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I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERALL FINDINGS

Philadelphia’s historic sacred places (HSPs) are a great inheritance – they are centerpieces of the “city of neighborhoods.” These churches, synagogues, temples, and other sacred places are valuable repositories of culture, particularly for immigrants and African Americans. HSPs have been a center of city life for centuries; they comprise a priceless and irreplaceable architectural and social legacy.

Buffeted by numerous changes in urban life in the last half-century – migration, mobility, secularization, privatization – Philadelphia’s HSPs face serious challenges. As individual institutions, and as a collection of civic landmarks, Philadelphia’s HSPs are under assault. Myriad factors – “internal” to the congregations and faith traditions inhabiting these structures, as well as the “external” factors of dynamic urban environments – shape the fate of HSPs. Dwindling congregation memberships and changing habits of worship; deferred maintenance of legacy buildings; weaknesses in historic preservation policies; an increasingly segregated city of winning and losing neighborhoods; an atmosphere of privatization (affecting urban space as well as individual experiences, relating to broad political trends, the ascendance of digital culture, and more); and challenges faced by civic institutions of all kinds – these are the threats endangering HSPs individually and collectively. Organized religion simply does not consistently play the same prominent role in personal and social life that it once did – thus, the places historically created for religious worship face an uncertain future.

Characterizing and understanding this uncertainty is the core goal of this study. How do we understand and grapple with the threats to such an important, valued, and visible part of Philadelphia’s social fabric? This study pursues this question through multiple lines of inquiry:

- Documenting and explaining the big picture (How many HSPs are there? Where are they? How are they used? What condition are they in?);
- Exploring the complex forces that continue to support HSPs as well as threaten them; and
- Creating a platform for future, creative work to imagine solutions for envisioning the future of Philadelphia’s HSPs.

The central focus of this study is the buildings themselves, an emphasis that differentiates this project from other studies, scholars, and institutions whose principal foci are the congregations and modes of religious worship. (This study uses “place” as a proxy for the religious buildings and other physical assets that house a congregation.) Physical place and social function are not fully separable, of course, but our approach foregrounds certain realities and processes centrally related to buildings (adaptive reuse, for instance, should demonstrate as much evidence of resilience as the continuity of a particular congregation’s worship in one location). The “client” for this study, so to speak, is therefore the collection of HSPs as an important element of the city’s heritage. (HSPs can be regarded as a kind of civic infrastructure, akin to the accumulated systems of parks, libraries, recreation centers, and other civic
assets currently being studied and invested in by the City of Philadelphia’s massive Rebuilding Civic Infrastructure initiative.

This study was purposefully not limited to the particular view of congregations in pursuit of worship, regarding religious use as an end in itself; the intention here is to enable a fuller view of the social, public, and gregarious values of HSPs through time and for the city as a whole. There are pros and cons of such a place-centered approach, to be sure, and sorting out the intertwined lives of buildings and inhabitants was a constant challenge in the project. The fate of congregations and the fate of HSP buildings are obviously linked in myriad ways, yet the study reveals that congregational lives do not necessarily determine the fate of HSPs. These buildings and complexes can be re-used and re-inhabited.

This study’s many parts are framed by trying to understand the resilience and vulnerability of HSPs. (These important terms are defined at length below.) The Pew Philadelphia Research Initiative (PRI) commissioned a study that is principally documentary; it establishes and reflects upon the current situation of Philadelphia’s HSPs without prefiguring particular advocacy, policy, investment, or other positions. Over 18 months, the research team collected data through field research, archival and desk research, conversations, and interviews. Additionally, the project team brings a broad spectrum and long history of work with religious institutions and historic preservation. To shed light on Philadelphia’s HSPs, we constructed a comprehensive survey of the city, mapped and analyzed the survey results, conducted 22 in-depth conversations with leaders of congregations inhabiting HSPs, and assembled a team of experts in historic preservation and the study of religious organizations to consult on what all the data mean.

A great amount of detail from the study is conveyed in the following “chapters” of the report, including methods and findings. The report, though extensive, is not intended to be comprehensive. The summaries and analyses presented here are meant to be suggestive, indicating the most important findings of our work while purposefully paving the way for more and different analyses using the same data. For example, the dozens of maps included in Section VI are just the first tranche of what could be many more interrogations of the rich, spatial data this project has assembled.

