

**Evaluation
of the
UUCF Property Stewardship Program
by the
Program Evaluation Committee
March 2016**

Evaluation of the UUCF Property Stewardship Program

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Property Stewardship at UUCF

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Property Stewardship Council and Lay Minister for Property Stewardship**
- 3. Property Improvements**
- 4. Staff and Volunteer Contributions**
- 5. Memorial Grove**

Appendices

A: Method

B: Interviews and Focus Groups

Executive Summary

This report presents the Program Evaluation Committee's (PEC) assessment of the Property Stewardship Program at the Unitarian Universalist Congregation of Fairfax (UUCF). The following questions framed the evaluation:

- Is UUCF's current staff structure sufficient, both now and for the foreseeable future, to provide proper care and maintenance of the church's buildings and grounds?
- Is UUCF's voluntary lay leadership--Lay Minister for Property Stewardship and Property Stewardship Council (PSC)--structured so that there is clarity of roles and responsibilities, particularly in relation to the church staff?
- Does UUCF have sufficient financial resources to provide proper maintenance of its buildings and grounds both now and in the foreseeable future?

The answers can be summarized as follows:

- UUCF is not sufficiently or appropriately staffed for its property stewardship needs. The Director of Administration routinely undertakes many maintenance and custodial tasks beyond the proper scope of his responsibilities, simply because there is no one else to do them. This is neither fair to him nor sustainable for the future. As soon as possible, UUCF should establish a Facilities Manager staff position, which would be responsible for the day-to-day maintenance of the church's buildings and grounds under the supervision of the Director of Administration.
- For neither of the two lay entities responsible for property stewardship--the Lay Minister for Property Stewardship and the PSC--are roles and responsibilities clearly defined. Like the other lay ministers, the Lay Minister for Property Stewardship does not have a job description describing duties and responsibilities. As a result, successive Lay Ministers have defined the position according to their particular interests. Nor does the PSC have an up-to-date charter that accurately describes the composition of the Council and the scope of its responsibilities. A proper job description and charter are needed for the lay minister and the PSC, respectively. If the position of Facilities Manager is established, it will become imperative to clearly define the interaction of the Facilities Manager, on the one hand, and the Lay Minister and PSC, on the other.
- UUCF does not have sufficient financial resources to fund all of the church's presently identifiable property and building needs. UUCF's operating budget is not able to provide funding for major repairs and improvements. Rather, such funding must come from either the 2013 "Reach" capital campaign or the

church's capital reserve fund. Thanks largely to a recent bequest, the capital reserve is currently at an adequate level. However, if the fund is to be responsibly maintained to safeguard against a true emergency, there is not enough money to cover current property needs. Depending in part on the final outcome of the Reach capital campaign at the end of 2017, the Coordinating Team (CT) and the Board of Directors will have to decide which projects can be undertaken during the next two to three years and which will have to be postponed.

Findings and Recommendations

Finding #1: The Property Stewardship Council is operating under a charter proposed in 2014 but never approved by the Coordinating Team.

Recommendation #1: The Property Stewardship Council and the Coordinating Team should work together to provide the Council with an accurate and up-to-date charter.

Finding #2: There is no formal job description for the Lay Minister for Property Stewardship position.

Recommendation #2: The Coordinating Team, in conjunction with the current and former lay ministers, should write a job description for the Lay Minister for Property Stewardship.

Finding #3: UUCF lacks the financial resources to fully fund several projects that are urgently needed to maintain and improve the church's buildings and grounds.

Recommendation #3: The Coordinating Team and the Board should establish a financial plan for meeting UUCF's capital improvement needs, for both the short-term and the long-term.

Finding #4: UUCF is understaffed for buildings maintenance and custodial functions, putting an unfair burden on the Director of Administration.

Recommendation #4: The Coordinating Team should review the scope of the Director of Administration's responsibilities as the job is currently being done and consider the feasibility of hiring a facilities manager. At the same time, the Coordinating Team should reevaluate the adequacy of staffing for buildings maintenance and custodial functions.

Finding #5: The Memorial Grove Committee is not sustainable in its current form.

Recommendation #5: The Coordinating Team and the Board should redistribute the responsibilities of the Memorial Grove Committee among the

Lay Ministry for Property Stewardship, the church staff, and perhaps the Lay Ministry for Caring and Wellness.

