

## Scenario Evaluation Worksheet Combined Input

Model: 2+2 Scenario 2: Cluster SMK and CCBT; cluster SKD, SM, and SJW

### Benefits of this Scenario:

- Keeps migrant camps together
- Strengthens everybody
- Every parish shares in the change
- All parishes within each cluster connected by 104 or 31
- The northern portion of this scenario has some natural affiliation with cottage ownership and usage during the summer and fall
- Would allow for one pastor and one parochial vicar in each cluster. Management could be consolidated. Fairly equal staffing of pastors, parochial vicars, deacons, and lay pastoral associates
- In the northern proposed cluster, people shop, go to school, do business and carry on daily responsibilities along Route 104, while to the south the same activity prevails along route 31. A great number of working families commute to Webster and Rochester for work, daily, along route 104 as no doubt many do via route 31. Nearly half of CCBT registered parishioners live mid-way between Wolcott (St. Mary Magdalene) and Sodus (Church of the Epiphany), the converse is also true (although in smaller numbers) as to the numbers of SMK parishioners that live between the Church of the Epiphany and St. Mary Magdalene. Additionally, using a visual from the parishioner (CMA) maps provided, southern cluster parishioners are most dense along route 31.
- This model/scenario also provides relative economies of scale improvements. While a case can be made to cluster CCBT and SJW such that two small parishes become one slightly larger parish . . . (in fact, combining the two still leaves the “new” cluster the smallest in Wayne County) arguably, a better case can be made to cluster the smaller with a larger (CCBT with SMK) thus strengthening both Parishes for the long term as opposed to creating a slightly larger entity that may only survive for the short term. Combining CCBT with SJW creates a Parish with approximately 737 parishioners, while combining CCBT with SMK creates a Parish with 1248 parishioners . . . a size much better positioned for long term sustainment. Likewise, combining SJW with SM (1422 parishioners) and/or with SM and SKD (2205) make a much stronger long term solution considering aging populations at and a diminishing population base at CCBT/SJW.
- Easier for pastors to merge certain parish functions

### Challenges of this Scenario:

- Funeral count higher in south.
- South shows higher attendance
- Breaks apart SMK & SJW faith formation
- Confusion of names – 2 St. Patrick’s and 2 St. Michael’s in the southern cluster
- Travel for Priest in Northern area is considerable (~ 43 Miles)
- Unbalanced attendance between 2 areas
- The travel required for the pastoral teams of *both* clusters would be quite difficult.
- The southern grouping would produce a cluster with very few natural affiliations.
- The greatest challenge in this model/scenario is the fact that an existing cluster in a new configuration could exist without the physical presence of a priest.
- This model also creates a problem in span of control. There are four year-round churches in the proposed northern community. There are six in the southern proposed community, which presents a

steeper challenge to the assigned priests. The “circuit” (Red Creek to Ontario and Macedon to Savannah) is 32 miles and 34 miles respectively, a challenge but not an insurmountable hurdle.

- In addition to Mass requirements, the northern proposed community in 2017 had 20 baptisms, 11 were confirmed, 4 weddings and 13 funerals . . . while the southern proposed community had 14, 13, 4, 4 and 35 respectively. The span of sacramental responsibilities along with the absence of a priest presence at one site in addition to the larger size (registered parishioners) of the proposed entity are significant challenges for this model.
- More meeting (Finance, Pastoral, etc) responsibilities for the 2 pastors
- Changes needed for Masses
- Deciding who are the two pastors and who are the two parochial vicars. (*Note, this is not a decision made by the planning team*)
- Some do not see the natural affiliation between parishes.

Additional input from the Pastoral and Finance Councils of each parish:

### Benefits

- This scenario strengthens all the parishes and maintains all the commonalities associated with North-South groupings: ease of transportation along 104 or 31, summer cottager communities, parishioners living mostly north of 104 and some very close to SMK.
- (Positive) – School employees work at schools along 104, Rochester workers commute to work and return on 104. Travel along 104/31 is familiar to parishioners and is beneficial during winter commutes.
- This scenario creates a cluster that matches a large parish with a smaller one thus making use of the ability of the larger parish to provide size-associated strength, sustainability and stability to the smaller.
- (Positive) – Represents a more innovative proposal to the diocese, one that projects sustainability into the future.
- Most efficient model
- Most balanced layout (Population, etc.)
- Most efficient travel using main highways east & west (St 104 & St 31)
- Minimal north & south travel which is a benefit during winter weather
- 1 large church in each cluster
- Travel in winter is all east & west
- Each Priest & Vicar could do 1 mass at each site legally
- Clusters churches that have historic & geographic connections
- Division of parish of north & south is a good idea
- One Priest and one Vicar could handle the masses within reason
- Might allow elimination of 1 or 2 parishes