TEAM

The Philadelphia Historic Sacred Places project was led by PennPraxis, in collaboration with Partners for Sacred Places. Team members for PennPraxis included: Randy Mason, Ashley Hahn, Molly Lester, Kalen Flynn, Stephanie Boddie, Aaron Wunsch, Mark Stern, Amy Hillier, Samantha Kuntz, Shrobona Karkun, Shannon Garrison, Ben Buckley, Larissa Klevan, and Lee Riccetti; team members for Partners for Sacred Places included: Bob Jaeger, Rachel Hildebrandt, Tuomi Forrest, Dan Hotchkiss, and Katie Day.
THE NEED FOR THIS STUDY

Headlines like “Philadelphia’s historic churches: Do they have a prayer for survival?” from a 2011 Philadelphia Inquirer column reflect a familiar refrain echoed in article after article on the fate of Philly’s religious life and religious landmarks: Philadelphia’s older, purpose-built, religious sites face complex pressures and shifting community, physical, and financial realities. Narratives of loss and vulnerability are too-common themes in news coverage of Philadelphia’s HSPs. Waves of Catholic Church closures and consolidations have been high-profile, but there are also variations on the theme: building safety concerns, development pressure in neighborhoods with strong real estate markets, and the shifting demographics of the faithful have also led to vacancy, loss, and in some cases, reuse. Sometimes there are also counter-narratives of resilience, rebirth, and resurgent congregations at HSPs.

But the frequent news coverage of HSPs, which so often focuses on threats, can only dig so deep. There is an acute need to study these purpose-built religious places in detail – in terms of their management, use, and physical complexity as historic places. Most attention focused on HSPs dwells on financial challenges for dwindling congregations or historic preservation issues (policy weaknesses, reuse compromises, funding gaps). It is common to overlook or deprioritize the physical assets when caring about the spiritual lives of congregations. (Ironically, Pew’s 2014 Religious Landscape Study used “landscape” only metaphorically – it did not address the influence or significance of physical places, buildings, and campuses as it sought to portray the shifting role of religion in American society.) And it is correspondingly uncommon to fully appreciate these physical places as investments of many kinds of value: religious and sacred, of course; economic, real-estate, and financial; social and civic. The present study seeks to correct this imbalance/blind spot locally.

While this study fills important gaps in Philadelphia’s knowledge about HSPs, it has benefited from a number of preceding, complementary works of scholarship and advocacy: Ram Cnaan and Stephanie Boddie’s census and characterization of all Philadelphia places of worship in the 1990s drew a clear backdrop of congregations struggling to fulfill their religious and social mandates in a changeful urban landscape; the 1995 book Invisible Philadelphia (eds. Toll and Gilliam) documented the history and contributions of community organizations to the city’s development; Katie Day’s narrative analysis of the lives of a subset of these HSPs along Germantown Avenue lends a deeper social and historical portrait of congregational lives framed by particular social geographies and histories in one of Philadelphia’s most historic and fraught neighborhoods; Partners for Sacred Places’ advocacy research on notions of social and economic values of HSPs has advanced the conversation about civic dimensions of sacred place preservation in Philadelphia and other cities. Meanwhile, on a national scale, scholars such as Nancy Ammerman and ongoing polling research by the Pew Research Center think-tank speak to the enduring, though threatened, role of religion and congregational life in American life. While Americans are getting less religious, and there may be
fewer observant religionists, many congregations and faith traditions are being sustained. (Note: For publication details, please refer to the References included in Section II: Research Design, and Appendix C: Literature Review and References.)

Is it an open question whether the documented “falloff in traditional religious beliefs and practices” (Pew 2015) correlates to greater vulnerability of the traditional HSPs that stud the landscape of Philadelphia and other large, historic cities? Not entirely; even if religious practices and beliefs are on the wane, the historic places created by religious organizations are remarkably durable. To preserve this legacy, increasing religiosity or religious worship is not the only appeal – answers can also be sought in finding new uses, sharing spaces, and cultivating an appreciation of the religious and civic functions of HSPs.

Even though this study centers on the buildings/campuses/places, the response to stress cannot simply be adaptation to new uses. The social values of these urban places – for worship, gathering, social service – as well as their heritage values (as works of excellent purpose-built architecture brought to life by continued use, as visual anchors of neighborhoods, and as symbols of spiritual devotion and community building) are of paramount importance.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND CORE CONCEPTS

Defining Key Terms

- **Historic sacred places** are defined in this study as properties (single buildings or complexes) within the City of Philadelphia purposely built for religious worship before 1965. The HSPs are the principal focus of the present study – not the congregations presently inhabiting the sites. They include churches, synagogues, meeting houses, and temples created for worship, religious education, and outreach by a wide range of religious denominations – some original to the building, while others are newer inhabitants of older sites. Extant HSPs reused for non-religious purposes remain part of our study.

- **Resilience**, in the context of this study, is the capacity of sacred places and the congregations inhabiting them to adapt to challenges. Resilient HSPs survive and thrive by responding and adapting to change (whether the change is driven by factors internal or external to the HSP) in myriad ways. Resilience relates to decisions about use and management of built space as well as material changes or maintenance of structures. And it takes many forms: one congregation inhabiting a place for very long time; a succession of congregations

---

1 As elaborated in the Section II: Research Design.
using a place through time, or even simultaneously; congregations sharing space with other non-religious organizations; and even the reuse of an HSP for non-religious purposes is a mode of resilience.

