

Board Meeting Minutes - December 23, 2020

Chicago Market Board Meeting

2020-12-23

Minutes by: Matthew Ruffi

—

Call to Order

This meeting was called to order by **Grant** on **12/23/2020** via Zoom. We **have** a quorum.

Roll Call

- Board Members in Attendance:
 - Amin Shawki, Ben Cook, Bob Kunze, Dana McKinney, Grant Kessler, James Gignac, Jonathan Hertel, Kate Grimm, Matthew Ruffi
- Board Members Absent:
 - Anthony Todd, Donna Curtin, Lee Herman, Sheri Reda
- Owners:
 - Elizabeth Foster & Lauren Thomas West

Agenda Approval

- URL for Public Agenda: [December 23, 2020 Public Meeting Agenda](#)
 - No objections/changes to agenda from any Board Member

Housekeeping

- Grant updated all on owner growth, and went through the basics of meeting.
 - Owners up to 1,884 (+2 from last meeting)
 - Asked board for examples where group working agreements are being used
 - DM noted she has appreciated being able to speak to the 'Say if we are swamped' items with the workload currently on her plate - and the understanding of the team is appreciated
 - JG noted 'Be Flexible' was working well with the events team by working through a lot of event ideas and being able to adjust, on the fly, as a team

to ensure events were a great success!

Consent Agenda Approval(s)

- Motion to approve minutes from the previous meeting was made by **MR** and seconded by **GK**.
 - Yay: 10
 - Nay: 0
 - Absent from voting: 4 (AT, DC, LH, SR)
 - Motion **passes**

Order of Business

Team Meeting Reports/Notes

- **To Market, To Market**
 - No questions/comments
 - MR noted later that project overview is being revamped and will be presented to the board more officially in the new year
 - GK noted that marketing has a great video coming with some TMTM highlights for sharing
- **Capital Campaign Team**
 - No questions/comments
- **Volunteer Team**
 - MR: Noted that emails from volunteer team to potential volunteers are within the volunteer BC group so not all board can see. KG will copy emails (after sending) to board area so all can see going forward
- **Marketing Team**
 - JH created a report to help us to get an idea of the goings on within the team. Did not make meeting agenda but will for future items as Org/Dev is working on charters for a few teams
 - MR asked for update on chartering from org/dev
 1. GK noted that Dana and org dev are swamped and items are slightly delayed but they expect to have them going soon
 2. DM noted that Marketing, Org/Dev are in the works
 1. GK mentioned that they are also looking at tweaks to some existing charters as well

3. GK called attention to poster designs that were sent just prior to meeting asking for quick feedback from board members (can be found in BC)

- **PM / Owners Rep Team**

- JH inquired about the org chart item that appears to be a question within the document (where ?team? is)
 1. GK - yes, still an internal question so note was in there to help remind the team itself. No actions needed from the board at this time. JH understood answer
 2. DM - talked to that a Project Manager should not report directly to the whole board but actually a sub-team (or person) directly assigned for that task (who will then keep board up to date)
- MR inquired about notes in this section saying that RFP from the team was actually being written by the person who would then respond to the RFP too (a GM candidate)
 1. GK noted that was not quite right in the report and that the team is starting draft work...asked Dana to speak further on the report section
 2. DM noted that there were actually three different RFPs and the notes on the report were slightly confusing on being tied together. Actually three different items
 1. One is the GM candidate - that is GM search team, not this team
 2. Second is PM - one of the GM candidates is being tasked with writing a proposal (not a RFP response - more like what you'd get if you asked a consulting firm to propose what they can deliver)
 3. Third is about architecture - that is a RFP, which the team is repurposing from an existing one from before (updated as needed). This is being done by the team. Still in 'pre-work' phase
- MR asked if PM and Owners Rep are expected to be local roles
 1. GK - Yes to Owners Rep, not necessarily to Project Manager
 2. DM - Owners rep is the one that will be tied in very closely with the local teams, companies, vendors, etc. for build-out, etc.

- **James - asked to speak to Events team items**

- Talked to an owners event, scheduled for Jan 12th, which needs some board response in basecamp RE: attendance and potential leadership of breakout rooms on the Zoom
 1. Discussion on this can be found in basecamp in the board section. Responses needed by board

- Working to do online info sessions in the new year as well - these will be scheduled soon
 1. Again, looking for board participation to have some differing voices, etc
- DM - heads up to volunteer team that we may need a volunteer(s) to help host, monitor chat, etc. for these events going forward
 1. The needs are being discussed internally
 2. They will submit (per process) needs to volunteer team for recruitment as needed

