

## PDF Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

**Date: Saturday, February 7, 2015 at 6pm**

**Purpose of meeting: Begin planning for Spring 2015 Burn**

**Agenda summary: Vote on old business; discuss new business and proposed budgets; overview of new regional requirements from BMorg**

---

### **Roll call:**

Owsla (leading meeting, co-PC Coord)

Karnak

Diana Smiles

Jill

Yeti (DPW Coord)

Aned

Dove (BOD)

Smartie Martie (Gate Coord)

Blizzard (Sound Marshal/Coord)

EmilyD (co-PC Coord)

Wendell

Arrgon

Jen Finkle (MOOP Coord)

José Rodriguez

Jim Barker

**Meeting called to order at 6:05 pm**

### **First Order of Business – Coordinator changes**

1) PC Co-Coordinator vote – Owsla is taking over as PC Coordinator as Emily D transitions out. For this spring planning cycle Owsla will be the co-coordinator, a temporary position for the transition. A quick vote is needed by the PC to make this position official as it comes with a reserve ticket. Discussed in January meeting; vote now needed.

***Result: unanimous pass***

## Second Order of Business – New and ongoing business discussions

- 1) Sound Policy discussion – Submitted by Blizzard
  - Proposed change to the current PDF sound policy; *full text attached at end of PC meeting agenda*
  - Quick summary of changes as read by Blizzard:
    - Removal of fluff text
    - Removal of section on sound committee (which has not been used in recent years anyways)
    - Changed the number of approved nighttime Sound Camps from three to as many as seen fit by the sound marshal; this change was suggested by Mark Nyon when he handed the policy back over to the PC, but the change was not actually made in the document then so was left it until it could be put up for discussion.
    - It's only 2 pages instead of 10.

### **Discussion:**

**EmilyD** – Question for Bliz: is there an intention with the policy to increase the transparency of camps who are applying for sound, and then who gets it, and also what happens at the event and if there are any issues... Is that information going to be made public and if so by what process?

**Blizzard** – Currently the policy itself does not contain any of that because that doesn't need to be part of the actual policy. Instead the process for choosing camps as we do it now is going to be written up and that will be made public, allowing then for people to join in, make comments and additions, etc. But this should be a separate document from the actual sound policy itself; the policy itself is the rules, while procedure and the way the sound department handles things will be an internal document, as will procedures on how to handle crises and situations that arise during the burn. These procedures will be written up more as a handbook or guide that will be given to people in the department on sound patrol, etc., and will also be publicly available for people who care to read it (and/or comment on it, make additions/changes, etc.).

**Wendell** – Hasn't read the new policy but had some ideas: transparency is really good to have, also getting accurate readings of dBs being put out is necessary and should be monitored by as many people as possible and done in a consistent and transparent manner. Suggests a three-tiered system for sound camps where various dB ranges are allowed at different times, e.g., low-dB outputs that would be allowed for more camps, mid-dB outputs for some camps, and high-dB outputs for just the few; in this way perhaps more camps would be allowed to have the sound they want and low-dB camps wouldn't have to compete with high-dB camps for limited sound slots (that tend to assume high-dB output).

**Diana Smiles** – Does the new policy/procedure provide for a chain of command or other mechanism between the sound department, the BOD, and the vets? What do you do when the vets intervene? Does either the policy or the procedures being created address that?

**Blizzard** – Procedures will have the chain of command in it. General populace should know that they can contact *any* of the people on the list and things will be taken care of from there, and the people on the list are those who really need to know the actual chain of command.

**EmilyD** – Is it worth adding a category in the sound policy/procedure to note that our landlords and their guests do not have authority over our sound policy, and/or that they count as PDF attendees for the purposes of sound policy (and thus have no special authority in the matter)?

**Jill** – The vets are the whole reason (as our landlords) that we need a sound policy and they should probably be consulted if things get out of hand. She doesn't want to see them excluded in a policy of ours as it's their land and their neighbors.