- **Vulnerability** stems from the inability of an HSP or congregation to adapt in the face of change. It is manifest in signs of deterioration, inactivity, isolation, congregational failure, and building demolition. Many factors contribute to vulnerability by undermining sacred places’ ability to continue operating as sites of religious worship and/or provide civic value. Vulnerability may stem from some combination of waning congregational membership, ineffective leadership, fragile finances, deteriorated buildings, and being misaligned with shifting neighborhood contexts.

- **Civic value** refers to the non-religious uses and functions of HSPs – the value they provide to the community at large. The civic value of religious congregations and the sacred places they inhabit is widely acknowledged, and documented in a growing line of academic research and related advocacy work on behalf of congregations. [See Literature review—Appendix C] The civic value of an HSP can be thought of as a set of qualities or a collection of services provided. They consist of faith-motivated or faith-based outreach, activities, functions, and meanings of sacred places: social-service functions hosted (food pantries, classes, community meetings); cultural values represented by architectural and art works; economic values generated by the sacred places (from operational and capital spending, spending by visitors, shared use of space, business incubation, etc.); and the senses of stability, orientation, well-being, memory, etc. stemming from their presence in the urban fabric. (We acknowledge that this term is used elsewhere in the literature on religious and congregational advocacy to describe a quantity of economic impact calculated for said non-religious uses/functions of religious places. We do not intend civic value as a measurable economic value [direct or indirect].)

**Theories of Vulnerability and Resilience**

The study started with vulnerability, but early on in the project, the endurance and relevance of Philadelphia’s HSPs alerted us to the importance of resilience.

The notion of “vulnerability” arose from empirical evidence of HSPs emptying, failing, and facing the specter of demolition – phenomena very evident in the media and in professional circles [see clippings -- Appendix C]. As buildings and social institutions, HSPs are susceptible to changes in the urban fabric and urban society around them; conversely, they can also be bulwarks that help communities weather broader changes. Our research design evolved from a focus on vulnerability to a broader, more complex consideration of resilience as well as vulnerability as two sides of a spectrum of HSPs’ responses to change.
There are many ways of modeling urban-architectural and social change and how institutions and individuals respond to it. The first challenge of this study is constructing a model of change broad enough to encompass the variety of situations, factors and capacities of the 839 HSPs that are the subject of this study. One of the most influential models currently employed is resilience. Based on systemic understanding of phenomena, resilience models envisioning likely (if not fully predictable) types and vectors of change, and use systemic insights to analyze and prepare for responses as change happens. Resilience is applied to many complex, “wicked” problems these days – social responses to climate change and sea-level rise; firm behavior in markets; cultural responses to development; even psychology and self-help. The resilience debate puts people and organizations in a mindset of anticipating change, understanding one’s part in the greater system, and valorizing responsiveness and adaptability. This orientation to change, we think, is clearly applicable to the situation of urban HSPs such as those of Philadelphia.

Resilience has become an influential concept for holistic management of change in a number of disciplines and professions (business, non-profit management, environmental conservation, urban planning). Judith Rodin, once president of the University of Pennsylvania and now President of the Rockefeller Foundation, is a leading advocate for resilience. Her model is one that broadly captures the thinking derived from several fields and stands out as the most current and widely applicable framework or theory of resilience – applicable to institutions, agencies, corporations, settlements or any other complex entity dealing with complex changes. The five points of Rodin’s model are:

- being aware of one’s situation and vulnerabilities;
- being diverse, in order to mount a range of responses;
- being integrated, in order to ensure collaborative solutions;
- being self-regulating, in order to prevent disruptions from cascading through the system; and
- being adaptive, in order to improvise in the face of challenges.2

Applying this to HSPs, resilience and vulnerability are functions of the building’s condition, the urban/social context of the site, the fit between building and congregation, and the congregation’s ability to sustain their function as both a religious organization and civic institution. A variety of factors internal and external to the congregation condition the see-saw between vulnerability and resilience. This framework is not intended to enable yes/no judgment of whether a particular sacred place is vulnerable or resilient (in other words, it is not an either/or question). Rather, each sacred place should be understood as having, in different measure, qualities contributing to vulnerability and qualities contributing to resilience. Following, we list a number of competing theories/hypotheses that will inform our analyses and have helped prompt our data collection strategies.