### Challenges

- Some Councils and staff felt that this scenario should not be recommended. The distances for the pastors would be too great. Some councils thought it could be worked around
- Extensive travel makes this scenario undesirable
- South cluster would only get 1 mass per worship site per weekend
- North cluster would get two worship sites with 2 masses
- Travel along Rt 104 in the winter is difficult
- Considerable travel distance between places of worship – could limit the number of masses at each church
- A challenge in summer with 2 cottage type parishes

## Scenario Evaluation Worksheet Combined Input

Model: 2+2 Scenario 4: Cluster SKD and SMK; cluster CCBT, SJW, and SM

### Benefits of this Scenario:

- Geographic area is better than some of the other scenarios
- Combined attendances relatively even between the two areas
- Good sharing of resources
- Every parish shares in the change
- Both portions of this scenario have good natural affiliations.
- Up to four properties could be downsized. (e.g. rectories)
- Could allow for one pastor and one parochial vicar in each cluster. Management could be consolidated from four entities to two.
- Good staffing model possibility of pastors, parochial vicars, deacons, and lay pastoral associate.
- Combined parish council with three parishes creates opportunity for bigger picture thinking.
- Possible long-term structural stability in clerical assignments.
- The parochial vicars could provide peer support for each other.
- Easier for pastors to merge certain parish functions
- This model scenario provides a better balance than the model 2 + 2 scenario 3. A Pastor with a Parochial Vicar could be assigned at SM and SJW respectively with an adjustment to Masses/Mass time (3 at SM and one at Lyons by the Pastor) and (two each at Savanna, Clyde, Wolcott and Red Creek by the PV). Since distances are reasonable between churches, the Pastoral Vicar could be assigned to CCBT or SJW.
- The “scope” of Pastoral (one Pastor) management either with SMK/SKD or SM/SJW/CCBT appears to be reasonable when compared to clusters in Monroe County where church sizes exceed those associated in this scenario: 1766 parishioners at SMK/SKD; 1687 parishioners at SM/SJW/CCBT.
- Distances are not impediments if the PV assigned to CCBT or SJW handled Masses at those clusters (20-25 miles), and they are not an impediment in the proposed SMK/SKD cluster since a priest would be assigned at each.
- The proposed scenario closes the distance in comparison of principal non-Mass sacramental loads (baptisms, weddings, funerals): 59 (SMK/SKD) versus 92 (SM/SJW/CCBT). Two Deacons are assigned who can assist in managing the imbalance.
- The Pastor’s residence at SMK is only 11 miles from Macedon and only 15 miles from Palmyra. The Pastor’s residence at SM is only 15 miles from Clyde. Clyde to Wolcott is 14 miles.
- This model/scenario also provides the potential for relative economies of scale improvements. While a case can be made to cluster two smaller parishes which become one slightly larger parish, a case might be made to cluster the smaller with a larger as an opportunity to forestall the effects of the inevitable population declines in eastern Wayne County, thus strengthening both Parishes for the long term as opposed to creating a slightly larger entity (a “larger small parish”) that may only survive for the short term. Combining SM/SJW and CCBT creates a Parish with 1687 parishioners . . . a size much stronger for all to better position each for long term successful sustainment.
- Relatively balanced households & sacraments
- Best clergy & staff scenario
- Masses can be rearranged relatively easily