**EmilyD** – The current policy is set up (with Sound Marshal, etc.) so that the vets do *not* need to interact with sound camps, and they shouldn't be interacting with sound camps they should be getting the Sound Marshal who does have the authority to shut down camps. It should not be vets going to camps and yelling at DJs even if there is an issue.

**Dove** – To clarify, the policy (here presented) that was rewritten was taking the policy that's presented in the WWW and GUD and simply reducing it, removing such information as the history of why we have a sound policy, etc. (As it was, it was very long and confusing and had a lot of extraneous information.)

As far as the vets go, the BOD has had some very firm conversations with them recently about their (recent) lack of adherence to the existing procedure and their own lack of following the policy.

The new sound policy is meant to be easier for camps and participants to understand (and thus comply with); the old version is too long and convoluted, to the point that likely many participants weren't even reading it. At this point with the new policy nothing has actually changed other than the hard limit of 3 nighttime designated sound camps has changed to a number at the discretion of the Sound Marshal. The sound policy is now reflecting what has been happening anyways, and is now in a short readable form.

**Arrgon** – Does anyone among the vets actually get a copy of the sound policy? Are they aware of what our sound policy contains?

**Dove** – Yes! However the BOD has received a bit of pushback from the request that the vets keep a radio so that they can call the appropriate people in our structure if they have a sound issue. This was discussed at length at the last burn and it was explained firmly that they would need to keep a radio so they can come to us and follow our channels if they have an issue, same as we go to them and follow their channels if we have an issue with them. A serious discussion was had over their recent break from following this procedure and while we can't promise it will never happen again it has been addressed and re-agreed upon.

**Aned** – Suggestion that all camps which have sound should be educated with the sound policy and the proper procedures; that way the vets are getting a consistent response from PDF, and also if there is an irregularity the camps know themselves what it is, who to contact to right it, etc.

**Smartie Martie** – Agrees with Jill that we only have a sound policy b/c of past neighbor complaints. Also notes that there are two vets up at the gate (front and back) who have radios that they are supposed to use in case of a complaint from a neighbor; if they don't call Pineapple (our main vet liaison) they are supposed to call our sound people and have radios and have been instructed in how to contact our sound people, and are supposed to do this.

**Blizzard** – Would not include the information about the vets in the sound policy itself, but is more than happy to include it in the emails sent out to sound camps when they are given their approval/non-approval and attendant information.

2) Golf cart discussion, continued – compiled from latest PONY discussion, presented by Owsla on the call:

- The proposal to use golf carts for shuttling duty is still under discussion and not cohesive, and no one comprehensive proposal has been submitted.
  - The posted guidelines (posted by Jill on the PONY discussion) are essentially already in effect and being handled by the purchasing coordinator and that stream of communication (to any/all department coordinators who are golf cart recipients at PDF)
  - The “Fresh Golf Cart Proposal” submitted by Jill on the PONY involves existing departments and coordinators, and as such should be agreed upon by those departments. If those departments are agreeable and want to propose budget additions for additional carts and expand their services they may do that. As it looks like at least one of those departments has done just that with their proposed budget for this cycle, this may be the best way to continue forward with this idea, *i.e.*, leave it in the hands of the departments who will be doing the work.

- The secondary proposal posted by Karnak uses no enforceable language regarding changes to rules or policy, but is stated in terms of allowed requests. An amendment to it was proposed by Rev.Dave concerning clearer restrictions on possible cart drivers.
- In order to try and synthesize these ideas and move forward, I propose that we start the discussion today exploring the idea of just having the existing department heads propose budget additions for the extra golf carts that they are prepared to take on the extra work for.

### **Discussion:**

**Jill** – That (as was just summarized by Owsla) is essentially it and would just mean that we could vote on the Greeters and Parking budget as they're presented to allow the extra carts to be rented. Reiterates that this is just an experiment and we've been talking about it for ages; how to help people when the roads are closed? We need a little experimentation, let's give it a try this spring and if it doesn't work we'll move on to the next thing.

**Karnak** – More or less wrote out a very simple proposal so that if someone sees joyriding in a cart they can go request that it be lent out for better use (so that we won't look bad as an org). However personally he thinks we should just ban carts completely given how small the area is.