Property Stewardship at UUCF

This report presents the Program Evaluation Committee's (PEC) assessment of the Property Stewardship Program at the Unitarian Universalist Congregation of Fairfax (UUCF). The following questions framed the evaluation:

- Is UUCF's current staff structure sufficient, both now and for the foreseeable future, to provide proper care and maintenance of the church's buildings and grounds?
- Is UUCF's voluntary lay leadership--Lay Minister for Property Stewardship and Property Stewardship Council (PSC)--structured so that there is clarity of roles and responsibilities, particularly in relation to the church staff?
- Does UUCF have sufficient financial resources to provide proper maintenance of its buildings and grounds both now and in the foreseeable future?

The answers can be summarized as follows:

- UUCF is not sufficiently or appropriately staffed for its property stewardship needs. The Director of Administration routinely undertakes many maintenance and custodial tasks beyond the proper scope of his responsibilities, simply because there is no one else to do them. This is neither fair to him nor sustainable for the future. As soon as possible, UUCF should establish a Facilities Manager staff position, which would be responsible for the day-to-day maintenance of the church's buildings and grounds under the supervision of the Director of Administration.
- For neither of the two lay entities responsible for property stewardship--the Lay Minister for Property Stewardship and the PSC--are roles and responsibilities clearly defined. Like the other lay ministers, the Lay Minister for Property Stewardship does not have a job description describing duties and responsibilities. As a result, successive Lay Ministers have defined the position according to their particular interests. Nor does the PSC have an up-to-date charter that accurately describes the composition of the Council and the scope of its responsibilities. A proper job description and charter are needed for the lay minister and the PSC, respectively. If the position of Facilities Manager is established, it will become imperative to clearly define the interaction of the Facilities Manager, on the one hand, and the Lay Minister and PSC, on the other.
- UUCF does not have sufficient financial resources to fund all of the church's presently identifiable property and building needs. UUCF's operating budget is not able to provide funding for major repairs and improvements. Rather, such funding is provided by either the 2013 Reach capital campaign or the church's

capital reserve fund. Thanks largely to a recent bequest, the capital reserve is currently at an adequate level. However, if the fund is to be responsibly maintained to safeguard against a true emergency, there is not enough money to cover current property needs. Depending in part on the final outcome of the Reach capital campaign at the end of 2017, the Coordinating Team (CT) and the Board of Directors will have to decide which projects can be undertaken during the next two to three years and which will have to be postponed.

1. INTRODUCTION

The UUCF Governance Manual states (section VII.E.2) that “[t]he Board shall engage in comprehensive review of programmatic areas of the Congregation on a multi-year basis. This Programmatic Assessment shall occur on a schedule adopted by the Board. In conducting the Programmatic Assessment, the Board may form a committee to assess a particular area, or it may direct a Board-chartered committee to assist it.” The Board and the Coordinating Team (CT) decided that program reviews should be conducted by the CT, with reports submitted to the Board for review. Thus, the PEC is a subcommittee of the CT.

The PEC has conducted three prior program evaluations. The first was done on the fellowship program in 2012-2013, the second on the social justice program in 2013-2014, and the third on financial stewardship in 2014-2015.

The CT recommended to the Board that property stewardship be made the subject of the current evaluation for two reasons:

- There is increasing concern over the amount of property stewardship and maintenance tasking being undertaken on a regular basis by the Director of Administration.
- Difficult decisions will need to be made in the near future on prioritization and funding of some major necessary buildings and grounds projects.

The Board approved the CT's recommendation that the Property Stewardship Program be evaluated. The PEC conducted this evaluation during the fall of 2015 and the winter of 2016.

2. PROPERTY STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL AND LAY MINISTER FOR PROPERTY STEWARDSHIP

As stated in an updated PSC charter, "the PSC was established in early 2005 ... to represent the interests of the congregation in caring for the facilities and the natural environment that comprise the UUCF campus." The Lay Minister for Stewardship

position was established in 2006 and divided into two positions--Lay Minister for Financial Stewardship and Lay Minister for Property Stewardship--in 2010.

