

Scenario Evaluation Worksheet Combined Input (Summary Points)

Model: 2+2 **Scenario 1: Cluster SMK, SKD, and SM; cluster CCBT and SJW**

Round 1:

Benefits of this scenario:

- Good sharing of resources
- Every parish shares in the change
- Geographically equal in size
- Number of Funerals would seem to be equal
- Masses would not need to change for East side
- Would allow for one pastor and one parochial vicar in each cluster. Management could be consolidated from four entities to two.
- Good staffing model of pastors, parochial vicars, deacons, and lay pastoral associate.
- Possible long-term structural stability in clerical assignments.
- The parochial vicars could provide peer support for each other.
- Required travel distances would be approximately equal for both clusters.
- Distance is equal per cluster
- Churches can handle up to 120 parishioners at a Mass.
- Easier for pastors to merge certain parish functions
- Relatively easy travel for Priests
- Relatively easy to adjust staffing
- Benefit to CCBT and SJW in terms of Pastoral Management scope and priestly presence at all sites.

Challenges of this scenario:

- Westside would have more mass attendance
- SMK & SJW currently share faith formation person / would need to do something different if clustered in this scenario.
- SMK & CCBT have most of the migrant camps. How advantageous would it be for migrant ministry to have them in the same scenario?
- Masses would need to change
- More meeting (Finance, Pastoral, etc) responsibilities for the 2 pastors
- Deciding who are the two pastors and who are the two parochial vicars . *(Note, this is not a decision made by the planning team)*
- Heavy ministry need in Western side of county
- Up to ten Masses on Sunday in the western half and six Masses in the Eastern half.
- Determining how staffing are assigned.
- The scenario places under a single Pastor and Parochial Vicar, the largest segment 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.
- The scenario allows priest presence (one Pastor, one PV) at the two smallest clusters (CCBT and SJW) while leaving at least one of the three largest Parishes in the County (SMK, SKD or SM) possibly devoid of a priestly presence.
- This scenario area (SMK, SKD and SM) experienced 67 funerals in calendar 2017, 42 baptisms, confirmed 31 and had 11 weddings in addition to providing 9 Masses every weekend over 5 sites. In

addition to other sacramental responsibilities, this burden appears to be too large for a Pastor and a single Parochial Vicar.

- Unbalanced work load between 2 proposed areas
- Unbalanced attendance between 2 proposed areas
- Unbalanced number of households (4x) between 2 proposed areas
- Could work well if modified into a 3+1 model with 1 priest, 2 PVs, 1 PA, and 1 Deacon in the western parish and 1 Priest and 2 Deacons in the eastern parish.

Round 2:

Councils Additional Input

Benefits:

- Executable (. . . but suboptimal)
- Distances are reasonably executable
- Shows no innovative thought, simply puts a fence around the three largest parishes in Wayne County and leaves the smaller, eastern parishes to fend for themselves.
- Larger parishes are “engines” for sustainability, innovation, evangelization and even growth. Why are we walling off the larger parishes from CCBT and SJW? It makes no sense.
- This scenario is “limited” in terms of out-year thinking. It hordes the inherent strength of the larger parishes to the West in the County where it is not needed and leaves the East of the county untended, where help may be needed the most. This scenario will place the Diocese in a position of having to address Wayne County again within the next decade. (short-sighted).
- This divides each cluster into north / south
- Pretty even
- Seems like best balance of mass locations
- Not too many negatives
- Travel distance about the same
- Similar to model 3+1 – A
- Less change for SMK

Challenges:

- There is a population imbalance that is too significant to ignore. The western grouping has too many people in comparison to the eastern grouping. The Eastern section of the County is expected to decrease further in population in years to come and the population imbalance created would necessitate further changes in the not too distant future. This scenario would not be recommended.
- Very unbalanced with two largest parishes in the same cluster
- Mass schedule would reduce significantly
- 5 worship sites for 2 priests is 6 total masses – Only one worship site would get two masses – which one? – This applies to both east & west clusters
- Long drives
- 2 Large churches in 1 cluster
- Feel eastern half of the county will die if we go this way
- Strenuous objections from one parish
- Travel distance for each Priest / Deacon would be difficult for them during winter months
- Unbalanced workload, attendance, number of households
- Dividing up Priestly duties in east large travel area

