. Contracts are being signed for the stage and pipe and drape (a new contractor) and security (same contractor). Inventory is being ordered (forks and spoons, etc.).

Meeting Highlights: 8-10: Placemaking Advisory Group with the Project for Public Spaces (PPS) with a follow-up session on 8-11 including a large group of Market members intended to be a cross-section. Questions about what was liked and not about downtown were asked and answered and info gathered about downtown public spaces. PPS will be back next month for more discussions. 8-12: Meeting with LCFM director Angela Norman about HM intended to be relationship building. LCFM desired to collaborate more on HM as they don't fill all their space from within their organization. They offered to allow us to rent space for our overflow, though we don't need to for this year at least. 8-16: Meeting with Nan Laurence to check in about development issues. She repeats that "nothing will happen on the Park Blocks without Saturday Market at the table" and that we are valued, integral, and essential to the process. The contract with the city was discussed and some umbrellas and bases have now been found and may be re-installed at Kesey. Staffing issues are critical right now as some site staff has left.

A letter was sent to the Board regarding a continuing issue about scents, and another about buskers. Actions have been taken in the scents issue and many of the aspects of it have been addressed. Strolling musicians (buskers) placed in the Bin #3.

Discussion: It was pointed out that recruiting vendors for the first weekend of HM was really effective last year and some newer members still do not know they can get in to it. We need the newer vendors to fill in the gaps so we aren't giving them false hope by letting them know it may be possible. Giving a pitch for new vendors about HM could be helpful (it is mentioned in the orientation but it could be helpful to do more, and hearing from fellow members is very effective.) LCFM is recruiting crafters to participate in their HM on television and should be advised that this is a change that ought to be examined. Some members were angry about this but LCFM is just trying to pay their bills and not to be adversarial, so we always want to assume the best and keep building the relationship. Some members feel the standards should be changed to discourage so many of certain crafts (jewelers for example) but our mission is to encourage art and community, so we can't really limit within categories, but it is also in our mission to make sure people thrive.

***Motion: Accept the administrative report (Alex/Eli) All in favor 7-0-0

Treasurer's Report: Kimberly gave an update that space income is up over last year by a substantial amount that is not all due to the increase in the base fee but also indicates individual sales are better this year. Expenses are being held to budget or below and although rents, insurance and payroll taxes are higher, net income is still up. Holiday Market income is coming in sooner due to the adjusted application dates. A suggestion was made that perhaps the Treasurer's report could be written to be less

confusing for those hearing it. The attempt is made to make it as current as possible so it is done the day of the meeting.

***Motion: Accept the Treasurer's Report (Deb/Alan) All in favor 7-0-0.

Committee Reports: Holiday Market: Alan reported on the 8-10 meeting. There was discussion about the hallway between the two markets, which is sometimes used by buskers and blanket vendors. More signs will be posted. Elf recruitment will be stepped up. Carpet options for the south entrance were priced. The Committee recommends adding back the funds that were subtracted from the HM ad budget at the beginning of the year when the SM budget was balanced. The budget looks healthy enough to afford this now. Next meeting September 14th at 4:00 pm.

***Motion: Accept the increase in the HM advertising budget of \$2500 (Deb/Kelly) All in favor 7-0-0.

***Motion: Approve the Holiday Market report as written (Paula/Alan) All in favor 7-0-0.

Survey Team: Kelly reported on the last two meetings and work session, July 26th, August 25th and Sept. 6th. A subscription was authorized and bought for four months of Survey Monkey and a survey was finished and posted online for members to take. This will be an internal survey to get used to the process and gather information about Market members. It is now in place and suggested to all members. An analysis is planned for the November meeting. A Board member shared that he was excited that we are doing this ourselves.

