

NOTES ON THE MEETING OF THE SITE SELECTION AND BUILDING PROGRAM COMMITTEE OF THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH OF AUSTIN (UCC) ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1999 AT 7:30 p.m. AT THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH OF AUSTIN (UCC), AUSTIN, TEXAS.

Members present: Jean Appel, Vic Appel, David Ashton (Co-Chair), Matt Blackstock, Sharon Brown, Paul Deisler (Co-Chair), Cathy Hubbs, Yoshi Kaneda, *ex officio*, Sara Ross, Mary Sinclair.

Members not present: Fran Briggs, Suzanne Moore, Pat Oakes, Jim Tomasek. * *Michael Adams, Jamie Adams*

Others present: Kristin Galle, John Moore.

Call to order and general remarks. Paul Deisler called the meeting to order. Yoshi Kaneda to offered the opening prayer.

Report on the results of the Coordinating Council Meeting of Monday, October 11, 1999.

Paul Deisler reported on the Coordinating Council Meeting having attended on behalf of the site Selection and Building Program Committee. He began with a review of the reports given at the Council Meeting of the results of the five Cottage Meetings just concluded.

The Cottage Meeting results were very varied, some expressing views directly contrary others. Although many different views expressed, there were certain themes that cropped up with some frequency, as follows:

- (1) Concerns over specific areas of Austin were expressed.
- (2) Financial affordability/uncertainty concerns were voiced (one group wanted to wait to have a capital campaign until land had actually been purchased and a design for the new facility had been prepared while others wanted either to proceed with a campaign now or to institute an ongoing campaign, starting now, to provide funds in advance of committing to the purchase of land, etc...).
- (3) There were concerns over the timeline, itself. Particularly, the April 2001 transition when a new pastor is to take over from Yoshi Kaneda as he retires is of concern: it was seen as impacting negatively on the success of a move if the Church were in the midst of a move as it occurred. There was some fairly widespread sentiment in favor of slowing the process down and of getting the new pastor involved in the project at an early date in the project.

The Coordinating Council considered all of the Cottage Meeting results and debated numerous alternatives. A pivotal

(though by no means sole) point in their thinking appeared to be the pastoral transition of April 2001. Bringing the new pastor on board at a time when he or she could become involved early in providing leadership during the project, and follow through after relocation, was considered important for the long-term success of this Church. The tie-in of the Church's Centennial Celebration and Yoshi Kaneda's retirement was also an important factor, the Council wishing to have Yoshi present and involved in the Celebration. And, the need to resolve and decide upon the partnering concept, especially if partnering would lead the Church to decide against a physical relocation to a new building belonging solely to it, were carefully considered. This latter point, it was found, needs to be resolved before going too far down the road in a physical relocation commitment. (It was noted that it could take as long as two years to flesh out partnering possibilities fully).

After considering these and many other factors the Council elaborated a five-part resolution to be presented to the Congregation for approval on Sunday, October 14, 1999. This resolution was presented to the Site Selection and Building Program Committee by John Moore as follows (reported here in substance; the words are not exact):

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. The Capital Campaign Committee be directed to create a plan for an ongoing capital solicitation and fund-raising through the pastoral transition period.
2. Efforts of other relocation committees (the Sale Committee and the Site Selection and Building Program Committee) be suspended until after the pastoral transition has taken place.
3. A Pastoral Search Committee be created immediately with the objective of installing a new pastor in April 2001.
4. A Centennial Celebration Committee be created immediately with the objective of planning the Church's Centennial Celebration in April 2001.
5. The Dialogue Task Force be instructed (a) to develop a calendar of short-term partnering activities (such as the recent joint activities with University Baptist) working with all of the active Boards and Committees of the Church; and (b) to develop long-term partnering alternatives for consideration by the Congregation by October 1, 1999.

The Site Selection and Building Program Committee then discussed in depth the meaning of item 2 to this Committee.

Yoshi Kaneda suggested that the Coordinating Council might need to hear explicitly and directly, in writing, from the relocation committees; that the Coordinating Council might put off its action until [REDACTED] its December 6, 1999 meeting has taken place.

After much discussion it became evident that, as far as the Site Selection and Building Program Committee was concerned, there was no need for a delay in the Coordinating Council's action. It was pointed out that this Committee is at the point where stopping for an interim is easy and convenient. The present meeting was originally called for the purpose of deciding how best to present the large amount of information now on hand to the Congregation so as to secure from the Congregation a clear directive as to which part of Austin the Committee should now focus on to find specific sites meeting the criteria from which, at a later meeting of the Congregation, one, final site would be selected. On completion of the selection of one site, the loan application could be submitted and negotiations on the site could proceed. Suspending now would therefore be advantageous if that is the decision of the Congregation; suspending later would only put the Committee and the Congregation to unnecessary further work, much of which would have little later relevance (sites selected now would very likely not be available later; areas chosen now might not be as desirable as others later; etc...). Moreover, what the Committee has learned so far, both factually and as to process, will stand it in good stead when operations are resumed. The Committee therefore concluded that taking additional time to hear from this Committee before the Coordinating Council takes action is not necessary.

Sharon Brown then made the following motion:

MOTION: The Site Selection and Building Program Committee supports the resolution proposed by the Coordinating Council.

The motion passed with one negative vote.

Actions pursuant to the immediately preceding item.

It was recognized that any actions of this Committee could not take place until after the Congregation's vote on October 14, 1999. Actions that would be taken if the Congregation approves the Resolution are as follows.

o Dave Ashton suggested that a report of this phase be written and placed on file to be available to the Committee on resumption of work. Vic Appel suggested that the report contain not only the historical and factual data but also the reflections of the Committee on what procedural approaches worked best and other material helpful in starting up quickly again. Paul Deisler

suggested that, while the Co-Chairs would undoubtedly have the task of pulling together the report, the Committee members needed to be involved in planning and organizing the report and in making specific, written contributions to it. The Committee was generally satisfied with all of these suggestions.

o The Co-Chairs will contact the realtor and architects about the suspension of activities. They will write confirmatory letters to them. The letters will indicate our pleasure at the way they have worked with us and helped us and that this Committee will recommend, for the future reference, that they be contacted about working with us in the future if they are then willing to do so.

o Gary Roberts from the UCC is to visit on next Tuesday afternoon and evening and possibly Wednesday morning, the 19th and 20th of October. The Board of Trustees has had much difficulty in contacting him and securing a visit from him for purposes of clarifying many matters about securing a UCC loan. Also, Gary Roberts had asked to see some typical sites while here (on the Wednesday). If the Congregation approves the five-part Resolution on October 14, the Committee concluded it will still be very useful to speak with Gary Roberts about these matters. Vic Appel added that questions also need to be raised about any impact our suspension of activities might have on our ability to receive a loan in the future. Also, Paul Deisler, asked John Moore and Yoshi Kaneda to ask Gary Roberts when they meet with him if, given the change in timing, he would still be willing to look at selected sites to give us his views on suitability from his wider perspective; such information would be a valuable addition to the report, looking to the Committee's future activities. Vic Appel and Matt Blackstock expressed willingness to accompany Paul deisler on such an inspection tour on the Wednesday morning.

Old business. A number of reports on observations on sites and other site-related matters were due from individual members. Paul Deisler asked that these be submitted in writing to him for inclusion in the information file (this was done at this meeting by all members involved)

New Business. There were no items of new business.

Next meeting. Whether the Congregation approves the resolution as it now stands or at a further meeting will be required (if approved, such a meeting would deal with the organization and writing of the report).

It was suggested that a new meeting might take place in two weeks but a firm date was not set. Members will be notified.

Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m..