---

Vulnerability and resilience are distinct tendencies of HSPs in relation to change. It is tempting to describe them as “opposite” tendencies; more accurately, they represent different sides of a spectrum of responses to change affecting the relationship between congregations and their spaces. Both vulnerability and resilience are affected by internal factors as well as external factors. They are both shaped by the creativity and resourcefulness of leadership, the financial health of the congregation, the character of the HSP’s estate (buildings, grounds), and their immediate urban and social contexts. Each of these factors calls forth the methodological question of what data can be collected, and how can that data be analyzed, to explore the role of the factor in pushing HSPs toward resilience or vulnerability. Referring to Rodin’s model, indicators could be devised to serve as proxies for each of the qualities contributing to resilience, suggesting some utility for empirical, quantitative research. More central to the point of the resilience theory, however, is the extent to which decision-makers/organizations respond in integrative ways, demonstrate awareness of change, and ultimately adapt – knowledge about these qualities are much better aligned with qualitative methods, such as interview-conversations we conducted with a small sample of HSPs.

Conceptually, as tendencies of organizations and sites, vulnerability and resilience are dynamic and relational – they are not static, fixed qualities. This was reinforced repeatedly in our conversations with congregational leaders. In simplest terms, resilient means adaptable and vulnerable means not adaptable. But vulnerability and resilience are not simply found in inverse proportion to one another (in other words, more resilience doesn’t necessarily mean less vulnerability, but it may result in more effective means of managing or surviving vulnerability). Vulnerability and resilience have to do with a congregation’s use, management and relation to the HSP they inhabit. Correspondingly, as a matter of research, we cannot “see” vulnerability and resilience and “find” them (or establish their absence), but we collected data that indicate the two tendencies.

QUESTIONS AND FINDINGS FROM THE STUDY

We identified, researched, mapped, and documented 839 remaining HSPs (purpose-built for religious workshop and constructed up to 1965), surveying them in every corner of the City of Philadelphia. This amounts to nearly 100 HSPs more than a preceding survey done in 2011 with only desktop data. Here is the broad view by the numbers:

- 839: Number of HSPs (as of February 2016)
- 379: Number of HSPs (45%) known to be “complexes,” not single buildings
- 378: Number of HSPs (45%) known to house successor congregations (“hermit crabs”)
- 698: Number of HSPs (83%) found to be in religious use
- 23: Number of HSPs destroyed since 2011
- 82: Number of HSPs (10%) adapted for non-religious use

This last fact – nearly 10% of extant HSPs (82) have been adaptively reused – signals a realization of the multiple values of these places, and, likely, external factors that favored reuse. Of the reused properties, as expected, the
Central planning district has the highest concentration of any planning district (19 of them), but the remaining 63 are distributed fairly evenly around the city. (E.g. University Southwest planning district has the second-highest concentration, with just eight.)

Many of the HSPs are remarkable works of art and architecture, works of great architects and unknown builders, cared for by congregations of every stripe. These places are evidence of immense investment by previous generations in the sacred and social life of the city. While acute cases make the newspapers, the vast majority are in serviceable condition. Our survey of material condition found that for the vast majority of HSPs, 781 sites (93% of the inventory) the primary exterior material is in fair or good condition. HSPs are not, by and large, public hazards crying out for demolition. Deferred maintenance, however, is an evident problem as our interviews and surveys confirm. Left unattended, today’s maintenance issue may become an urgent concern in the near future.

We recorded 23 HSPs that have been destroyed since 2011. Though confirming and expanding this list was not a specific focus of our research – we focused on what HSPs remain – it is an important indicator of change and should be the focus of future monitoring and research. We documented an additional 21 that were demolished at earlier dates, but this search was not an explicit focus of our research and this is certainly under-reporting.

As a total population, the geographical distribution of HSPs maps the historical evolution of the city and its neighborhoods, mirrors the distribution of dense housing development, and cuts across many of the social patterns of today’s Philadelphia: HSPs are in neighborhoods rich and poor, older and newer, in all directions. The three planning districts with the largest concentration of HSPs are Central (111), Lower North (85), and North (79); The planning districts with the fewest HSPs were Lower South (2), Lower Southwest and Lower Far Northeast (15 each), and Upper Far Northeast (17).

When parsed for religious polity, Philadelphia’s HSPs are overwhelmingly occupied by Christian congregations, predominantly Associational denominations (340, or 40%), followed by those that are Semi-Hierarchical (233, or 28%), and Hierarchical (125, or 15%). There are 31 non-Christian congregations (4%) included in this inventory. There were 18 (2%) for which there is no religious affiliation known, and another 91 (11%) that are not currently in religious use (including properties that have been adaptively reused, as well as additional vacant properties).

Of the 839 HSPs inventoried, 79% (663) have no form of historic designation. Just 70 (8%) are listed in the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, 38 (4%) are listed in the National Register of Historic Places, and 68 (8%) are listed in both. This has implications for a layer of protection against demolition, incentives for adaptive reuse, and shapes the kinds of futures (from demolition to reuse) ahead for an HSP.