**Smartie Martie** – For clarification, Ticketing and Greeters are budgeted together, and often share duties and swap volunteers when needed. This is also sometimes done with Parking; sometimes they borrow a greeter or two to help when Parking is overloaded.

As for the golf carts, only certain people are allowed to drive the carts anyways. What if a golf cart driver is on their way and doing something and a person thinks they're joy-riding when the driver really isn't? How does the person really know? (I.e., will this just foster more rather than less resentment?) How would it work? Can any participant just come up and say hey I think you're joy-riding so I'm going to take your cart from you? It's really only supposed to be coordinators and a couple other authorized people who should be driving carts in the first place.

**Owsla** – Question for Karnak: There isn't any definite language in the proposal that you put up on the PONY and everything is in terms of requests, and isn't that exactly the current case of what we have? That nothing is currently restricting requests of cart borrowing other than who is allowed to drive the carts and who isn't? This is (I think) the point that Rev. Dave was trying to speak to (on the PONY discussion) in terms of clarifying who would be allowed as drivers of the carts in the first place. So what would your proposal actually be changing?

Question for Smartie Martie: Asks for clarification as to what was being

said about Gate, Greeters, and Parking possibly all being under the same budget? The point was confused (to Owsla) and so clarification is being asked for on that point (as all three are not under same budget).

**Smartie Martie** – Was just saying that originally all three of those departments were together and working together... She'd just been mentioning a bit of history on that point. But currently Greeters and Ticketing are still together as one group.

**Jill** – She spoke to Nathan (new Greeter Coord) and his assistants and everyone agreed that they'd include the cost of the golf cart in their budget. If that didn't get over to Smartie Martie then there may just be a communication error. In the proposal that she (Jill) put out Parking and Greeters each would be responsible for an additional cart. The co-Coords would generally be the ones using those carts but there should be an option for other coords/organizers with legit business to also use those carts; they shouldn't just be restricted to only Parking and Greeters.

**Yeti** – Going on the record as generally both practically and philosophically against this proposal. Would like to add a proposal that any department cart is only driven by the coordinator of that department or those who that coord has extended their permission to because the coord and the department are the ones responsible for said cart.

**Owsla** – My goal with the discussion of this tonight is to, if possible, get everyone on the same page as to how we move forward with this issue and get it in a form that we can actually vote on. Currently there are a number of competing ideas and if we can combine them into one working proposal or if we can agree to leave it to the individual departments to address additional carts (and responsibilities) in their own budgets then we can go forward with things. Otherwise if we remain with competing proposals then we will have to deal with them all separately. The question I'm putting out now: Is anyone vehemently opposed to leaving this in the hands of the individual department coordinators, who seem to be willing to put these additional golf carts into their budgets and to take responsibility for their use, and to let this be handled internally by those departments, or is that unacceptable to people?

**Karnak** – How many golf carts are we talking about now?

**Owsla** – At this moment we are talking about one; Parking put into their proposed budget an additional (second) golf cart essentially as a response to all these talks but also they had some other uses for it anyways, e.g., helping people with disabilities get on site. So there is currently an additional golf cart in the budget for Parking. There is not an additional one in the Greeters budget right

now but that's something that if they want to add it they can go ahead and do that.

**Karnak** – So Rangers have a cart, MASH has a cart, Jill has a (personal) cart, now we will have two carts for Parking, two carts for Greeters... We are up to now 7 carts?

**Jill** – Responds that her cart is hers personally, she rents it with her own personal money and it has nothing to do with PDF organization. Also other people in the past have brought their own carts.

**Karnak** – Acknowledges that; so asks if we are going from 4 PDF carts at last burn up to 6 PDF carts this coming burn?

**Owsla** – Probably; I'd have to check the old budgets to say for sure.

**Karnak** – So we'll have to see what the budgets are like, see who's requesting carts, and leave it to the person/department requesting those new carts to say what's done with them and where they go.