## Challenges of this Scenario:

- West side keeping all churches open.
- Two buildings are St. Michaels in SJW/SM/CCBT cluster
- Does break apart faith formation current sharing SMK, SJW
- SMK & CCBT have most of the migrant camps. While in some scenarios, they are clustered together. They are separate in this scenario. How advantageous would it be for migrant ministry to have them in the same scenario?
- Eastern sphere has a lot of ministry needs; e.g. hospital, county jail, nursing homes.
- Would require pastor in eastern cluster to oversee three parishes, including three finance councils.
- Three parishes for one pastor.
- More meeting (Finance, Pastoral, etc) responsibilities for the 2 pastors
- Changes in Masses
- Deciding who are the two pastors and who are the two parochial vicars. (*Note, this is not a decision made by the planning team*)
- There are no realistic natural affiliations when we align clusters north and south in Wayne County.
- Travel for Priest in eastern area is considerable but could be reduced with PV, PA, & Deacons
- Priest in eastern area would have 7 churches to manage

## Additional input from the Pastoral and Finance Councils of each parish:

### Benefits

- Generally evenly distributes Wayne County registered parishioners within the two clusters.
- Resolves many of the distance-related problems of other scenarios while providing a large-parish “engine” that would provide scale benefits as well as strength through stability and sustainability of the smaller, eastern county parishes.
- Pastor plus a Parochial Vicar along with two currently assigned deacons would help “balance” the sacramental workload and more evenly balance Mass responsibilities among the two assigned priests throughout this cluster.
- Provides perhaps the most innovative approach focusing on long term sustainability for Wayne County parishes. Other scenarios are “keep what we have” short –term scenarios that will need to be revisited in the not too distant future because of eastern Wayne County population demographics. This scenario provides large parish generated potential dynamics to BOTH the western and eastern ends of the county . . . it appears to be the most RESPONSIBLE approach we can provide back to the diocese.
- Easier for pastors to merge certain parish functions
- Clusters have a somewhat natural affiliation
- Best staffing / cluster model to accommodate a further county reduction to 3 priests should it be needed in the future
- Having two deacons in the eastern cluster as well as a pastoral associate and two priests would provide for a good staffing pattern. This scenario could hold together for a long time without having to revisit and readjust the model too soon. There is significant natural affiliation in the clusters and this would help to reduce the impact of too much change for the people. This scenario has already gained the most confidence from the parish-based planning groups.
- Better balance of mass coverage with population & family
- 1 Large and several small churches in each cluster
- Travel is not as long / Driving distances are more favorable
- Seems easiest to implement
- Seems to be acceptable to most

- Distances are limited
- Clusters larger churches with smaller churches
- By far, gives the parish & Priest more flexibility in providing quality services to the parish
- Most agreement by participants
- Only 5 parishes in North West

### Challenges

- Three parishes for one pastor.
- More meeting (Finance, Pastoral, etc) responsibilities for the 2 pastors
- Changes in Masses
- Deciding who are the two pastors and who are the two parochial vicars. (*A decision for the bishop and priest personnel*)
- Simply the size of the clusters would make for a managerial challenge for the pastors.
- East cluster would only get 1 mass per worship site per weekend
- North & south travel in winter will be bad
- East seems like most challenging geographically
- The overall ministries such as hospital, jail, and nursing homes would suffer if you do not secure more ministry of lay people volunteering
- Too many churches, especially with St Michael's (Newark). Very large church
- Breaks apart faith formation (SMK & SJW)
- More travel distance north – south
- Eliminate Rt 104 – St 31 travel
- More parishes 8 vs 5

## Scenario Evaluation Worksheet Combined Input

Model: 3+1 Scenario A: Cluster SKD and SM; cluster SJW and CCBT; keep SMK the same

### Benefits of this Scenario:

- No change in 1 area (good and bad – the bad is that this scenario does nothing to strengthen the parish without any change). The cluster of St Joseph the Worker and Blessed Trinity would have strong natural affiliations.
- Staffing model would be adequate.
- Could allow for the sale of a rectory in two of the clusters.
- Sets up benefits for future management in respect to priests.
- Would involve relatively few changes for congregations.
- Possible involvement of senior priest
- Natural affiliation for SJW and CCBT cluster
- Two of the clusters can achieve some efficiencies with combined committees (liturgy, religious education, buildings and grounds, etc.)
- SM and SKD retain a priest presence (if this mix is selected)
- Although not optimal for CCBT which would be left without a priest presence, this scenario, with the PV assigned to the SKD/SM cluster to handle sacramental scoping, is achievable.
- Distances between worship sites are achievable in this scenario with the CCBT-SJW circuit the most challenging (20-25 miles to RC/FH depending on the season)
- It appears as though the Mass/sacramental loads are manageable as long as the PV is assigned to the SM/SKD cluster.