See Section III-C for an explanation of the Building Conditions Index, and Appendix F for the field survey data dictionary.
Based on our interviews, relationships between congregation and HSP vary widely. Among the 22 congregations interviewed leadership, finances, and congregational capacity have an enormous influence on the trajectory of HSPs. Theology was somewhat less determinative in the state of those interviewed. Some clergy viewed their HSP as an intimate reflection of and important element in the congregation’s historical narrative, while others expressed variations on the theme that a church is not the building.

Studying historic sacred places (buildings and complexes), as opposed to congregations, enables a more expansive view of HSPs’ civic values – especially their potential for adaptive reuse as well as ongoing religious use and shared use. This perspective does not privilege worship, though that continued use can be a valuable source of strength.

In architectural terms, the HSPs exhibit great variety and richness. As a group they are in mostly good condition, though deferred maintenance is ubiquitous. When maintenance stops, results can be dire. Still, some exterior building materials are more durable, able to stand more neglect, than others.

In preservation terms, the “integrity” of an architectural resource means the degree to which a building retains its original legibility of materials and form. Our study’s use of this term is not intended to privilege this finding; rather, our use of the term is intended to interpret which buildings are relatively unaltered. Unsympathetic alterations from a preservation perspective, such as Plexiglas over stained glass windows or vinyl siding over a tower, may be unattractive but actually serve to protect the historic resource. These kinds of adaptations are common.

Certain negative property conditions observed should be seen as more worrisome than others. Trees growing from masonry or detached drainage systems point to problems that if not urgent now could become so soon.

From surveys of sites where interviews were conducted, there is ample room for deeper investigation to determine the extent to which observed conditions are more cosmetic or structural.

Most of the congregations interviewed are shrinking, which has important implications for how the ways these HSPs are occupied. Many are shifting toward smaller spaces within a complex, often out of practical concerns like heating, and this is prompting some to evaluate their physical plant, including viability of staying put. This trend is also resulting in space adaptations, like flexible seating or opening up areas of building(s) to other groups or rental tenants. Many represent creative responses to change. But a congregation’s lifespan matters here too. Among the 22 interviewed in depth for this study a few were actively confronting the reality of closure or considering selling property (indeed, Church of the Crucifixion is effectively shuttered; Garden of Prayer COGIC has sold).

It is not possible to point at a particular population of HSPs as most threatened or most secure. There is not a “vulnerable list” and a “resilient list.” Resilience and vulnerability are matters of degree on a spectrum of issues – not either/or propositions based on some empirical quality. This study suggests those concerned with the lives of HSPs must regard their relative resilience and vulnerability, current state and possible futures, through a number of
different lenses simultaneously. The story of HSPs cannot be reduced to the inherently fragile nature of historic religious buildings — many are remarkably strong. Similarly, this is not a story of dwindling congregations or changing demographics and mobility among Philadelphians at large and the faithful in particular. Nor too is it simply a matter of congregational or polity finances. All of these factors combine to shape the fate of HSPs. (It follows, then, that any efforts to support these places must be holistic, but that is beyond the purpose and scope of this study.)

It is one of the major findings of the study that vulnerability and resilience result from the confluence of distinct but intersecting factors emanating from within congregations, from external social dynamics, and from the material and geographic realities of inhabiting historic buildings in a legacy city. The factors that emerged most clearly related to the empirical realities of historic buildings; to the congregations inhabiting, using, and caring for them; and to the geographical contexts of the HSPs as part of the Philadelphia landscape. They included: Adaptability, building stewardship, civic value, financial stability, leadership, lifecycle, membership, and neighborhood context. Resiliency and Vulnerability remained the overarching pair of themes by which we framed all the insights from the study.

In the research design, we postulated that a number of factors shape vulnerability and resilience in HSPs. These became our guides in choosing appropriate research methods. In the following section, we restate our earlier hypotheses and indicate what the data from our interviews, surveys, and mapping suggest.

Theories of resilience/vulnerability focused on internal factors:

- Leadership capacity and effectiveness influences vulnerability and resilience directly, and this is expressed differently in large vs small congregations, in different faith traditions/congregation types/polity frameworks: Yes, this was emphasized over and over again in the interviews.
- Independent congregations become vulnerable, because they face local, internal challenges and lack a denominational support system or safety net. And parishes that belong to Roman Catholic and other hierarchical systems are vulnerable to system-wide decisions made at the judicatory level: Impressionistically, this holds true. Factors external to individual HSPs — judicatory policy, real-estate pressures — are most influential. According to the building condition index scores, Associational congregations have markedly worse scores than either the non-Christian HSPs or those that are part of Hierarchical structures. Independence, therefore, can be construed as leading to greater possibility of building-based vulnerabilities.
- The smallest congregations are the most vulnerable, because they are more likely to have fewer financial and leadership resources: This is not necessarily the case. There was no clear pattern of good or poor leadership in large and small congregations, or across polity categories. Issues of financial resources are complicated by the wealth of members, the depth of external resources possible to call upon during times of need, and the ability to generate income from space or enterprise.
Sacred places inhabiting buildings/complexes in poor physical condition are more vulnerable. Corollary to this: congregations inhabiting larger, more extensive building complexes are more vulnerable, or sacred places inhabiting older building complexes are more vulnerable. This is not necessarily the case; physical condition does not seem to be the most important influence on vulnerability. The vast majority of buildings inventoried are in good or fair condition. Based on interviews, size in relation to congregation size and needs can create more expansive and expensive problems.