**Smartie Martie** – Asks if the BOD is okay with having an untapped expense (i.e., the potential cost/liability of PDF shuttling peoples stuff and possibly damaging the shuttle carts)? Damage to the carts will happen and the current renter of the carts is very nitpicky about the wear on the carts; already Hatter (Purchasing Coord) has to keep pictures of the carts when we get them of any nicks and scratches already on the carts. So is it okay from a BOD perspective?

**Dove** – The only issue she recalls that we've ever had a problem/liability with was from when Lamplighters cargo-loaded a cart and damaged it.

**Smartie Martie** – That's exactly the type of transporting we're talking about now; cargo loads and loading the carts with that type of gear. Shuttling stuff people don't want to carry, i.e., big and heavy. Currently our policy is that we aren't allowed to carry that kind of gear on the carts because of that sort of past damage. So now we're talking about possible 7 carts (b/c we forgot to include Participation Station's cart) doing just that kind of cargo transport?

**Yeti** – To his understanding (and Hatter said he'd be forthcoming on data too), is that there has been more than one incident of us having to address cart damages; things that Hatter has had to defend us from such as undercarriage damage. There have been a lot of damages that at least the renter's have tried to hit us with already, just from normal field driving. Adding cargo loading will make it worse, or even just constant people shuttling.



**Dove** – Her understanding was that the big issue (with golf cart damages in the past) was physical damage to the leather seating (such as a tear/cut in it). She's more than happy to check in with the company to see what we have been charged with in the past, but her understanding was that it was an issue of carrying something on the cart that cut a hole into the seat.

**Jill** – The only thing she knows of us having to put out a lot of money for in terms of damages is from torn upholstery of a cart when a Lamplighter spire dug into a seat. She's rented a cart personally 4-5 times now and has never been charged for damages, and says she hauls a lot of stuff.

### **Third Order of Business – Budget proposals**

**Owsla** – First, best to clarify question of which department is taking on the budget for laminates this cycle: individual departments or grouped together under WWW?

**EmilyD** – For the time being laminates are being left in with the WWW budget, but we may change it out after this cycle.

**Smartie Martie** – There's never been an email sent out telling departments what their laminate cost is.

**EmilyD** – Yes, but we want to in the future break it down by department. For this cycle it will be a lump sum in the WWW budget because we order the laminates and the WWW from the same printer, but going forward we will try to figure out a basic cost per laminate so departments can own their own numbers.

**Owsla** – Moving on to proposed budgets...

1) Burning Arts – \$3,310

#### **Discussion:**

**Owsla** – Rev. Dave couldn't be on the call but he posted on the PONY to explain some of the new items, including concrete blocks to replenish the current dwindling supply

**Jill** – How many cords of wood are being asked for? (*Answer given: 15*) So there's nothing in reserve? Normally what we've done is order 15 and then ask for enough money for 3 extra, just in case of really bad weather.



**EmilyD** – Let's talk about that afterwards; we may be handling that a bit differently going forward in regards to extra budgeting.

**Diana Smiles** – Are the concrete blocks for participants or for burn barrels at the gates? We shouldn't be supplying blocks for people; radical self-reliance (indicates people should bring their own blocks).

**Owsla** – We are talking about blocks that would be available for anyone, and Rev. Dave acknowledges that yes this is something that people could (should?) be responsible for themselves but historically there has been a supply so he was putting them in the budget to replenish that resource.

**Dove** – Historically there's always been some few (10?) cinder blocks for first come first serve. Given the incidences where we've had burn scars it seems that this would be something that is appropriate to purchase more of. There are lots of things we have at PDF that are not radical self-reliance like electricity, showers, water, MASH, Sanctuary... There are lots of things that add to the longevity of the event and something as easy as cinder blocks is a valuable addition for camps with burn barrels.

**Jill** – Yes, not radically self-reliant but if we don't have cinder blocks then we will have more burn scars, and that's one thing that the vets are very particular about.

**Jim** – His goal is to be there early for DPW work and he's willing to be the one to run to Lowe's (or other place) and pick them up. They're super cheap, can be stored on site, and used repeatedly in the future.