Pitch Practice

- Capital Campaign Team came on meeting to help provide pitch practice for the team
 - Team was given the 'parts of a pitch' document (in agenda pre-reading) to give some structure around an idea, and then allowing you to take it and bring your own voice into it
- CC team broke board into different rooms to allow for discussion/pitching between pairs (done twice to allow everyone to be paired up a couple different times to work to pitch)
- CC team gathered feedback from the team and is working to assign out some more tasks to keep improving that document as well as to push out a tracking document
 - Mentioned that there are conversations in CC team regarding the best way to track things (right now just google sheet, but CRM tool would make sense as this becomes more of a push)
- Board gave feedback to the CC team regarding their initial thoughts from the breakout groups which the team can take back and help to continue to give guidance to board

Owner Forum

- DM: Opens up floor to owner questions, comments, etc.
 - No owner comments/questions

Discuss Upcoming Site Vote - what do you need/pros+cons

- For board members who were not in attendance - discussion starts at ~59:30 mark in the recordings
- Grant opened section to discuss what is needed from board as well as pros/cons (brought up here or within document sent to him)
- Opened floor to discussion regarding open questions, comments, thoughts - with the intention to, at the end, run a 'straw poll' to get current feedback from the

board on their stance today

- GK noted that Q&A document will be updated as needed and that he will post an additional document related to the legal items (leasing, leasehold improvements, etc.) will be outlined by him and posted within BC for additional board review

Straw Poll for moving forward with Chicago Market in the Gerber Building

- Straw Poll was called for by GK - asked for an answer from each member as well as a quick (~20 sec) comment for the record on their thoughts
 - Straw Poll Outcome Count:
 - Yay: 11
 - Nay: 0
 - Absent at time of poll: 2 (LH, SR)
 - NOTE: This is NOT an official vote and each member's votes absolutely **can** change for Jan. This is to get a general 'feel' only
 - **Anthony** (via Grant)
 1. Would vote yes
 2. No additional comments at the time
 - **Donna** (via Grant)
 1. Would vote yes
 2. Sees the acquisition of a PM and/or GM as soon as possible as critical on a bunch of interrelated levels. Stimulating funding and owner growth - that individual will bring a level of gravitas needed to move this project forward
 - **Kate**
 1. Would vote yes
 2. Feels it is our fiduciary responsibility to move forward on the project. Understands there are a lot of challenges (and that there would be major impact if we didn't succeed), but feels that we have the capacity (and/or can recruit the capacity, as needed) to get there. She's excited to take this forward and notes that, "...it's the time for action!"
 - **Amin**
 1. Would vote yes
 2. Feels that we have an opportunity now to get a lot of momentum and make this happen!
 - **Ben**
 1. Would vote yes

2. Notes that we're at a "shit or get off the pot" point in time...with a great project, and a great location he feels we can meet the high demands and goals we need to make this a success. Again noted the great location!

- **James**

1. Would vote yes
2. Notes that he feels the project is overly expensive as well as that he would like to spend more time looking at ways that we can ensure we have checkpoints through the process to monitor progress. He would need to understand that before any formal vote but feels he would likely vote yes if those were covered off

- **Dana**

1. Would vote yes
2. Agrees with Ben's point - notes that we're at a "go big or go home" point with this project. We've progressed very far and it only makes sense to continue moving forward at this point

- **Jonathan**

1. Would vote yes
2. Agrees with many of the above notes. Noted that his confidence was raised even higher after conversation (during the open floor discussion section of this) regarding the volunteer group, their pending volunteers and ability to recruit for more. Gave him even more ideas of how to work with that to help with moving this forward.

- **Bob**

1. Would vote yes
2. Noted that while it is certainly easier to sometimes talk to the potential downsides of any project, unless we move forward we can never realize the true upside potential that we have with this! Additionally notes that once we start to communicate this further, you never know who might come out of the woodwork to take this to a new level - and it only takes a couple people like that to make this *surprisingly* good! Certainly has his concerns and wants to ensure that we keep hyper focused on our true goals throughout the project, and that checkpoints to ensure we are on track are important.

- **Matthew**

1. Would vote yes
2. Agrees with many of the points above. Notes that the cost of exit is so high that we've almost put ourselves into a position where a yes is the only logical conclusion he sees.

- **Grant**

1. lean toward voting yes
2. Talked a bit to the origin stories of the Market - specifically to challenges and hurdles that he's (and legacy board/owners) have seen before...and the ways that the team has overcome them in the past. Noted one time when everything was first starting and the team had to take a loan just to get the first push done - - it was a risk, it was a huge challenge...but the drive of the board, the volunteers and the owners (new or otherwise) got the Market through. Actually got it to a point where Chicago Market's owner growth was one of the biggest owner growth numbers a co-op has ever seen (not just ours...anywhere). Co-ops are always difficult - but, as proven by what we did before AND what co-ops, in general, do by leaning in on campaigning and working with passionate people (within and out of the core teams) he feels that this IS possible! It will take hard work and he continues to be concerned with capacity - feels this is something we need to sort out (and stay on top of)..but knows that it IS possible! He closed by saying that he is, "Happy to team up with y'all to take on the impossible in January!"

Closing

- This meeting was adjourned by **GK** along with many happy holiday wishes for the board and all owners!

Discussion