Scenario Evaluation Worksheet Combined Input (Summary Points)

Model: 2+2 Scenario 3: Cluster SMK, SKD and CCBT; cluster SM and SJW

Benefits of this scenario:

- Most equal in attendance
- Keeps migrant camps together
- Every parish shares in the change
- Easier for pastors to merge certain parish functions
- SM and SJW cluster have a somewhat natural affiliation
- Management could be consolidated from four entities to two. The southeastern cluster – St Joseph the Worker and St Michael – would produce a cluster with a very strong natural affiliation.
- Relatively balanced households & sacraments
- Lake Communities / cottages / migrants are natural affiliations
- Combined attendances relatively even between the two areas
- Like scenario 1 it technically presents a benefit, this time to SM and SJW in terms of Pastoral Management scope and priestly presence at all sites.
- There are economies of scale synergies that can be accrued to CCBT and SJW by aligning with larger Parishes.
- Natural affinities exist between CCBT and SMK and between SM and SJW under this model/scenario.

Challenges of this scenario:

- Travel Distance for SMK, SKD, CCBT is large
- Breaks apart faith formation SMK & SJW
- May require both Parochial Vicars to both be assigned to same cluster
- More meeting (Finance, Pastoral, etc) responsibilities for the 2 pastors
- Masses would need to change and difficult to reconcile
- Deciding who are the two pastors and who are the two parochial vicars. (*Note, this is not a decision made by the planning team*)
- The travel required for the pastoral team of the St Maximillian Kolbe, St Katherine Drexel, Blessed Trinity cluster is geographically untenable. There would be very little travel requirement balance between the two clusters.
- The above-named cluster in this scenario has very little in the way of natural affiliation, especially between St Katherine Drexel and Blessed Trinity.
- This would probably require parochial vicars to live on their own.
- Travel for Priest in Northern area is considerable
- Could create a new scenario of 1 Priest and 2 PVs for northern area but would create a heavy workload on southern area Priest
- This scenario assigns a single Pastor (along with a Parochial Vicar) to manage two (SKD/SMK) of the three largest Parishes in Wayne County (in terms of registered parishioners), as well as having to deal with the two extremes in terms of distance between churches in Wayne County . . . Red Creek to Macedon being a distance of 43 miles one way. The span of control encompasses a total of over 1,000 square miles, with six separate year-round worship sites. The management scope is not realistic for a single Pastor.

- The scenario places under a single Pastor and Parochial Vicar, the second largest segment of real property among Wayne County Parishes, as well as the second greatest number of institutions including nursing homes, assisted living facilities, hospitals, living facilities, wellness centers and recovery centers that require regular pastoral assistance.
- The scenario allows priest presence (one Pastor, one PV) at SM and SJW while leaving at least one of the existing clusters (CCBT) devoid of any priestly presence.
- This model scenario proposal (SMK, SKD and CCBT) experienced 30 funerals in calendar 2017, 32 baptisms, confirmed 12 and had 7 weddings in addition to providing 9 Masses every weekend over 6 sites. There are two deacons assigned and no near term prospects for additional deacon assignments in the foreseeable future. In addition to other sacramental responsibilities, this burden may be too large for two priests and two deacons.

Scenario Evaluation Worksheet Combined Input (Summary Points)

Model: 2+2 Scenario 5: Cluster SKD and SM; cluster SMK, CCBT and SJW

Benefits of this scenario:

- Keeps migrant camps together
- Keeps faith formation together St. Max & St Joseph
- All parishes share in the change
- This scenario technically presents a benefit to SKD and SM in terms of Pastoral Management scope and priestly presence at all sites
- 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 from four entities to two. Fairly equal staffing of pastors, parochial vicars, deacons, and lay pastoral associate.
- Equity in terms of number of households in each cluster.
- Easier for pastors to merge certain parish functions
- Relatively balanced households & sacraments
- Combined attendances relatively even between the two areas

Challenges of this scenario:

- The scenario is geographically and sacramentally imbalanced. It assigns a single Pastor with a Parochial Vicar to manage an area of 860 square miles with seven year round worship sites. The distance from Ontario to Savannah, one way, is 38 miles going south and to Red Creek is 33 miles going east.
- The scenario places under a single Pastor and Parochial Vicar, arguably the largest segment of real property among Wayne County Parishes, as well as the second greatest number of institutions including nursing homes, assisted living facilities, hospitals, living facilities, wellness centers and recovery centers that require regular pastoral assistance.
- Churches would need to
- The scenario allows priest presence (one Pastor, one PV) at the first and second largest clusters (SKD and SM) while leaving at least one of the existing Parishes in the County (CCBT or SJW) devoid of any priestly presence.
- 50% of the entire Wayne County priest presence would be confined to an area of roughly 52 square miles while the other 50% must manage an area of roughly 860 square miles.
- The scenario creates a major disparity in Mass responsibility: three worship sites and up to six Masses per weekend for two priests versus seven worship sites and up to nine Masses over 860 square miles for the other two. Priest in northern area would have 9 churches to manage
- The travel required for the pastoral team of the St Maximillian Kolbe, St Joseph the Worker, Blessed Trinity cluster is geographically untenable. There would be almost no travel requirement balance between the two clusters. Travel for Priest in northern area is (54 miles) considerable (13 miles for southern area Priest)
- The above-named cluster in this scenario has very little in the way of natural affiliation.
- More meeting (Finance, Pastoral, etc) responsibilities for the 2 pastors
- Masses would need to change and some may not have Sunday Mass
- Deciding who are the two pastors and who are the two parochial vicars. (*Note, this is not a decision made by the planning team*)

Scenario Evaluation Worksheet Combined Input (Summary Points)

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

Benefits of this scenario:

- No change for one parish – Blessed Trinity
- Keeping a small parish (Blessed Trinity) might be good for a priest who, because of age, other duties, or other reason might need such an assignment.
- The clusters have good natural affiliations.
- Distances are reasonable.
- Natural geographical affiliations.
- Travel time is reasonable with the two clusters.
- Due to small number of parishioners, CCBT could be staffed by a senior status priest.
- Two of the clusters can achieve some efficiencies with combined committees (liturgy, religious education, buildings and grounds, etc.)
- This scenario presents a benefit to CCBT in terms of Pastoral care in that we retain a Pastor. In the larger scope of things, however, where priests are expected to be a scarce commodity in Wayne County, retention of a Pastor by the smallest community in Wayne County at the expense of large, more challenging and diverse Parishes is too injurious to consider for execution and is therefore considered by CCBT to be unacceptable.

Challenges of this Scenario:

- There are staff model challenges in the western cluster – St Maximilian Kolbe and St Katharine Drexel.
- CCBT is left alone – no help to them
- Difficulty of determining which cluster gets the parochial vicar (Sunday Masses vs. # funerals)
- Doesn't strengthen parish with no change
- Masses would need to 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)
- SKD and SMK represent the largest number of households.
- 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.
- SM/SJW, #1 and #4 largest Parishes would be left with only a single Pastor. SJW could be left without a priest presence.
- Unbalanced sacraments
- Heavy workload for 2 of 3 Priests
- To keep northeastern area, the south and west areas suffer loss of Masses and ministry
- South and west areas has 6x the attendance of northeast area

Scenario Evaluation Worksheet Combined Input (Summary Points)

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

Benefits of this scenario:

- Two of the clusters can achieve some efficiencies with combined committees (liturgy, religious education, buildings and grounds, etc.)
- SJW is unaffected.
- Keep migrant camps together
- Takes advantage of multiple natural affiliations east and west. It aligns clusters along major arteries, Route 104 and Route 31; it bounds the northern communities by Lake Ontario and southern communities by Seneca and Ontario Counties
- 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.
- Culturally, the northern communities share significant ministerial potential with the migrant populations since both existing Parishes reside in the midst of the largest number of orchards in Wayne County. Likewise, both existing communities are experienced providing pastoral care to burgeoning summer populations particularly from June through mid-September. In addition, schools, elementary through High School are physically set along Route 104 from Red Creek through North Rose, Sodus and Ontario (Wayne Central).
- This model/scenario also provides relative economies of scale improvements. Clustering the smaller with a larger (CCBT with SMK) strengthens both Parishes for the long term. Combining CCBT with SMK creates a Parish with 1248 parishioners . . . a size much better positioned for long term sustainment.