**Karnak** – Jim and he are on the same page; requests that Yeti add a line item to the DPW budget and that he and Jim will pick them up and drive them over to site so we can enforce this (i.e., raised burn barrels) better.

**Arrgon** – How many cinder blocks are we talking about for \$100 (i.e., the amount in the budget).

**Owsla** – I don't have that information in front of me (i.e., it's not on the budget), but we can assume a standard price.

**Karnak** – They're \$1.50 a piece. (After quick internet search: ) \$1.37.

**Smartie Martie** – Agrees this is a good resource. But is there a communication breakdown? Are all participants aware that their burn barrels need to be up off the ground on cinder blocks? Maybe we should put a notice up by the shed to come get cinder blocks. And/or do other things to make this requirement more out there for participants, so we don't have 17 burn scars like we did last burn.

**Karnak** – Introduces idea of doing “fire permission”, and to raise awareness we should “ban fire” and make noise about it saying that people must come talk to us about having fire, and thereby be able to educate them on the requirements (like raised burn barrels!).

**Arrgon** – What happens to the cinder blocks after we purchase them?

**Jill** – Original blocks were bought many years ago (maybe 10-11 years back?) to make a burn platform for the big burn. Now we have a dedicated big burn area and don’t need them for that, so they’ve been available for participants to use. So they’ve been around 10-12 years.

**Arrgon** – Likes Karnak’s idea of “burn permission”, but thinks we should go about it in a different, less aggressive way. We don’t want to make resistance to what we are trying to do by “banning fire”.

**Karnak** – People don’t listen unless we piss them off.

**Arrgon** – I totally disagree with that.

**Owsla** – The issue of how to communicate this is a separate discussion, so I’m going to table that for now and it can be discussed elsewhere what the best way to communicate that to participants is going to be. Any further comments on this budget itself?

**Jim** – Simple answer to that, why don’t we get a wooden stake with a sign that’s laminated and put by the wood piles that says all burn barrels must be up on cinder blocks?

**Owsla** – Again I really want to defer communication of this to a separate discussion; communication of the message is not what we’re discussing right now and we need to stick to the agenda or we’ll be here all night. It’s not a bad idea, but start a discussion on the PONY about it, and/or we can talk about it at the next meeting.

2) Exodus – \$25

**Discussion:**  
***None.***

3) Gate/Greeters – \$3,004

**Discussion:**

**EmilyD** – Wants to make a comment that the Gate/Greeters listed cost for the golf cart is the correct one (of \$325), which includes the delivery fee, and that number needs to be reflected in everyone else's budget. Also the extra \$25 budgeted for extra gas is for extra gas for *only* Gate/Greeters. Any other department wanting extra golf cart gas needs to budget for their own.

4) MOOP – \$50

**Discussion:**

**None.**

5) Parking – \$1,211.80

**Discussion:**

**Jill** – What's up with the bandanas charge? They've got a count of 80 units for \$350 which seems outrageous; bandanas should be at most \$2/each and if buying in bulk even less. Where is this price from?

**Owsla** – That's a good question it can be thrown back to the people who put that budget together.

**???** – It works out to \$4.38/bandana; I know they get them custom done so that may be why they're more expensive.

**Jill** – I'd have to vote against that. Give me a chance to do some shopping around and find them cheaper. I'll talk to Parking about it.

**EmilyD** – May be thinking that it's an increase by 80 units of bandana and not an increase to 80 units; she thinks they may have been getting more than that previously. We may want to look up the old budget.

**Diana Smiles** – Wanted to note that traffic cones are not on the budget (and is something we'd been talking about needing more of)

**Karnak** – Has already found traffic cones; they are covered.

6) Rangers – \$535

**Discussion:**

**Jill** - \$60 for office supplies? From what she can see the Rangers usually share office supplies with Participation Station. It's probably not worth bitching about but \$60 seems pretty steep.