### Challenges of this Scenario:

- Would require more travel for the Blessed Sacrament-St Joseph the Worker pastor.
- Changes in the Masses
- Parochial Vicar may need to be assigned to SKD and SM due to household density and large number of ministries.
- Decision as to who are the 3 pastors and the parochial vicar. (*Note, this is not a decision made by the planning team*)
- The pastor in two of the clusters would be responsible for additional meetings in each parish (finance council and pastoral council)
- St Mike/St Katherine has most of the funerals
- Separates migrant camps
- Unbalanced population between southwestern area vs. other 2 areas combined
- Separates faith formation SJW-SMK
- Difficulty of determining which cluster gets the parochial vicar (Sunday Masses vs. # funerals)
- North-South orientations are not optimal. There are no significant natural affiliations between CCBT and SJW, other than relative size of the parishioner base.
- This model/scenario negates relative economies of scale improvements. While the case can be made to cluster CCBT and SJW such that two small parishes become one slightly larger Parish . . . (in fact, combining the two still leaves the “new” cluster the smallest in Wayne County) arguably, a better case can be made to cluster these smaller parishes with a larger Parish thus strengthening both Parishes for the long term as opposed to creating a slightly larger entity that may only survive for the short term.

- The proposed SM/SKD cluster combines the second and third largest Parishes in the County and the largest combined sacramental load (weddings, baptisms and funerals). It's achievable with two priests but is that the best combination of use of scarce assets over a confined space of only 52 square miles?
- Heavy workload of funerals for Priest in southwestern area; Priest in the eastern area would manage 6 churches

Additional input from the Pastoral and Finance Councils of each parish:

Benefits

- Only works if Parochial Vicar is assigned to east cluster – This would unbalance the number of parishioners served per Priest
- Not many
- No change for SMK
- Good for SMK and SM
- Smaller parishes in largest area might need more Priests or Vicars

Challenges

- No single parish should be left unchanged in this process. To be equitable to all, all must share the burden.
- This puts a fence around all of the “machines of scale and stability dynamics” and leaves the eastern parishes to fend for themselves while the western churches clutch all of the potential benefits of large parish affiliations. It is imbalanced in its construct.
- As noted in previous commentary, the SM/SKD cluster is not the best combination of use of scarce assets over a confined space of only 52 square miles.
- There is no innovative thought attached to this, it is simply a collection of strength on strength. How does that help Wayne County in the long term, by constructing little islands of individuality in the western part of the county, where the larger parishes reside (as in 2+2 Scenario 1) while leaving the much smaller eastern parishes to fend for themselves?
- There are few natural affiliations in the proposed clusters. Huge population in Macedon, Palmyra, Newark. It would be difficult to move to another cluster/scenario if necessary in the future
- Church population not equitable
- Divided into 3 groups – 2 of the 3 groups each have a church with a large parish, the third group comes up short
- Will lose eastern part of the county
- Poorer, smaller churches bunched together and will fall off
- Would be resentful because one parish is not required to change
- Loss of masses but this is going to happen at all churches
- Managing 6 churches is too much
- Separates faith formation (SMK & SJW)
- Loss of masses due to large size cluster
- SMK & SM benefit more than the eastern larger group
- Too much travel for eastern Priests

## Scenario Evaluation Worksheet Combined Input

Model: 3+1 Scenario D: Cluster SMK and SKD; cluster CCBT and SJW; keep SM the same