Challenges of this Scenario:

- Mass coverage would be very difficult in two of the three clusters.
- Distances in the northern cluster are excessive.
- Travel distances within SMK and CCBT cluster are unmanageable.
- 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)
- Potential loss of churches/Sunday Masses
- Worst scenario for distance of this model
- Difficulty of determining which cluster gets the parochial vicar (Sunday Masses vs. # funerals)
- Doesn't strengthen parish with no change
- Separates faith formation sharing of SMK/SJW
- ***To be a fully plausible scenario***, given the distances involved, the Parochial Vicar would need to be assigned to the SMK/CCBT cluster. That would place the proposed SM/SKD cluster at substantial risk and that cannot be recommended.

- Under this scenario, half of all parishioners in Wayne County would fall under a single Pastor (SM/SKD); this proposed cluster already manages the highest sacramental workload and retains approximately 53% of the County institutional burden. This workload is likely too large for a single Pastor.
- Unbalanced attendance
- Considerable travel for northern area Priest
- Priest in northern area would have to manage 6 churches

Scenario Evaluation Worksheet Combined Input (Summary Points)

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

Benefits of this scenario:

- A retiring priest could be easily switched out.
- One with no change
- A Pastor is retained at a single site that is the 3rd largest Parish in terms of registered parishioners and has the third largest sacramental load of all the other Parishes.
- Distances are achievable for a single Pastor from SJW to serve CCBT (14 miles rectory to rectory), however. **
- Two of the clusters can achieve some efficiencies with combined committees (liturgy, religious education, buildings and grounds, etc.)
- SKD is unaffected.

Challenges of this Scenario:

- Macedon has family ministry needs – hard to be met with one pastor and no support.
- Staffing model for Pal-Mac and eastern sphere not favorable.
- Doesn't strengthen parish with no change
- Difficulty of determining which cluster gets the parochial vicar (Sunday Masses vs. # funerals)
- Splits migrant camps
- Splits faith formation sharing of SMK/SJW
- Pastor within a small ~ 20 square mile enclave, managing the third largest Parish with the 2nd largest sacramental burden (baptisms, weddings and funerals), at the expense of combining the #1 and #2 largest Parishes with a combined sacramental burden well in excess of SKD, within a ~ 400 square mile cluster boundary.
- In light of the above, this scenario sub-optimizes the use of scarce Pastors.
- North-South orientations are not optimal. There are no significant natural affiliations between CCBT and SJW, other than relative size of the parishioner base.
- Pastor will need to serve 5 active, year-round churches
- This model/scenario negates relative economies of scale improvements.
- SM and SMK are the #1 and #2 largest Parishes in Wayne County in terms of registered parishioners. The proposed cluster will manage 77% of the combined County sacramental workload in 2017 (nearly three times as much as the SKD cluster). 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 combined institutions including nursing homes, assisted living facilities, hospitals, living facilities, wellness centers and recovery centers that require regular pastoral assistance.
- Uneven management of churches (6 vs 2)
- 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)

Scenario Evaluation Worksheet Combined Input (Summary Points)

Model: 4 + 0 Scenario i: Cluster SMK and SKD; keep others the same

Model: 4 + 0 Scenario ii: Cluster CCBT and SJW; keep others the same

Model: 4 + 0 Scenario iii: Cluster SKD and SM; keep others the same

Model: 4 + 0 Scenario iv: Cluster SM and SJW; keep others the same

Model: 4 + 0 Scenario v: Cluster SMK and CCBT; keep others the same

The planning team rejected all 5 scenarios that used 4 pastors, as none of the models provide long term stability in light of the priest availability. It is unlikely that would be sustainable and the team determined it was undesirable to have such a short term plan. The one cluster in any of the configurations would not have sufficient support, and this would do nothing to strengthen 3 of the 5 parishes.