**Arrgon** – Looks like there's no budget for shirts?

**Owsla** – If they haven't asked for a budget for shirts it's usually because there are enough shirts left over from the last order. It's not something that's necessarily requested in the budget every single burn. Generally we make bigger orders (for better pricing) and then wait a few cycles for them to be gone through.

7) Sound – \$102

**Discussion:**

**Wendell** – We could maybe use phone apps as sound meters, so maybe we can have a discussion with the sound camps where they can bring their own meters so that everyone's on the same page as to the sound levels and the accuracy of the meters and so on.

**Blizzard** – Phone apps aren't useful because phones have cutoffs that are well below the levels we need to read. He's looked into the before and the cutoff levels and equipment aren't standard across phones so they don't work as a standard anyways. Many sound camps do bring their own monitors which is great but we do (as an event) need to have our own equipment with a standard calibration that Sound Patrol and the Sound Marshal uses; we do often compare these to what sound camps have themselves. We have two of these devices currently and a third would be great.

**Wendell** – Another idea would be to set a percentage and do an average as a way to deal with the calibration issue...

**Owsla** – Let me invite you guys to talk about non-budget sound issues at a different time, because again we're fairly strictly trying to stick to budget issues right now. These are great ideas, but it would be better to talk about them after this call with just the appropriate parties.

8) Stage – \$730

**Discussion:**

***None.***

9) Theme Camps – \$75

**Discussion:**

***None.***

10) Volunteer/Participation Station – \$900

**Discussion:**

**Jill** – For the golf cart they've only got \$250 budgeted; she's pretty sure those 6-seaters are closer to \$325...

**Owsla** – Yeah EmilyD already mentioned that some of the numbers for golf carts needed adjusting; I've got a note to amend those.

We are still missing budgets from DPW, Fire Perimeter, Lamp Lighters, MASH, Sanctuary, and WWW. Hopefully we'll be getting those shortly and they'll be on the agenda to discuss for next meeting.

For any issues that were raised here and need to be chased down before these budgets go to a vote, please, it's important to chase them down and discuss them on the PONY and get them figured out before these budgets come up for voting, which will be next meeting.

#### **Fourth Order of Business – BMorg regional status requirements update**

1. Brief overview given by Dove covering recent requirements sent out by BMorg concerning regional status:

**Dove** – For a very long time PDF has been a Regional Burning Man event. For that time it's been very easy for us to confirm that status, requiring only one of our regional contacts (such as Dove) to vouch for the event concerning any number of criteria. Sometimes PDF has been a little sketchy on said criteria, and it was mentioned to Dove about 6 months ago that some of that had been noted by BMorg. About 2-3 weeks ago all regional contacts received an email about new policies for events to be considered an official BM event. No changes have been made to the actual requirements, however our accountability factor has changed a lot. Previously it just took a vouch from a regional contact, whereas now they are looking for us to enter into a more formal use agreement that says

we fulfill all of these requirements. No individual person needs to enter into that personally, but PDF does (if we choose to keep our regional BM status).

Some things that we at PDF are not currently in compliance with are safety plans; this is for safety, fire, security, sound issues. We do not have any written documentation currently stating what our plans are to deal with emergency issues in those arenas. We also will be required by BMOrg to have a transparent Afterburn report, which means that all departments are required to submit Afterburn reports. These are the two biggest things that PDF has been lacking in terms of compliance.

So in order for us to maintain and apply for official regional BM status, those things must be addressed. They must be addressed prior to us entering into the new use agreement that BMOrg requires.

As a PC, it would be great for us to set up a protocol that would get safety plans together, Afterburn reports delivered in a timely manner, etc.

### **Discussion:**

**Jill** – Do we have a deadline? Is there a set deadline for the safety plan and everything else?

**Dove** – There is no specific deadline. We were hoping (from PDF Town Hall discussions) to have our self-imposed deadline be the end of this month (February). A number of people are working very hard on the safety plans. As for Afterburn reports, Coordinators have to get those written up and turned in in a timely manner.

