

Dear Stephanie,

I have spoken to several community members, all of who are on board with keeping SF Camerawork open, and rebuilding its programming and community involvement. To that end we are proposing the following:

Our working group will secure funding for three months, which with what is already in hand will keep SF Camerawork open into early 2027. This will buy time to bring in community stakeholders with the specific goal of building the individual donor pool and reviving Camerawork's earned income initiatives. It will also buy time for a complete review of the archives and a determination by a community represented board as to rehousing options.

Our group would agree to cover any shortfall that might arise relative to the operating budget during this period should a shortfall occur.

In return, we would need the following:

Immediately provide our working group with the annual operating budget and a P&L showing monthly expenses.

Agree to immediately add five people to the board who have knowledge of the community and field, and would commit to achieving individual donor support and earned income. We've already identified candidates.

Keep the doors open through this transition period.

This has to happen as soon as possible.

I can tell you that the optics of this are pretty bad. Organizations don't close when they still have operating capital and no debt. And they don't reduce the board size and cut themselves off from the community and long-time stakeholders.

I would like to do this collegially—I think what we are proposing would be a win win for everyone. The current board members would not be left holding the bag and Camerawork would begin a new phase in its organizational life.

If the board chooses to dig in its heels we are prepared to step up, which could include the following:

Full disclosure to the press (I'm already being contacted for interviews).

A complaint to the state attorney general regarding the change in the bylaws to reduce board size, which effectively compromised broad community involvement and compromised the mission of the organization.

I am happy to talk to anyone you wish about this, or meet with the board and take any suggestions current board members might have. If this cannot be accomplished, or I feel

myself getting played, I will go full force naming names and demanding answers. Two immediate questions:

Why did a community organization reduce the size of its board, effectively cutting out the community?

Why did the board elect a board president who is new to the area and has no local contacts?

Why is the organization closing with no community input and no request for financial assistance?

In closing, I think we can change course and offer an honorable exit ramp to board members who don't want to continue on.

On a related topic, we have identified a couple very experienced people who are knowledgeable about the organization and community who could take over interim ED responsibilities immediately.

Time is of the essence.

Hal Fischer