Creating a robust index of vulnerability proved to be beyond reach— we would have had to delve further inside the workings of the 839 HSPs to generate consistent data. Instead, we created an index of building conditions to serve as a proxy for physical vulnerability. Vulnerability stemming from leadership, financial condition, judicatory measures, etc. would require a much finer grain of research on a small set of HSPs; this was beyond the scope of our study.

Theories of resilience/vulnerability focused on external factors:

- Regarding three linked hypotheses: (a) Areas with higher, stable property values have fewer vulnerable sacred places; (b) areas with significant, rapid changes in property values have more vulnerable sacred places, (c) areas that have seen a recent rapid increase in property values (i.e., gentrification) have a higher percentage of vulnerable sacred places, and (d) greater mobility (% people moving in/out of a neighborhood) is correlated with higher vulnerability: Our study mapped building condition against neighborhoods considered according to TRF’s 2015 Market Value Analysis (MVA, a composite measure of socio-economic status and neighborhood change) — this is the closest we came to scoring vulnerability or resilience. Neighborhoods categorized through the MVA as Regional Choice or Steady were dominated by HSPs with the most positive building conditions index scores. Conversely, areas considered Distressed or Stressed had properties with worse building condition scores. Of the 39 vacant HSPs, 13 are in Regional Choice or Steady neighborhoods and 18 are in areas seen as Distressed or Stressed. (See Maps 18-20 in Section VI-B.) Our study did not seek to measure or quantify the extent to which gentrification accelerates the vulnerability factors, challenges leadership. Our interviews, however, provided ample examples of congregations struggling to see themselves in their neighborhoods, complicating everything from parking for services to drawing new membership or playing an active role as a neighborhood institution.

- Congregations with more relationships to external partners and collaborators contribute to more resilient sacred places: From interviews, it seems more insular HSPs are more vulnerable. The extent to which congregations and HSPs were outward-facing creates new networks, boosts civic value and rootedness. And sacred places listed on the local or National registers of historic places, or located in historic districts, are less vulnerable: This is true for HSPs as a matter of local policy (notwithstanding preservation hardship appeals), and in terms of potential financial incentives for reuse. But legislated resilience for the building
could result in greater vulnerability for the congregation by limiting its decisions about ways to change.

Another original hypothesis was that vulnerability would stem equally from internal (more controllable) and external (less controllable) factors. The weight of evidence from the study suggests that internal factors are more important – especially if the HSP is the focus of the question, not the congregation. For many HSPs, financial stability and the capacity of congregational leadership are the leading indicators of vulnerability. The influences on this are many and not formulaic, but the literature suggests (and our interviews support) that the most common vulnerabilities are those resulting from leadership failings. And these, in turn, underlie the second greatest vulnerability – financial instability. Our interviews and other research demonstrates how intertwined these factors are in practice – that is, in the decision-making, stewardship, sociability and worship of HSPs around the city.

We know that theology matters in shaping attitudes toward buildings. In general, the nature of this study and the methodologies chosen purposefully do not attempt to see HSP dynamism through the lens of spirituality or theology. While those have some influence, the broad hypothesis behind this research holds that what shapes the fate of HSPs most profoundly is a combination of practical, non-religious factors having to do with the materiality of buildings, the effectiveness of leadership, and the changing urban and social contexts of the HSPs.

Finally, there are a number of urban factors for consider. What role do the HSPs play at the scale of the city or district? How do HSPs relate, as civic assets, to other issues and urban dynamics? Mapping at the scale of the City enables us to see and analyze some of these urban patterns and relationships, and it signals the possibility of more precise mapping and deeper, more layered spatial analysis in the future.

Philadelphia is in many ways a divided city – to see this in striking terms look at geographic patterns of class and race. Yet our mapping indicates a wide and fairly even distribution of HSPs across the city landscape and its sundry divisions; HSPs are a strong presence in all historic centers of Philadelphia’s urban development over time. The condition of HSPs, mapped against the 2015 MVA map offers a portrait of this layered landscape at this time. The Northeast is the only inhabited part of the city seemingly underserved by HSPs – understandable, given that it was developed in an era of greater automobile mobility and dwindling participation in organized religious worship. HSPs constitute a truly civic infrastructure – a set of assets that is civic or urban in scale. Because they are not in consolidated ownership/control (and before this study, never even listed or mapped comprehensively), we don’t envision or regard them as a unified class of civic assets.

