

585 Collective Transition Meeting - Date: 07-06-2025 @ 585 Woodward

Agenda

Goal

The goal of this collective meeting is to amend and then ratify the transition plan so that the collective as a whole can move forwards. After that, we will discuss putting the transition plan into practice.

Agenda

- Agenda overview, facilitation, stack, goals (5 min)
- Reading of documents (25 min)
- Discussion, conversation, and amendments to transition proposal (1 hr)
- Ratification (amendment) of proposal (5 min)
- Naming (15 min as time remains)
- <('o'<)

Sunday, July 6th 8:30pm at 585 Woodward

(rachel is taking notes)

PLEASE READ AND REVIEW THE LINKED DOCUMENTS IN ADVANCE

Goal

The goal of this collective meeting is to amend and then ratify the transition plan so that the collective as a whole can move forwards. After that, we will discuss putting the transition plan into practice.

Notes

- Discussion, conversation, and amendments to transition proposal (1 hr)
 - Response: it's not a vote, its an agreement
 - R: this is what we are willing to compromise on as lease holders, the idea is to move forward so we can be operational again
 - If it's not a proposal
 - R: the proposal is what we are giving to the co directors to show what our collective intention was moving forward > based on 6-7 meetings
 - R: the amendments are not substantial changes to anything the proposals says, they are things we are mentioning as requirements for leaseholders to feel a little more comfortable (doesn't feel "comfortable" as it stands)
 - R: reading now and responding may not be possible
 - R: everyone will be involved > it's not "ratified" per se, bc larger community hasn't seen it > if people have strong amendments to amendments document, it can still be changed before it's ratified
 - So if we can vote on it in 45 mins > i don't think anyone will leave this meeting happy
 - If we do not move forward we will not meet financial goals for rent
 - Q: "it sounds like there is some space for offering concerns or alterations? But liability holders these are your terms for moving forward > and the urgency for tonight is because it's been taking too long, and if we use two more days, not possible
 - R: "two more days tends to tumble into weeks"
 - Resp: what i had in mind for this, is i'm a little confused about stack thing – the idea is that this is merely an articulation of liability concerns we've already laid out
 - We do not have ability to dissolve working group bc annoyed or whatever, but if there are things that come up that make the space unworkable, if people are defacing property, putting on risk-heavy events, disregarding MOU, that can effectively mean individual members > or a problem that can become endemic to a whole group > if there is a group that proves itself to be that much of a problem, legal concern, they have to leave
 - R: the first document is SIGNED and passed. You will not be seeing them.
 - Q: "august 1 deadlines" > how do we know ?
 - R: it's in the second and third documents
 - R: for anyone not a leaseholder, the main thing is cease using "woodbine"
 - R: anything that has a deadline attached i'm happy to share . anything that pertains to anyone here, we can duplicate and share
 - Q: asking for info shared with spokes council and admin groups
 - R: fair enough .. these deadlines are somewhat flexible because contingent upon finding fiscal sponsors
 - R: deadlines may change but happy to give those deadlines

- 1. We will not be able to define “3 tasks”
- 2. Anything that is unilateral, i don't have issue if it's part of lease holder, but i want it to be inclusive > i don't want to hear about it later, through the grape vine > COMMUNICATION
- R: SURE > yes the coordinators chat for those questions and answers, esp when pressed to make sure a unilateral decision
- R: every other action goes through conflict support first
- R: unfortunately it's the opposite: i think it'll be nearly impossible to take away access related to anything related to replicate the space
- R: honor system thing? Spreadsheet thing? Extractive relationships to the space? But people are already mad at me
- Q: what about dues-paying people?
- R: either dues paying or task-fulfilling > either or or , generous and open-ended
- R: as far as i'm aware, personal harm is PROactive, don't know of any situations
- R: other liability issues: we are all in a room full of cell phones so not going to say all those things> common sense, some of them relate to harm that could happen in woodshop, machinery, Trump era affiliations, all sorts of things > I can't anticipate everything that would happen
 - So coordinators chat: when these things come up, why such a decision was made
 - DO NOT GET ARRESTED IN THE SPACE => IMMEDIATE LEASE TERMINATION
- R: assuming risk in what sense? On your own behalf is different
- Q: another red wave swept away by CIA > are we just gonna stop associating with any group that is currently targeted? R: NO
- 3 minute limit total w 1 min warning
- “We have all the people that need to chat here” for friendly amendments
- Q: are we voting on something tonight? (amendments)
- Q: that is clearer now; i think naming this as a proposal is misleading bc it's an agreement we don't have an option to discuss; first document is agreement between leaseholders and co directors; second document is collective document; FINAL document is “proposal” > this is misleading language as an offer with room to discuss and make changes > doesn't feel prepared for agreement
- Agenda > 5 minutes for ratification: i assumed meant voting but apparently not the case?? Question: what is the PLAN?
- Q; which project is being taken is highly contentious:
- Q; the ability to dissolve working groups seems to be in admin, think it would be better in the hands of the spokescouncil
- Q: i am curious: first document not being online > is there any sort of hard copy available to spokes council or coordinators? How do we keep track of relevant timelines ?
- Q: clarification: the amendments offered by leaseholders, i take it to heart, they are in order “to feel comfortable”: but they are not written in stone > this is always changeable in the future
- Q: theres' a number of mentions of unilateral actions:
- Q: “so wrt access” 1. Who or how are ppl held accountable for these 3 tasks? There's nobody here to vouch that i did xyz tasks? 2. I paid for access > does that affect task