Property Stewardship Council

Finding #1: The Property Stewardship Council is operating under a charter proposed in 2014 but never approved by the Coordinating Team.

According to its charter, the PSC is headed by the Lay Minister for Property Stewardship and includes the UUCF Director of Administration and the Accessibility Ombudsman. Currently, the PSC comprises an additional five members. Two of these members serve a particular constituency, i.e., Green Sanctuary and Memorial Grove; the others are at-large members, who bring expertise relevant to particular interests of the PSC. Recruitment of members is the responsibility of the Lay Minister. A possible addition is a liaison from Faith Alliance for Climate Solutions (FACS). PSC members demonstrate a good rapport and positive working relationships; some have served for five-plus years.

The Lay Minister for Property Stewardship, PSC members, and the Director of Administration characterized the PSC as primarily serving in an advisory capacity to the Director of Administration and CT regarding property stewardship initiatives for both grounds and buildings. The current UUCF budget provides only \$500 for PSC projects. PSC members state that they are satisfied with their advisory role and do not see the need for more money from the budget. The PSC also leads volunteer-staffed projects on the UUCF campus, including grounds cleanup and native plant installations.

The charter under which the PSC is operating was proposed in 2014 but never approved by the CT. It generally reflects the current function and form of the PSC, but it needs to be revisited to ensure accuracy. For example, the charter states that PSC membership will include, among others, an Accessibility Ombudsman. One of the PSC members originated this position six to eight years ago and still serves in this capacity, though he is no longer a member of the PSC. He would like to transition out of the position. The PSC needs to decide whether or not it requires the Accessibility Ombudsman to be a member of the PSC and ensure that its charter accords with reality. The PEC sees a clear advantage to having the Accessibility Ombudsman be a member of the PSC so that he/she can look out for accessibility impacts of any proposed changes to UUCF's buildings and grounds.

Recommendation #1: The Property Stewardship Council and the Coordinating Team should work together to provide the Council with an accurate and up-to-date charter.

Lay Minister

Finding #2: There is no formal job description for the Lay Minister for Property Stewardship position.

Although the Lay Minister for Property Stewardship position was established in 2010, there is still no formal job description.¹ Past and current lay ministers indicated that they would appreciate a clearer definition of their role. There is inherent uncertainty, even intimidation, in entering a role without a job description. Additionally, a lay minister job description might benefit the property stewardship program as a whole by keeping it more evenly attentive to its two areas of responsibility--buildings and grounds. Without a job description, there may be a temptation to focus on the preferred interest of the current lay minister.

Recommendation #2: The Coordinating Team, in conjunction with the current and former lay ministers, should write a job description for the Lay Minister for Property Stewardship.

3. PROPERTY IMPROVEMENTS

Shortly after assuming his position at UUCF in 2009, the current Director of Administration, with the support and approval of the CT, commissioned a comprehensive assessment by a private contractor of UUCF's buildings and grounds. Nothing like this had been done before. The assessment was completed in April 2010. Based on the report, the Director of Administration compiled a spreadsheet listing all the property improvements recommended by the contractor with their associated costs. In March 2012, at the request of the Board, the then Lay Minister for Property Stewardship and the PSC compiled a master plan, i.e., another comprehensive survey of the church's property, with recommended improvements and repairs.²

Recent and Planned Property Improvements

Two major components of the PSC's 2012 master plan were improvement of UUCF's parking lot and connecting UUCF to the public sewer line. Funds generated by the Reach capital campaign paid for the redesign and construction of the parking lot during the summer of 2014, at a total cost of \$898,000. Other Reach funds are earmarked for the sewer line project, with a current estimated cost of \$193,000. It is expected that the work will be done during the summer of 2017.

Several energy-saving initiatives recommended in the 2012 master plan have been accomplished, such as upgraded thermostats and better lighting in the parking lot, and

¹ None of UUCF's lay ministers have job descriptions.

² Copies of these reports and the associated spreadsheet are available at the church office.

have resulted in significant reductions in gas and electricity costs. As recommended by the 2010 assessment, the capital reserve fund was used to pay for a new roof on the Administration Building.

The PEC wishes to emphasize that all of this work deserves the highest praise. The UUCF campus, beginning with the parking lot, has never looked better nor operated more efficiently.