Further, contextual mapping demonstrates that large clusters of HSPs are located in areas of the city of greatest need (for more education, higher economic and social wellbeing, reduction of crime). (See MAPS 23-27)
NEXT STEPS

We present this summary of Philadelphia’s Historic Sacred Places, to continue a conversation about ensuring their role in Philadelphia’s social, civic, and architectural future. The HSPs embody great value – they should be part of the conversation about the future of the city, its neighborhoods, and its inhabitants.

Why protect HSPs? They continue to play a strong role in social life – worship, community use, etc. – and retain great potential to continue doing so. Many represent an irreplaceable historic legacy, collection/archive of great works of art and architecture. They stand as a testament to the collective life and spiritual beliefs of preceding generations of Philadelphians.

How to protect HSPs? Survival of the congregations that inhabit HSPs is a matter of individual strengths and weaknesses, as connected to polity structures (or their absence). But sustaining HSPs as part of the Philadelphia landscape and heritage is also a policy question. How should public policy be designed to support such civic institutions? (For instance, transfers of development rights have been a successful tool used to preserve low-scale, historic landmark buildings in other cities. Other cities have adaptive reuse ordinances to incentivize preservation in moments of transition.)

Greater resilience, and correspondingly reduced vulnerability, should stem from:

- More focus on realizing civic values and embracing non-religious uses of the HSP (as long as they are not in conflict with religious worship); adaptive reuse strategies – particularly mixing uses – is an indicator of resilience;
- Stronger financial condition – specifically a stable, sustainable annual budget, some access to contingency funding or a reserve, and the capacity to undertake a capital campaign;
- Thoughtful and adaptive leadership, involving both senior clergy, lay leaders, and other congregation members;
- Location in neighborhoods that are not changing rapidly (for worse or for better); or
- Congregational cultures that facilitate (versus inhibit) leadership to balance the mission, values and religious and civic purpose of the congregation.

Embracing adaptive reuse of HSPs could be a very productive focus for achieving greater regeneration of these places for a variety of uses incorporating civic and religious values. Already 10% of the city’s HSPs have been repurposed [See MAPS 14 and 15]; with participation in organized religion continuing to decline nationally, reuse should be more common and should be purposefully designed to ensure balanced outcomes (ongoing religious use where appropriate, and a range of social uses). Exploring public policies and case study projects emphasizing shared
use, economic impact and inclusion, and public-private partnership governance models would be a fruitful subject for subsequent work.

In the course of this study, many future research efforts were suggested. Among them: Digging deeper into the dynamics of congregations as they decide how to steward individual HSPs; acquiring far more detailed financial records for a larger sample of congregations; the strategies of the different policy organizations and their influence on HSP stewardship; exploring trends in adaptive reuse, closure and reuse of HSPs by different faith traditions. It would, in the future, be helpful to interview leadership of some of the polity groups (e.g., the Catholic or Episcopal dioceses). In the short term, this may be precluded by internal judicatory policies against discussing preservation issues publicly. This study also only included the influence of public policy and municipal enforcement in a marginal way. A deeper exploration of how these external influences enable or inhibit the options and perpetuation of HSPs is also warranted.

At the gross level, the status of HSPs is reflected by how many are demolished and how many are reused. The status of all 839 HSPs should be monitored regularly; it is hoped that some partner in this study can periodically update the survey, track changes, and publicize the results. Beyond the straightforward task of monitoring, there are many more, deeper questions to probe regarding the role of HSPs in Philadelphia’s future and regarding the life of congregations and their HSPs. Once the overarching Pew report on this research is issued, we and other partners stand ready to continue asking and pursuing such questions.

The hope is this study will serve as a platform for advocacy, policy, future research, and continued monitoring of the geography, condition and value of Philadelphia’s HSPs.
II. RESEARCH DESIGN
   A. SUMMARY

The PennPraxis/Partners for Sacred Places research contract with Pew Charitable Trusts centered on study questions related to the vulnerability and resilience of historic sacred places in Philadelphia. The project responds to the general, growing sense of threat to historic sacred places (HSPs) and the congregations using them, and inquiries into the factors shaping both vulnerability and resilience of these sites in contemporary society.

The project investigates the integrity of HSP sites as landmark places and community institutions; their roles as physical and social sites in urban fabric, processes and stories; and the myriad forces affecting the HSPs. In broad perspective, we frame the state of HSPs in terms of vulnerability and resilience – two tendencies that (1) describe how the life of congregations relate to their physical estates and local setting, and (2) recognize the threats facing HSPs as well as the adaptability that sometimes show (in other words, the strengths and weaknesses of both the buildings and the congregations inhabiting them).