requirement? 3. I would imagine there are certain limits to what people can do > tasks that are highly specialized > it feels general and vague and doesn't show how we can hold people accountable > access revoked when their contributions aren't being recognized

- Q: lots of legal indemnification mentions in first document: what are some examples of legal risk in the past? General idea of legal risk: what are legal risks and what should we try to avoid? Mentions of threats of personal harm? Is that something we need to worry about?
- Q: time for amendment: the idea that in order to manage this membership issue, we have a membership committee> there is an admin council empowered to manage thing on behalf of entire members > manages codes, manages that people are doing what they say that they're doing > keeps labor off of lease holders >
 - R: could that be part of the next spokescouncil meeting?
 - R: SURE
 - R: i think this is something that is hard for me to answer on the spot
 - R: my understanding of membership is de facto: if you are involved in a working group: i don't think there should be reasons to remove membership unless they are continually doing actions that place us in legal liability, and managing membership, i don't know what that means if we are doing honor code type system? It seems unmanageable with so many people? Overly bureaucratic? Very messy? So i'm open to maybe tabling that amendment in the interest of ratifying, and returning to what membership looks like
 - Q: in terms of "tabling" there is a future conversation where we will be having a collective conversation?
- Q: spokes council create policy, admin implements with veto power if it involves liability and threat than the whole
- Q: FIRST I WANT To acknowledge hard work that went into this and emotional time for a lot of people and the space; been involved since the beginning, "wondering about gym collective we have a policy that's similar in terms of reproductive work for space - would the guideline around ppl wanting to do "3 tasks" - would those qualify? What is the overlap of task responsibility between working groups and space as whole?
 - R: these emails will go out as soon as we "are operational" hopeful next days > describing what these spaces are, and option to donate to one or both
 - Agreed to 3 contacts
 - R: i personally would like to see it extend beyond; these tasks are not as arduous as they seem: taking out garbage one night .. since this is an honor system i wouldn't worry yourself too much
 - Q: i saw that "585 space" is going to be contacting donors - is WB going to make it clear that it's no longer associated with all groups staying at 585>
- Q: mentioned 6 months later meeting about whether spokes and admin councils are working out? What are the format and invites of the meeting? Would it be a format different than a regular spokes council meeting
 - R: i think we don't really know - something we wrote during meetings; we needed to push through a structure w/ accountability to leaseholders, and keep the space going, and emphasise integration with collective body > we think it has legs, but want to make space for it needing lots of changes > 6 month review will be time for

feedback and working it out > we are committed to reviewing it in 6 months ,and on the