***Motion: Accept the Survey Team minutes and report (Alex/Paula) All in favor 7-0-0

Standards: Teresa reported on the August 17th meeting. A member was given an exception to use a "jockey box" to dispense cooled kombucha from a keg. He will be allowed to fill customers' lidded containers and his own, labeled and lidded containers, but not cups. He can give samples and is required to hand a label to customers when he fills their containers. It might be better to find him a space near the food court so he could serve drinks but as long as he is a prepackaged food seller he should not be serving open cups of his drink from a craft space. An illustrated book was approved, but coloring books that were edited but not drawn by the author were not approved. A complaint about the process of working on scented products was discussed. Committee members felt that good process was followed in deciding not to call in all makers of scented products but rather to work more individually through the complaint process with a strengthened guideline. A newsletter article will be written reminding all members to be sensitive to health and safety concerns regarding scents. Making a map of sensitive people/scented products on the Park Blocks had not been workable although staff does try to be proactive about the issue. Three Notices of Concern were addressed. Several items were put into the Bin for later discussion or agenda placement. Those included the Books and Pamphlets Guideline, Alcohol Sales, Partnerships, and Kegs and Taps in Prepackaged Foods in Craft Booths.

***Motion: Accept the Standards Report (Alex/Eli) All in favor 7-0-0

Street Team: Kelly reported that the Guidebook is in the hands of the graphic artist and all ads were sold. The Kareng Fund was very pleased with their ads. The book will be printed in late September and distribution will begin in late October.

Food Court Committee: Colleen reported that the committee met August 30th with members of the Standards Committee to make a plan for filling an open space at the Holiday Market, but that this is not a committee report. Three options were identified and negotiations will be held with those identified as possibilities. The increase in the booth fee was a factor in the existing booth's decision to take a leave of absence. The FCC will work on a heat advisory protocol after a recent very hot Saturday.

***Motion: Accept the recommendation for the HM space options (Paula/Alex) All in favor 7-0-0.

Leave of Absence Task Force: Alan presented the revised LOA and Sabbatical Policy. (Please request a copy for details.)

***Motion: Accept the LOA and Sabbatical policy (Kelly/Deb) All in favor 7-0-0.

Members Task Force on Downtown Developments: Diane requested that she be named head of this task force to inform members of the developments and support staff in making decisions. She prefers that it not be an appointed member list but open to drop-in members so that all members would feel welcome to attend without commitment. Written and visual materials will be used to get people up to speed if they enter midstream.

**Motion: Appoint Diane to lead the Downtown Developments task force (Alex/Kelly) All in favor 7-0-0.

Discussion: Tying this to an end product might be advisable as it sounded like a public announcement was coming quickly about the CPW study. Strategy is important so a letter might be good now but it also might be important to wait for the right time. The September 14th meeting next week could be a good time to firm the response up and make sure it says what will be helpful. Members disagree about the time issue, but more discussion seems important. Responding before the October meeting also seems important.

Board Retreat Update: The retreat will be held Sunday, September 25th from 12-4 and will begin with a potluck. Paulette will meet with a facilitator next week to go over the questions from members and if you haven't given your input, please do so quickly.

Personnel Committee: appointments can wait until next meeting. Only two members (Paulette and Julia) are members at present.

Annual Meeting: November is not a good month to have one, and December is hard as well. October might be best. October 26th? Holiday Market Orientations have filled Wednesday evenings in October, so another night (Tuesday) might work. Typically regular work is not done at the Annual Meeting. The Garden Club or River Road Annex might work. Discussion did not result in a decision.

BIN: the Bin isn't functioning as intended. A catch-up meeting might also be good in October to deal with items in the Bin. This will be discussed again.

Budget Committee Appointment: There is no requirement that only paying members can serve on committees. Family members have always been welcome to serve as volunteers. The interested member was asked to write a letter of interest with her qualifications. Policy does not presently require this, or a confidentiality agreement, so that could be done, but shouldn't delay this appointment. The only thing confidential about the budget is the detail of what each staff member's salary amounts to, and it is asked that details such as the Fairgrounds contract amounts be kept close for business reasons. Any member should be able to see the budget at their request. This process was messier than desired and not meant to be personal. Good process for the Budget committee is to ask the member to attend a few times to see if it is a good fit before appointment.

***Motion: Appoint Tym to the Budget Committee (Alex/Deb) All in favor 7-0-0.

Extra Discussion: Should David's letter get a Board response or more discussion? Kimberly feels that she did respond to him at length. She gets mixed feedback about some of her actions, and does not agree that the formal complaint system isn't working well as he stated.

Meeting Evaluation: Too long. Meeting more often might help, not necessarily every month but a few times a year. We might start meetings with reading our meeting etiquette so we can follow it more closely.

Adjourned 9:25 pm.