



**Foothills Board of Trustees Meeting  
Approved Monthly Meeting Minutes  
June 21, 2020**

**Board Members in Attendance:** Sara Steen, Brendon Mahoney, Sue Sullivan, Debbie Gentry, Glenn Pearson, Joan Woodbury, Cheryl Hazlitt, new board members, Andrea Delorey and Doug Powell, and Reverend Gretchen Haley (ex-officio member).

Online meeting convened at 6:00pm via Zoom with a virtual chalice lighting and check-in.

### **Consent Agenda**

Sara asked to pull the Board Meeting minutes from May 21, 2020 in order to make some minor changes. **Cheryl moved to approve the Consent Agenda consisting of the Finance Committee, Personnel Committee, Governance Committee and Nominating Committee minus the May 21, 2020 board meeting minutes. Motion passed.**

A slight correction was made to the May 21, 2020 board meeting minutes. **Cheryl moved to approve the May 21, 2020 board meeting minutes as revised. Motion Passed.**

### **Discussion Items**

#### **Item 1: Develop ministry charge for Building for Courageous Love work**

Sara reported that the Capital Campaign Calling Team report submitted on June 9, 2020 by Sue Ferguson (working with Ben Marvel), indicated that they had contacted most of the congregants who had made pledges but had not yet started making payments. Of those contacted, 100% reported they would be able to pay their pledge. With this information, it was concluded that there would be close to a \$6M pledge base in order to begin work on the building campaign.

Brendan questioned if outside donors were still being considered. Sara clarified that contacts with outside donors made pre-Covid were more focused on building relationships. Since the pandemic started, these donors (specifically the Bohemian

Foundation and the Community Foundation) had not been contacted but were continuing to strengthen through our mutual interest in ISAAC, the Family Housing Network, and BIPOC.

Sara outlined three possible paths forward with our building campaign that were also posed at the June 14, 2020 Annual Congregational meeting. These three options are:

- Raise \$900,000 by asking donors to increase their initial pledge and/or additional loans or member notes and instruct the architect to move forward with the final design of the \$8.2M Phase One project.
- Go back to the architect and ask them to provide us with a new Phase One plan that could be completed for \$7.3M (\$6M in pledges + \$1.3M C-PACE loan).
- Revisit the \$1.3M loan in light of the economic uncertainty and either revise or reduce our design or try to raise additional money or some combination of these.

Sara noted she and Rev. Gretchen discussed these paths and Rev. Gretchen indicated it would be helpful for the board to come up with a new list of deliverables that outlined what the board wanted and when it was due. Rev. Gretchen felt a new discussion with Peter would be appropriate now that we needed to incorporate options for social distancing into the new design. Also she noted that because Jeffrey Mizell is leaving, she could use board help with the financing component.

Sara updated new board members, Doug Powell and Andrea Delorey, about what was meant by “giving a charge” to the ministry. She explained that this was a useful tool when the board had something specific that was needed from ministry to help the board in their decision making process. Sara continued that it’s an opportunity for the board to be directive while also remembering to leave enough space for ministry to figure out how to complete the task.

Doug questioned if our current information from the architect included a variety of project sizes along with what the trade-offs would be for each size and asking if certain things could be deferred. Cheryl remembered an earlier discussion the board had on what various dollar amounts would buy and it was thought that accessing that information would be helpful.

Sue noted two pieces of information she would like to have the ministry provide: Is it possible in this new Covid environment to raise an additional \$900,000 in supplemental pledges from our largest donors and has Rev. Gretchen considered any other way of repaying the C-PACE loan other than renting out the building.

Sara brought forth three questions that needed to be answered before the board could make recommendations to the congregation:

- Is the board comfortable that we will have a \$6M pledge base to begin our work;
- Is our ability to pay back the C-PACE loan still feasible and is there room to take out an additional loan;
- Is ministry willing to go back to large donors and see what they say about increasing their pledge in order to cover the remaining \$900,000 or should the ministry be charged with assessing the feasibility, given these new circumstances, of raising these additional funds from within the general congregation?

Cheryl reminded the board that the architect would also need to know that a plan for social distancing would need to be built into the design.

Sara said that she would draft a charge and post on basecamp within the next two days for comments and revisions.

## **Item 2: Board Year Review**

Annually, board policy mandates a review of the board's compliance with policies on governance and oversight, in conjunction with the board president, a self-evaluation of board committees to ensure their ongoing relevance and effectiveness and an evaluation of the partnership between the board and senior minister. In order to help with these reviews, Sara included goals the board set for ourselves during the board retreat last year and thought it would be beneficial to look at things that were helpful last year in meeting our goals and things that prevented us from meeting our goals.

General consensus on the goal, "be deliberate about tending to our spiritual health both individually and as a group", was the board did well with this goal starting at the retreat last year when the agenda included ways to be vulnerable and to build trust. The Brene Brown workshop, led by Michelle Faris, was seen as excellent and the check-ins were especially helpful during Covid. It was also thought that Rev. Sean was a wonderful presence during last year's retreat asking us to ponder spiritual questions and guiding the conversation. Also, while Rev. Gretchen was on sabbatical and Rev. Sean was present at the board meetings, it was thought that the board took on more responsibility because of Rev. Sean's less hands-on approach and that this had helped the board grow more as a cohesive group.

Another goal was to “clarify endowment structure and begin work on revising church bylaws”. Joan expressed difficulty in finding people interested in revising the church bylaws adding it might be beneficial to limit the task force to no more than two to three people. Brendan acknowledged Sue’s help in working toward clarifying the future of the endowment fund. Sue mentioned that going forward, a good idea might be to charge the endowment task force with educating the congregation.

Another goal was to give the governance committee direction on how to establish policy book revisions. Although a worksheet had been created outlining the steps in revising policy and the governance committee had completed this worksheet, Joan felt there was little interest in the committee doing this work going forward. She suggested it might be best for the board to take ownership of writing policy with Sara mentioning her interest in working with policy this next year.

The goal to implement a process of conducting an evaluation of the senior minister every three years was thought to have worked well although it was not yet known how helpful it would be to the board and to Rev. Gretchen going forward.

Sara felt that after 3 years of policy governance, most people were beginning to understand this concept at a deeper level. She thought this would make it easier for the board to take greater ownership of the policy book, visioning outcomes, monitoring and linkage. Linkage was thought to be the least understood though development of the Community Circles was helping to identify the moral owners that really served as the sources of authority and accountability.

Cheryl brought forward that the personnel committee needed more clarity; Brendan questioned if the role of the treasurer was necessary going forward; more clarity around the work of board committees versus task forces was mentioned; and what changes would working online bring to board work in the future. Sue expressed her desire to rethink and revise those structures that no longer fit.

Sara acknowledged and thanked all of the board members for their hard work this year.

### **Item 3: Annual Meeting Review**

Acknowledgement that the next few annual meetings would probably be conducted online led to concerns being raised about the length of the meeting with 90 minutes thought to be the maximum amount of time going forward; concern that there was not

enough time to answer all of the questions that were raised; finding a better way of conducting an online poll using Zoom; and how to handle conflict online. On the positive side, praise was given to Sara for overseeing and managing the meeting; Brendan was commended for his work in managing the online questions that came into the meeting; Amy and Cheryl were given credit for making sure those who attended the meeting were appropriate and Dug Steen was very helpful in the yes/no count. Glenn raised the idea of planting questions in future meetings to keep the meeting flowing and adding interest.

Sara welcomed new board members, Andrea Delorey and Doug Powell.

**Sara adjourned the meeting at 8:15pm.**

Minutes written and presented by  
Debbie Gentry,  
Board Secretary