Additional Needs

In addition to connecting to the public sewer line, there remain four major property improvements facing UUCF. Each was flagged by the contractor in the 2010 assessment, so nearly six years has gone by since they were first brought to the church's attention. They are listed below, with the estimated cost for each from the 2010 spreadsheet, updated to 2016 dollars on the basis of the CPI:

- **A new roof for the Sanctuary building (\$49,000).** The present wood-shingle roof is the original roof. The Sanctuary opened in 1983, so the roof is more than thirty years old and its expected life has expired.
- **A new floor for the Sanctuary (\$11,800).** Again, the present floor is the original. The wood is so worn after more than thirty years that it can no longer be sanded and refinished.
- **Replacement and upgrading of all HVAC units (\$57,000).** Currently, if one of the church's HVAC units breaks down, it is immediately repaired so the area it serves continues to get heat or air conditioning. UUCF needs to replace and upgrade all the units at once in order to have a more efficient and cost-effective system.
- **New energy-efficient windows in the Administration and Program Buildings (\$164,000).** The present single-pane windows leak heat and make church offices and classrooms uncomfortable in the winter--some staff members are forced to use space heaters in their offices--and costly to cool in the summer.

The windows project was a specific goal of the Reach campaign. The other three projects were not.

In addition to these projects, the PSC would like to regrade, improve drainage, and replant the hill that leads down from the traffic circle to the front of the Program Building. At present, the bottom of the hill is bare, becoming very muddy after a rain; and children playing in the area track mud into the building. The cost of the PSC's envisioned improvements has been estimated at \$40,000.³

³ Other, less costly, options do not account to the same degree for important environmental impacts.

3. SHORTAGE OF FUNDING

UUCF's operating budget supports property stewardship by paying for building and equipment repairs, tree maintenance and removals, lighting upgrades and repairs, gardening, maintenance staff, and so on. However, the operating budget cannot and does not provide funding for major property repairs and improvements. Such funding comes from two sources: the 2013 Reach campaign and the church's capital reserve fund.

Finding #3: UUCF lacks the financial resources to fully fund several projects that are urgently needed to maintain and improve the church's buildings and grounds.

Looking at the current balances in the Reach and capital reserve accounts, it is clear that UUCF lacks sufficient funds to accomplish all of the needed improvements cited above. As of December 31, 2015, there was \$386,873⁴ in the Reach account. About two-thirds of all Reach pledges had been paid, leaving \$853,659 still to be collected. Although the deadline for payment of Reach pledges is December 31, 2017, UUCF must refinance its mortgage debt a year earlier, on or before December 31, 2016. The CT and the Board have set a goal of using \$750,000 in Reach funds to reduce the church's mortgage debt and thereby lower the burdensome mortgage payment--currently over \$108,000 on an annual basis. No Reach funds will be spent on any other projects during 2016, and a reopening of the Reach campaign--a "special ask"--is planned for the fall to raise more funds for debt reduction.

Once debt reduction is accomplished, the CT and the Board will be faced with funding the three remaining Reach commitments: the sewer connection, the new windows for the Administration and Program Buildings, and the mandatory "10 percent set-aside" for social justice and outreach work that was established at the outset of the Reach campaign. At this point, it is unclear how and in what order the funding will be allocated--particularly since the final calculation of the set-aside amount will have to wait until the Reach campaign closes at the end of 2017. It is also unclear whether there will be sufficient Reach funds to cover the cost of both the sewer and windows projects, which, on the basis of the information available to the PEC, is currently estimated at \$357,000 (\$193,000 for the sewer project plus \$164,000 for the windows).

There is currently \$102,700 in the capital reserve fund. The Director of Administration advised the PEC that the fund should be maintained at a "floor" of \$50,000⁵ in order to safeguard against a true emergency, such as serious leaks in the Sanctuary roof. It appears then that about \$50,000 could be safely spent. However, even if the windows

⁴ A substantial amount of Reach receipts has already been spent, most notably on the parking lot.

⁵ The PEC notes that the brochure distributed to the congregation at the outset of the Reach campaign stated that "prudent management" of UUCF's "financial health and stability" requires total reserves of "at least \$400,000."

project can be entirely funded with Reach money, the capital reserve fund cannot pay for all of the other projects.