- Q: for people not part of spokes, they would want to be at that meeting
 - R: i predict it will be a lot like this meeting > review the explainer document for spokescouncil and meetings and harm reduction
 - Q: id' like to understand how and why events have played out the way they have; i haven't been at any meeting, summer time , a lot of people not
 - R: SPOKESCOUNCIL WEBSITE wiki: please then share them to all the working groups
 - R: I've been frustrated at some of the spokescouncil meetings, bc i've been part of this process for a very long time > i do feel like it is almost owed to people a kind of anodyne a somewhat description of events of how things ended, i think that could be a goal
 - R: sure but let's not name names
 - R: a lot of people have disparate feelings and views
 - Q: i would like to make space and time for this discussion in the future, especially with donors?
 - R: There are lots of one on one conversations we can have; first both spaces it is suicidal to donors
 - Q: doesn't want one-on-one
 - R: that is going to be rough; idk if you want to do that
 - R: delivering news of the split was at the big meeting > how often are we going to repeat this story
 - R: are there any amendment that kind of details note-taking at these meetings > and how will these notes be posted? There are notes posted in groups? Is there a drive with all these ???
 - Q: useful for everyone to describe liabilities in insurance documents? \ul style="list-style-type: none;"> - R: Would you be willing to read 145 pages ? Would you be willing to read a 145 page document?
 - R: the crux of issues will be in MOU liability document
- Q: Jumping back: to this model of this way we are moving forward is proposing a culture of accountability, where we can secure our access to the space through different activities > things could be fulfilled based on working group use and needs > an ideal to aspire to using gym model where we sign up on a google sheet and we self document; this is a very messy and complicated thing that we need to achieve without blowing our heads up about immediate thing in how we interact w space > even non-key people need to follow through with use of the space >
 - R: i'm open to formalizing this
 - R: Formalization is not going to come in the immediate term, not a hammer over heads, but we also have to be willing to hold the hammer for most gentle needs of the space
- Q: instead of like "who's showing up and taking names" > mention of "End Of Week cleaning" and trash days > where everyone can see it >
 - Can we highlight them
 - Can we make this a proposal for the next spokescouncil meeting?
 - R: YES
- Projector question: the differences in where they are and access, and I

- R: This is a little complicated
- R: the opening of this space
- R: did matt buy it directly
- Q: i wanted to share my unique perspective of this, bc just came back from year long mental health from WB, before which i was doing a lot things w/ a lot of people ; part of coordinator and even co director, but then things happen, and now i see myself coming back from coma? What the fuck is happening to the whole thing? I am hopeful for this new future, i am a little bit sad that we kind of collectively failed as WB project in this space; my concern for the new structure is the SAME as for old structure: COMMUNICATION – i want people to be able to be encouraged to have agency while we have harmony and don't step on each others toes; community building is hard task, we don't have blueprint, give us some slack and grace as we all try to keep going > worried about not giving enough AGENCY, esp to new people: where should i go what should i do?
 - R: two people reach outed to me as professional conflict resolvers
 - R: ppl from within 585 can be involved
 - Q: “conflict resolution training” > somebody from outside coming into to prevent certain groups from having power over other groups
- Q: a lot of sadness, transition pains, i encourage everyone to look at spokescouncil explainer and proposal document > There was a lot of effort to try to overcome the pain points from before > it's there and people are thinking about it and have been
- Q: as far as conflict resolution: formalizing stuff, a lot of it can be done in the spokescouncil > esp with CLEANING > for conflict resolution, i love the idea of outside person coming esp when things are really big, who don't have a particular bias; for transparency, i would be point person of conflict resolution, but i was also going to reach out to external person to get trained, and to be an ambient vibe check for people to bring up concerns; with liability concerns and space use > talk to the person first, remediation first, and then safe space where people can put conflict concerns forward > things are maybe emerging into bigger conflict, and people can discuss, to try to avoid personal bias and proactively reach out to someone outside the space
- R: q about liability and conflict support: “e.g. some event proposal’ - we can't do that . not really a conflict support thing. As for how conflict support operates, we don't have a clear idea of that, and figure out in spokes council moving forward
- TIME IS UP:
- R: in terms of agency, there are a lot of people that are more silence, not represented here, doing a lot of invisible work, not speaking up in spokes council
 - R: we haven't actually had a spokescouncil meeting yet
 - R: one of the emphasis is visible-izing labor that isn't always visible
 - R: for example, folks who clean up after hours > some formalized process
 - R: that is the goal
- Q: some questions about MOU from earlier, i was one of the signatures, i think it's fair that people want to see it; i think that we could share the parts of it that are relevant > i will follow up on that: i want to say something POSITIVE, WE got a really good opportunity here with the two-wheel model, of organizing the space from the bottom up, this is the goal of the spokes council, > working groups having meetings and bringing proposals to spokescouncil meetings and making sure that spokescouncil will have a lot of say in everything that is going on > good idea to table some of that nitty gritty for later meeting

