

Date: July 7, 2016

To: UUCB Board of Trustees

From: Freestone Task Force (Richard Hanway and David Lingenfelter)

Subject: Progress Report - Freestone Code-Compliance – Definitive Needs List

Action Requested

We request funding of up to \$2000 to cover the costs of developing a definitive list of items at the Freestone retreat needing repair in order to return the retreat to code-compliance.

Justification

The Board needs to know what the total costs will be of returning the retreat center to code-compliance. It will use this information as part of its deliberations to either return Freestone to use as a benefit to church members, or to sell the property.

Obtaining the total costs is a three-step process. The first step is obtaining an accurate listing of all the code violations at Freestone. The second step will be to determine what the repair of each item on the list will cost. The third will be to determine the sum of the individual items.

Background

In July of 2015, the Board charged the Freestone Task Force with a number of goals. Among these was a goal of investigating long-term options for the Freestone property.

In March 2016, the Board moved to cease all rentals at Freestone. This was the result of the Board having been made aware of potential liability issues related to probable health and safety code violations.

At that March 2016 Board meeting, it was suggested that the Task Force engage the services of a private inspector, in order to determine what it would cost to return the retreat center to code-compliance.

In early April, two members (Hanway, Lingenfelter) of the Task Force met with Mr. Paul Brand, a private inspector, at the Freestone property. Mr. Brand works for the Buyers Protection Group, a company recommended by Laura Richards of Coldwell Bankers of Sebastopol. Ms. Richards in turn provided earlier assistance to the Freestone Committee relating to the evaluation of the market value of two unused Freestone parcels.

However, at that time the Mr. Brand indicated that he was not certified by the state of California to compare the condition of the property to the specific health and safety codes in force when the building permit was issued.

Subsequent discussions with various church members led to the recognition that a licensed architect could provide the needed specifics. Further discussions revealed that the difference in cost for the proposed work between a licensed architect and a (certified) private inspector would be small. The architect Patrick Cousens, who had recently performed the design work on the church terrace was recommended.

A subsequent series of conversations with Mr. Cousens led to his providing a written proposal (see attached). This proposal was shared with church members Jane Lundin, Tom Tripp and Larry Nagel. All of them stated that in their opinion the proposal was reasonable and that approval of it should be granted.