Recommendation #3: The Coordinating Team and the Board should establish a financial plan for meeting UUCF's capital improvement needs, for both the short-term and the long-term.

As stated above, UUCF was advised by its consultant in April 2010 that over the following ten years – that is, by 2020 – the Sanctuary roof, the Sanctuary floor, and the HVAC units should be replaced. Nearly six of those ten years have passed. Given these urgent property needs, the PEC recommends that the CT and the Board establish a comprehensive funding plan. In the short term, the CT and the Board must decide whether the sewer connection and windows projects are more important than the other projects listed above. The question is whether or not to spend the \$50,000 available in the capital reserve account or hold it until it becomes clear whether it will be needed in 2017 to help pay for the sewer connection and windows projects if Reach funding does not cover the full cost.

If it turns out that the \$50,000 can be “released” for other projects, the CT and the Board would again have to set priorities. Which of the remaining projects is the most important? Arguments for all of them can be made; but, again, not all can be funded at present. For example, it might be possible to replace the Sanctuary roof, but that would leave little or no money for the remaining projects. Additional funding would be needed over the longer term.

4. STAFF AND VOLUNTEER CONTRIBUTIONS

Buildings Maintenance and Custodial Functions

Finding #4: UUCF is understaffed for buildings maintenance and custodial functions, putting an unfair burden on the Director of Administration.

UUCF is understaffed for buildings maintenance and custodial functions, and volunteers are not able to fill in the gaps. The church currently has three staff members for maintenance and custodial work: a handyman who works approximately eight hours on Saturdays, a custodian who works 30 hours per week, and a sexton who works a total of approximately six hours on Friday and Saturday nights to prepare the buildings for Saturday and Sunday morning activities. Interviewees agreed that the handyman is extremely capable in a variety of areas, and it would be useful to have more of his time. Volunteers currently play only a small role in building maintenance. As noted by the PSC, law dictates that licensed contractors be used for projects such as wiring. There are several PSC members who are construction professionals and lend their talents from time to time.

The Director of Administration noted the inherent difficulty in hiring and scheduling custodial personnel while avoiding paying for a lot of down time. Help is needed at odd, not necessarily consecutive, hours. For example, someone is needed Tuesday evenings or Wednesday mornings to prepare for the Wednesday morning Compass home schooling group, then again on Wednesday afternoons to clean up. Someone, currently the sexton, is needed late on Fridays and Saturdays to ready the buildings for Saturday and Sunday activities. The situation has become more challenging as rental business, representing a significant portion of UUCF's income (about \$100,000 annually), has increased.

In comparison to other Beltway UU congregations, UUCF, according to the Director of Administration, is understaffed for maintenance and custodial coverage. The PEC communicated with three other Beltway area churches⁶ to learn whether they had a facilities manager position and the number of hours per week worked by custodial and other facilities-related staff. As shown in the table below, UUCF's total hours for buildings maintenance and custodial work are well below other Beltway churches. Configurations for staffing vary by church. Both Cedar Lane and Arlington have facilities managers while River Road does not. Cedar Lane has one custodian, Arlington has two, and River Road has four (one of whom is full-time and is designated as the head custodian). Cedar Lane has three additional part-time facilities technician positions.

Staffing for Buildings Maintenance and Custodial Functions by Congregation

	CLUUC		RRUUC		UUCA		UUCF	
	# Positions	Hrs/wk	# Positions	Hrs/wk	# Positions	Hrs/wk	# Positions	Hrs/wk
Facilities mgr	1	40	0	0	1	30	0	0
Custodian	1	28	4	76.5	2	72	1	30
Other*	3	40	0	0	0	0	2	14
Total hrs/wk		108		76.5		102		44

*Includes facilities technicians (CLUUC), handyman (UUCF), and sexton (UUCF).

UUCF's Director of Administration currently acts as a de facto facilities manager. It is commonly recognized that when a maintenance or custodial task isn't getting done, he steps in and does it. He deals with campus emergencies such as broken HVAC systems, plans the work of the handyman and sexton, attends PSC meetings, and steps in when no other staff is available to set up rooms for events and meetings. Because of the odd hours at which some of this work must be done, it is quite common for other staff not to be available. As he puts it, "we're always cobbling coverage together." He

⁶ Cedar Lane Unitarian Universalist Church (CLUUC), River Road Unitarian Universalist Congregation (RRUUC), Unitarian Universalist Church of Arlington (UUCA).

also noted that room set-up has become more complicated over the years, in part due to increases in audiovisual needs, although UUCF's audiovisual technician does some of that work.

