

Congregational Meeting Minutes

June 2, 2019

The meeting was brought to order at 10:45AM. 32 people were in attendance.

Elizabeth Hamilton presented the agenda; presentation of Bryan Geib as a new HRC member and an update to the congregation concerning the three meeting space options that church leadership is currently researching.

Matt MacNeill as the HRC representative, presented Bryan Geib as a candidate for HRC. Brian was given an opportunity to comment and then the floor was opened for questions. After one round of CDM's, consensus was reached.

Elizabeth Hamilton then announced that Lynn Wetherbee has recently expressed a willingness to be considered for the open role as elder. Because of the need for a 2-week notice, it was agreed that this will be presented at a future meeting after proper notice to the whole congregation has been given.

Elizabeth then turned the meeting over to Church Council. Amanda Bouwman, as the new Church Council chair, introduced the topic of meeting space options by taking a quick hand survey of participation in recent meeting options. Rough results were:

- Attended service at Common Place: around 20
- Attended evening service at Wharton Wesley: around 17
- Working on Ad-hoc Calvary task force: 4

Ethan Tan then presented a summary of the survey results, taken in the weeks following the service at The Common Place (TCP). The results were presented as word clouds and specific comments, showing both positive and negative comments (see printed document). An opportunity was given for new comments or questions, specifically for folks that did not fill out the survey or for comments not seen in the survey. One additional comment was made from the point of view of the worship leader (light and sound issues, distraction of side doors during the service).

Amanda then opened the floor to others to comment on people's comments. A question was asked about accessibility and the issue was discussed. A question was asked about SS rooms and arrangement, furniture and ability to have some control over setup. Lorie responded to this question with how this might play out based on a few conversations with our contact at TCP. A question was asked about the timeline of the merging of congregations at TCP and how that affects our timeline. Lorie addressed the current status of the merger and how we might be part of that process in that space, with the impression that there should not be timeline merge issues. A question was asked about office space and Lorie indicated that office space would be available for us. Several lighting questions were asked and folks responded with their experience.

Ethan then presented the survey results for the evening service at Wharton Wesley (see printed document). Opportunity was given for new comments or questions about these results. Amanda then opened the floor for questions to others who were not at the evening service. Further comments were made about how this time is difficult to manage. A question was asked about the possibility of a Saturday evening and how that might work differently than a Sunday evening. A comment was made about where an evening service might be, since Wharton Wesley is not considered a viable option. A comment was made about going to church in the dark

during half of the year. Comments were made about how hard it would be to have an evening service with the beginning of a new work/school week. Further comments were made about possible changes to the meeting hour (later or earlier) and meal options and ramifications on fellowship time and Sunday School time.

Amanda then turned the discussion to the work being done on the Calvary option. Lorie presented a history of the leadership groups that have been active at Calvary (see handout for details) up to the proposed involvement of Partners for Sacred Places (PFSP) and their work towards creating a sustainable model for operating this space as a viable community space. Sheldon then presented from the Ad-hoc committee, whose purpose is to gather information about the true status of Calvary governance so that WPMF can make an objective, fact-based decision about whether there is any real option for us to stay in this building. He related the ways in which the Ad-hoc Committee has become very involved in the multiple levels of leadership meetings of Calvary, CCCC and “the task force” and how there seems to be a shifting happening within Calvary leadership towards more openness and a willingness to give up control for the greater good of the building. Sheldon also made comments concerning the building and its place in this community. He then spoke further on the history of PFSP in this building and where the model that was put in place by PFSP many years ago, has failed. Sheldon then discussed capital campaigns and indicated that in order for a capital campaign to be successful, governing structures need to be solid or reformed in order to pass muster to the giving communities and that the building ownership must be legally clear/no title issues. Both of these items are currently major issues for Calvary and must be resolved before any more work can be done. The desire is that PFSP conduct its study over the summer and present its report in the fall of 2019. At this point a discussion needs to happen about the report and willingness of all parties to participate as directed. This will be a point where the Calvary leadership team will have decisions to make about how their role changes. This discussion and decisions will then inform WPMF in regards to our willingness to continue in this process, in this building. There will likely be other changes and work needed that will be required before the capital campaign can be begin.

The floor was opened for questions. A question was asked about the status of the Methodist denomination as it relates to the building and Sheldon responded to the need for clarity on property ownership/title/liens and Lorie presented about current issues within the Methodist church regarding LGBTQ issues and how those issues will likely affect Methodist congregations and their buildings. The Methodist denominational leadership has indicated that if congregations choose to leave the denomination, they will be given the opportunity to take their buildings with them in return for payment of outstanding loans to the denomination. Lorie also spoke about the “shared ownership” model for the building being discussed by Calvary, various user groups and also by the “Methodist Church”. Comments were made from a council member about sharing with the congregation the complexity of the situation that we have been dealing with. Lorie responded to questions about the day-to-day issues of security and issues of working in the building during the day. Questions were asked about our importance to the Calvary process and where we as a church want to put our energies (are our time and energy better placed at TCP than at Calvary where we have a poor history of return for our efforts). Comments were made about Kol Tzedek’s status, both from the point of view off their leadership team and from their congregation. A question was asked about if we are able to wait on this Calvary process and there was discussion about, both the need to wait to allow this study to be completed and digested and also the fact that work is still being/can be done on all three building options. Sheldon reframed the question about waiting as WPMF doing our due diligence with Calvary to see if there can be meaningful change before making a decision. Comments were also made about the status of this building as a building in a community and who we are in relation to our community. A comment was also made about the fact that there is no clear direction, either from

the congregation or from Church Council, as both groups represent a wide range of thought on all three building options.

Amanda then presented the letter requesting that WPMF participate financially towards the study to be done by PFSP. She also presented the recent Church Council decision to use \$2000 from our building fund (monies given by a few donors over the years towards buying a building with a balance of around \$60,000) and ask for personal donations/pledges over the next week, if anyone is so inclined. It was cited that most persons giving to the WPMF building fund have been contacted about this use of these funds. The floor was then open for questions and a question was asked about LGBTQ issues as it relates to meeting at TCP. Lorie stated that this has been discussed with the leadership of the two congregations currently meeting at TCP and there does not seem to be an issue. It is unclear if there is any issue with the Wayne Presbyterian, who are the current owners of the building.

Elizabeth closed the meeting.

Thanks to Tim Martin Johnson and Rebecca Weber for snacks and thanks to all on WPMF leadership teams who have had a part in furthering all parts of this ongoing discussion.

Respectively submitted,

Jeff Knightly