- Q: at one point you mentioned estimated loss of \$2k income > where did that figure come from?
 - We are also going to be able to democratize fundraising
 - Lots of energy and excitement over new model a
 - Important to focus on being able to bring in new money to support the space and have more transparency !
 - Please come to me (Dora) if you have any deep and dirty question for the spreadsheet > highly encourage people to contribute if you can
 - R: we are going to assume that we are losing some coworkers > ones who are not super active but still signed up
 - With friends and patreon bring in almos \$4k-we estimate to lose half
 - Honestly i think it will be \$3k loss
 - Memorial fund also moving to WB
 - R: in that document, there's an overview, but i put together a spreadsheet for anyone that wants the weeds and dirty details of it all, talk to Dora > in that document i didn't include \$1.5k in so doesn't have to be included in OUT
- Q: Dues model: probably for spokescouncil : can we do an optional dues model? Like i think some people can contribute small models
 - R: that's how the new patreon and withfriends will work, with tiers
- FAcilitator: great operational question not yet in proposal > we need to agree that we are moving forward with this ??? can we do this in a week?
- An action item for US is what is part of next spokescouncil meeting and when is it??
- I don't think anyone wants to stay till 12am.
- POINT OF PROCESS: Is this now a vote??? Do we need to vote?
 - "I feel like poor record keeping"
 - "I've read it" - the wiki doc reading through the same notes that i read when i was abroad in finland, without getting a sense of the issues that lead to this split
 - R: "coordinators model > Where people are informally invited into a chat based on their commitment to space > co director space and chat and model fell apart from it not working" that's the shortest answer I can give
 - R: That is NOT what we are talking about at this meeting
 - R: please stop thinking about this as "split" > similar programming and friendships > R: i don't understand getting into personal drama for ratifying
 - Q: i want these changes to respond more to history directly in each document?
 - R: do you have an amendment for your concern ? > No
 - DOES ANYONE NOT WANT TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THIS? OTHER THAN ME (JOHNNY)
 - "I FEEL like i have a lot of questions that haven't been answered"
 - I AM SECONDING CONCERNS FOR BETTER COMMUNICATION/RECORD KEEPING>
- VIBE CHECK: do people need a day or two to process?
 - R: i think that is AN accurate response/account
 - R: i am fine with that happening but i want HARD DATE for these to actually form and happen
 - R: probably not next week?
 - R: probably no vote tonight? So we can all vote next sunday

- R: We need to start getting money; we have been rejected twice now > we have someone this week we think we CANNOT HOLD UP MUCH LONGER
- R: “my comment is that not everybody is here tonight, not everyone reads everything > tell your groups! Spokescouncil forming soon, get ready, read documents”
- R: “this is not the end all be all - -if shit not ideal, not holding up, that is going to be how we get through the next few months; i don't want us to get stuck in the weeds trying to get into the clearing
- R: “everything is subject to revision” spokescouncil is place for the revisions > so much could happen: everything could fall apart, there's no guarantees > this is us just broadly saying we agree with the general direction moving forward> we need to start getting FINANCES
- Q: SOME OF THE THINGS IN THESE DOCUMENTS ARE NOT REQUIRED TO make finances and could warrant more consideration
 - R: i said i would table that
 - R: thanks i like that
- Proposal: can i propose that we ratify this agreement on the contingencies that there will be room to amend inf future spokescouncil meetings
 - R: YES.
-
- Vibes: give people a day to think
- I've been largely on the outside, this feels very plausible 98% of the time;
- The purpose of the meeting is that we are formally on the lease, we need safeguards, but otherwise we are are somewhat ready (amendments document just needs some space to breathe)
- PROPOSAL: until spokescouncil is elected and has its own meetings: can we continue to have meetings every sunday after diner to do these kinds of meetings
- Ratification (amendment) of proposal (5 min)
- Naming (15 min as time remains)
 - R: not all obvious about which are joke names! Should not make unilateral decisions to remove names some people think are jokes
 - Main concern is to open bank account ? even more pressing: we can't create ANY social media, fundraising, public-facing ACCOUNTS without a name> you can choose whichever legal name that doesn't need to change .>>> SOCIAL MEDIA ACCOUNTS > how do we get donors without a name
 - Narrow down to 10-15: we are just going to choose a name for our fiscal sponsors NOW > V i have a timeline for myself
 - Q: suggestion/requestion: to all parties, that it matters to, the naming document 70% are all jokes, please take more seriously
- END
- <('o'<)

Links

[Proposal for Collective Stewardship of 585 Space](#)

CLARIFICATIONS AND EXPANSIONS TO 585 SPACE TRANSITION PROPOSAL