When the current Director of Administration retires, which he expects to do within the next three years, a major issue will be the scope of the next incumbent's responsibilities. It may be difficult for UUCF to find a new Director of Administration who is similarly flexible in his or her abilities and generous with his or her time. At a more basic level, though, we need to ask whether it is appropriate for the role of Director of Administration to include what might otherwise be considered the duties of a facilities manager. One possibility is to hire a facilities manager who would ensure that the facilities were ready for all events, equipment was maintained, break-downs were dealt with, and other maintenance and custodial functions handled.⁷

Recommendation #4: The Coordinating Team should review the scope of the Director of Administration's responsibilities as the job is currently being done and consider the feasibility of hiring a facilities manager. At the same time, the Coordinating Team should reevaluate the adequacy of staffing for buildings maintenance and custodial functions.

Grounds Keeping

UUCF grounds are maintained by a combination of part-time staffing and volunteers. The current level of hired and volunteer labor appears to be appropriate for grounds maintenance, with one exception: removal of non-native, invasive species, about which there is a high level of concern within the PSC. An on-going volunteer effort comprises four to five members who meet monthly to work on removal of invasive and non-native species and planting of native species. While their work is commendable, it is not by itself sufficient for a quick solution to the problem. Members of the PSC mentioned the possibility of hiring a professional landscaper to work on the problem, but there is no consensus for doing so nor ready source of funding.

UUCF hires part-time labor for routine grounds work such as watering, weeding, lawn mowing, mulching, and leaf raking.⁸ Many interviewees agreed that it has been difficult to get volunteers to do these ongoing tasks. For example, UUCF used to have a Garden Angels project, in which members adopted specific areas of the church's planting beds, but their volunteer efforts faded after about a year.

Volunteer labor is used primarily for special, one-time projects. There are also periodic grounds projects, such as for the Martin Luther King, Jr. Weekend of Service. Small

⁷ In order to afford such a position, one option is to downgrade the Director of Administration position to that of a business manager. In fairness to the current Director of Administration, however, any such downgrade should not occur until he has retired.

⁸ UUCF also pays for a snow removal service during the winter months, which can add significantly to the total amount spent on grounds.

groups occasionally request to help with grounds projects--the PlaygroUUp and at least one covenant group have worked with members of the PSC on short-term, "get in and get it done" projects. Several people mentioned that volunteer efforts might be more successful if there were a stronger social component. However, Grounds Days, which are advertised to the congregation, have not been universally successful; one interviewee said that people tend to drift away during the day without finishing their assignment. Grounds Days require a great deal of organization and there is a question of whether the level of effort put into planning them is worth the output.

5. Memorial Grove

Finding #5: The Memorial Grove Committee is not sustainable in its current form.

UUCF's Memorial Grove presents a unique property issue. The Grove was conceived, designed, and brought into being many years ago by a small group of church members. The vision for the Grove was that it be a quiet and contemplative repository for the ashes of deceased members, as well as a place for small ceremonies and celebrations of times and events in our life cycle. It was not to contain headstones or other memorials to specific individuals; rather, families who wished their loved ones to be remembered by name could purchase name plates for the memorial wall panel in the Sanctuary. There is a \$500 fee for scattering or burying ashes in the Grove and a \$100 fee for a name plate. These fees were set by the Memorial Grove Committee and have been in place for many years.

Over the years, and particularly before the arrival of the church's Director of Administration in January 2009, the Memorial Grove Committee operated independently of any lay ministry or other larger church organization and has been largely unknown to the general congregation. In early 2011, a charter for the Memorial Grove Committee was drafted, but it was never approved by the CT. The membership of the Committee has now dwindled to two members, both in their seventies. All the other Committee members have either died or been forced by age to step down. One of the two remaining Memorial Grove Committee members now also has a place on the PSC. This has not, however, broadened participation in the Memorial Grove Committee's work.