### Benefits of this Scenario:

- St Michael would be able to continue to cover the Mass schedule and the particular ministry needs of the parish; viz, nursing and assisted living homes and the Newark Wayne Hospital.
- Travel distances in the western sphere would be acceptable.
- The rectory at Blessed Trinity could be sold.
- Mass schedule could be left intact at two out of the three clusters – western and Newark.
- Two active deacons are in the St Joseph the Worker/Blessed Trinity cluster.
- There is a good balance of Mass attendance numbers.
- In the future, this model could transition into 2+2, Scenario 4 without too much reshuffling.
- This scenario leaves St. Michael's alone. If we pursue a 3+1 scenario, would it make sense that St. Michael's in Newark be the one left alone as it is the second biggest in attendance, covers the hospital, multiple nursing homes, and among the largest number of funerals. We admit we may be biased here but it is a real observation. Conversely, it does not strengthen through sharing of staff resources St. Michael's.
- Two of the clusters can achieve some efficiencies with combined committees (liturgy, religious education, buildings and grounds, etc.)
- SM is unaffected.
- Travel distances are very reasonable.
- Mass schedules can remain intact at SM and SMK & SKD clusters.
- A Pastor is retained at SM, the 2<sup>nd</sup> largest Parish in terms of registered parishioners (2<sup>nd</sup> only by 23 registered Parishioners) and which has, arguably, the largest sacramental load of all the other Parishes. Maintaining an independent Pastor in Wayne County's largest city makes sense.
- Distances are achievable for a single Pastor from SJW to serve CCBT (14 miles rectory to rectory). \*\*
- The model scenario reasonably balances sacramental workload by cluster/site.
- This model is executable if the PV is assigned to SKD
- Relatively good model for staffing
- Most limited Mass impact
- St Michael's as is, beneficial to Communion ministry

### Challenges of this Scenario:

- Would be difficult to maintain Mass schedule in St Joseph the Worker/Blessed Trinity cluster.
- Asymmetrical management needs.
- How to determine who to get parochial vicar in two large clusters
- Splits migrant camps
- Splits faith formation sharing of SMK/SJW
- Difficulty of determining which cluster gets the parochial vicar (Sunday Masses vs. # funerals)
- Doesn't strengthen parish with no change
- Decision as to who are the 3 pastors and the parochial vicar. (*Note, this is not a decision made by the planning team*)
- The pastor in two of the clusters would be responsible for additional meetings in each parish (finance council and pastoral council)
- North-South orientations are not optimal. There are no observed significant natural affiliations between CCBT and SJW, SMK and SKD other than relative size of the parishioner base.



- The assigned Pastor will need to serve 5 active, year-round churches. This model/scenario negates relative economies of scale improvements for SJW and CCBT.
- SMK and SKD are the #1 and #3 largest Parishes in Wayne County. The scenario places under a single Pastor and Parochial Vicar, one of the largest segments of real property among Wayne County Parishes, as well as the greatest number of institutions including nursing homes, assisted living facilities, hospitals, living facilities, wellness centers and recovery centers that require regular pastoral assistance.

Additional input from the Pastoral and Finance Councils of each parish:

Benefits

- Two of the clusters can achieve some efficiencies with combined committees (liturgy, religious education, buildings and grounds, etc.)
- SM is unaffected.
- Travel distances are very reasonable.
- Mass schedules can remain intact at SM and SMK & SKD clusters.
- Would be relatively easy to transition to another scenario (in particular, Scenario 4) in the future if necessary. There is a retired priest in good health in the proposed SJW-CCBT cluster. There are two deacons in the SJW-CCBT cluster. The rectory could be sold in CCBT. This seems to be the scenario that we could move into the most easily. This could be a workable scenario even though geography and Mass schedule would be challenging. This scenario already enjoys support from the other parishes.
- Like the combining of services
- Workloads seem reasonable
- Travel distances are reasonable
- SM stays the same but many beneficial results for parishes and possibly could transition into 2+2, scenario 4
- Keeps largest attended parish unchanged
- No travel for SM Priest unless helping with other clusters
- Parish Priest should help out with close parishes
- Abandons the potential positive impact a large parish like St. Michael's can have if it is clustered with smaller, eastern county parishes as in scenario 2+2(4).
- Does not explore innovative thought for the LONG TERM future of Wayne County. It is not a necessarily responsible response to providing the diocese with a long term solution for Wayne County.
- There is no observable compelling reason to a) leave St. Michael's on an island by itself while b) ignoring what a large parish like St Michaels can do "positively" for the eastern end of the county.
- Change of Masses
- The pastor in two of the clusters would be responsible for additional meetings in each parish (finance council and pastoral council)
- As with all scenarios, geography would be challenging
- Layout not equitable
- Very unbalanced for Mass schedule
- East cluster is poorly served and Priest will have difficult time covering the area
- Unfair for St Michael's in Newark to be alone
- Large travel for CCBT – SJW Priests & Deacons & Pastoral Vicar