**Jill** – We have to have deadlines or it won't get done. People drag their feet.

**Dove** – I'm a member of the PC like everyone else. The BOD is of the opinion that if the PC decides that we don't want to be a regional burn then the BOD won't fill out the paperwork. So if those pieces aren't in place, then we're not going to do that.

It's going to be a continued requirement of Coordinators to be sure to have Afterburn reports done in a timely manner (i.e., within 30 days). Once the safety planning is in place then it won't have to be rewritten every time, just reviewed. BMOrg has said to get requests in for regional status as soon as possible. They have not given a deadline. It's not Dove's or the BOD's job to tell the PC to have it in by any certain date.

**Jill** – The question of whether or not we want to still be a regional burn is something the BOD should have brought up with us immediately. Is this something that we're going to vote on? Is there going to be a proposal for this? Or is this something we can kick to the curb right here and now?

**Dove** – This is the first PC meeting that’s occurred since that email from BMOrg, which came in only about 2 weeks ago. So this is the first PC meeting we’ve had to bring this up.

**Aned** – If the BOD is saying that it’s up to us, the PC, to decide then her opinion is that yes we should be a regional burn and yes we should be an exemplary regional burn since we are one of the first if not *the* first. Maybe amongst ourselves we should figure out a deadline to give people. We don’t need to re-invent the wheel to get into compliance.

**Owsla** – In terms of whether or not we’re a regional burn, this has always been a choice of ours and at any point we could have decided to not be. For me, unless someone puts a proposal forward to say let’s not be a regional burn anymore, I wouldn’t really see a reason why it would be a question to re-agree upon. It’s just continuing as we have been. The requirements of accountability aren’t all that extreme.

**Karnak** – By next meeting can Dove find out exactly what we have, what we need, and when the deadline is? Or as soon as you can, find out and put that information up on the PONY? So people can then coordinate and push this forward. We need to know what the task is before we can agree to it.

**Dove** – There is nothing at all new in the requirements from BMOrg other than entering into an actual use agreement contract. In order to do that (properly and in good faith), we need safety plans and Afterburn reports delivered in a timely manner. She will put this on the PONY and include the contract. Again, no individual person has to be named, it’s just PDF as an organization. We are still missing many Afterburn reports and are still very lacking in our safety planning, including safety, security, medical, sound... Once we have those in place they won’t really have to change. Once she has them she’ll for sure put them on the PONY.

**Karnak** – Yes please post what you need in terms of Afterburn reports so that we as the PC can start talking to the Coords who haven’t turned them in yet and communicate to them why they’re important, etc.

**Arrgon** – Dove can you talk about briefly what in your opinion is the problem of Afterburn reports? What does that actually consist of?

**Dove** – Dove’s posted about this as well as Damien Masterson (a former Greeter Coord) who’s been reaching out on the Coord mailing list asking specific departments who haven’t turned in their Afterburn reports to do so. BMOrg wants as much transparency as possible. Coords will have to submit an



Afterburn report. It doesn't have to be detailed, just what happened, what was good, what could be improved. That's it. Dove is happy to create templates for Afterburn reports to make it streamlined in easy. Someone mentioned Transformus, who puts out an extremely detailed annual report; we do *not* need to be that detailed. It just needs to be something, and it just needs to be done.

**Jill** – On the PONY we could set up a blank template where departments go to fill out their Afterburn reports, and where it's apparent to everyone whether or not they've been filled out.

**???** (**Dove?**) – I like the idea of a template. Again it doesn't need to be terribly detailed.

**Arrgon** – I'm a big safety nerd, and would like to volunteer to help anyone that needs assistance creating/filling out their safety plans.

**Jill** – Arrgon, please talk to Rev. Dave!

**Owsla** – Any more comments for this topic? (*Negative*)

### **Fifth Order of Business – Planning committee reminders**

1. Upcoming PC meeting schedule:
  - Sunday March 1 – Vote on previously proposed budgets; vote on previously proposed business; discuss new business and budgets
  - Saturday April 11 – Vote on previously proposed budgets; vote on previously proposed business; wrap up final planning for Spring Burn

**Meeting closed at 7:38 pm**