Most of the administrative work associated with the Memorial Grove is done by the Director of Administration. This includes keeping track of fee payments and overseeing the Grove's two bank accounts. When ashes are to be buried in the Memorial Grove, one of the Committee members digs the hole. There is no map of where ashes have been buried--the locations are solely in the memory of the Committee member who digs the holes.

The Memorial Grove's bank accounts contain significant sums of money. There is \$15,000 in a savings account that is the remainder of the money raised to build an accessible wooden walkway from the Administration Building. There is another \$14,230

in a custodial account, which handles the small costs associated with Memorial Grove activity. Although perhaps tangential to this review of property stewardship, the PEC believes the fees charged by the Memorial Grove Committee should be examined. The vision for the Grove was that it be financially self-sustaining. However, aside from the wooden walkway and benches, which need periodic maintenance, the Grove itself now requires very little attention: the hardscaping is complete and the plantings are well established.

Recommendation #5: The Coordinating Team and the Board should redistribute the responsibilities of the Memorial Grove Committee among the Lay Ministry for Property Stewardship, the church staff, and perhaps the Lay Ministry for Caring and Wellness.

The two remaining members of the Memorial Grove Committee recognize that a handover must occur. Most of the tasks associated with the Grove are already done by the Director of Administration.⁹ Thus, the Memorial Grove Committee should be terminated as a stand-alone entity, and responsibility for physical management of the Grove should be transferred to the Lay Minister for Property Stewardship and the PSC. The present members of the Memorial Grove Committee should be welcomed as members of the PSC if they wish to have that status. Alternatively, they could choose to educate the Lay Minister and the PSC on all aspects of the Memorial Grove, including the location of buried boxes of ashes. To the extent that the Memorial Grove Committee members have assisted the ministers in providing guidance and support for individuals desiring to commemorate a loved one through use of the Memorial Grove and/or the memorial wall panel, such work might be appropriately placed with the Lay Ministry for Caring and Wellness.

⁹ If a facilities manager becomes part of the UUCF staff, the Memorial Grove would come under his/her purview.

Appendix A: Method

Research for this evaluation of property stewardship at UUCF included four major components.

Interviews. PEC members conducted a joint interview with UUCF's Senior Minister and Associate Minister. They conducted individual interviews with the Director of Administration, Director of Religious Exploration, and current and former Lay Ministers for Property Stewardship.

Focus Group. The PEC conducted a focus group with members of the Property Stewardship Council.

Document Review. The PEC reviewed a variety of documents, including the following:

- Property Condition Assessment by Envision PCA Solutions (April 2010)
- Spreadsheet showing estimated costs of repairs recommended by Property Condition Assessment (2010)
- Memorial Grove Committee draft charter (2011)
- Property Master Plan prepared by the Property Stewardship Council (March 2012)
- Property Stewardship Council draft charter (2014)
- UUCF budget (2015-2016)

Research into Practices of Other Churches. The PEC looked at staffing for property stewardship at three local UU churches:

- Cedar Lane Unitarian Universalist Church
- River Road Unitarian Universalist Congregation
- Unitarian Universalist Church of Arlington

The PEC agreed that comments and observations of interviewees and focus group participants would not be attributed to individuals, except for a few attributions made with the permission of the individual. Staff and members who participated are listed in Appendix B, as are the interviewees from other congregations. The PEC appreciates the support, thoughtful insights, and participation of these individuals.

Appendix B: Interviews and Focus Group

UUCF Interviewees

Rev. David Miller, Senior Minister
Rev. Laura Horton-Ludwig, Associate Minister
Rich Sider, Director of Administration
Linnea Nelson, Director of Religious Exploration
Suzy Foster, Lay Minister for Property Stewardship
Raoul Drapeau, past Lay Minister for Property Stewardship

UUCF Focus Group Participants

Bill Ades
Jim Allen
Ken Foley
Karen Grycewicz
Lois Phemister
Alan Tubbs
Zeena Zeidberg

Individuals at Other Churches Interviewed/E-mailed

Sara Deshler	Cedar Lane Unitarian Universalist Church
Ana Lim	River Road Unitarian Universalist Congregation
Tamara Srader	Unitarian Universalist Church of Arlington, Va.