Our fundamental hypothesis was that the vulnerability and resilience of these places is shaped by a complicated array of internal and external factors; corollary to this, vulnerability and resilience mean different things to different HSPs (they don’t all face the same challenges); no particular combination of factors is a recipe for vulnerability or resilience.

Our project approached these questions from two angles:

- An inventory of all historic sacred places in Philadelphia: Data on this entire population of more than 800 sites was collected from existing inventories and databases, publicly available data, field visits inspecting the places from the public right of way; and

- An ethnographic study of a small number of congregations inhabiting historic sacred places: A small number of congregations were interviewed directly and in depth, and an architectural survey was conducted of both the exterior and interior of all associated buildings on site. Conversations with congregation leaders explored the challenges and opportunities they face, the resources at their disposal, the decisions they make, and the story of their congregation.

Pew and the Penn team agreed from the outset that this two-track, mixed-methods research approach was well-suited to understanding and drawing comparisons across the intra- and extra-congregational dynamics facing historic sacred places. Our shared hypothesis was that the observed phenomena of church closings, demolitions, dwindling congregations and neighborhood change could be understood only by looking holistically at the buildings and congregations (their stories, trajectories, perceptions of self and context, meanings associated with their buildings/places and civic values) and the urban scene in which historic sacred places have long played such a prominent part. Likewise, we explored congregations that have weathered change and HSPs that have changed, in order to build as complete a picture as possible. It was not the intention of this study to devise a scoring or ranking
system or other means of empirically determining how vulnerable or resilient particular congregations are. Our investigation characterizes the status of HSPs in relation to urban and congregational change, identifies types of vulnerable or resilient behavior and conditions, and explores similarities across the large population of HSPs in Philadelphia.

The principal outcome of this research contract is a set of findings and associated data conveyed to the Philadelphia Research Initiative of the Pew Charitable Trusts. PRI will publish a report on the findings of the study; PennPraxis/Partners for Sacred Places team members will be able to pursue independent and institutional research threads identified in the course of our work.

B. PURPOSES AND GOALS

General purposes and goals

The overall purpose of this study was to document the conditions and analyze the values, risks, and dynamics that shape the city’s collection of historic sacred places. The data collected provides a basis for understanding the situation facing HSPs. Our analysis considered this research inquiry through both qualitative and quantitative methods, to understand the complexities of the internal and external forces that create conditions for vulnerable and resilient congregations. We pursued this through both qualitative and quantitative methods, to understand the complexities of the internal and external forces that create conditions for vulnerable and resilient congregations.

The research was not designed to reach causal conclusions and therefore does not center on inferential statistics; nor do we classify certain HSPs as vulnerable and others as resilient entirely through a scoring or ranking system. Rather, the research and its findings are documentary and descriptive, and centers on descriptive statistics, mapping, and narrative analysis of ethnographic data and contexts to shine light on many dimensions of the civic life of these important historic institutions.

Questions and prompts

Popular and academic literature, and the observations of both the research team and Pew colleagues, indicate significant threats to the existence of sacred places in Philadelphia and elsewhere. Against these threats, one finds individual HSPs and their congregations exhibiting aspects of vulnerability as well as aspects of resilience. Indeed, some HSPs continue to thrive. A number of specific questions arise from the frequent episodes of succession, closure, demolition, and adaptive reuse of the churches, synagogues, and other sacred places. These questions prompted our research directly:

Generally:

● How are vulnerability and resilience manifested?
● What are some key indicators of vulnerability and resiliency?
● What internal (congregational, building-specific) and external (urban, civic) dynamics affect vulnerability and resiliency of HSPs?
● How does the relative strength or weakness of a sacred place relate to its civic value?

More specifically:
● What internal factors (such as building maintenance, organizational structure, congregational culture and leadership, finances, shifting attendance, size, age of buildings, type and character of architecture) influence vulnerability and resiliency of historic sacred places?
● What external factors (such as shifting property values, neighborhood demographics, community partners, municipal regulations) influence vulnerability and resiliency?
● What makes a sacred place more or less susceptible to closure or adaptive reuse? What are the ideal conditions for resilience? How can these factors be recognized?
● What civic uses and values do HSPs contribute to communities? And what community characteristics support HSPs and their congregations, or undermine them?
● Can patterns of risk, or typical narratives of sacred place “lives,” be discerned in the data about HSPs? Or in narrative accounts of their evolution and current situation?
● How should the city’s inventory of HSPs be characterized, and is it possible to project which types and how many houses of worship are prone to closure or adaptive reuse?

C. PROCESS AND SEQUENCE

This document summarizes our overall research approach—what we did, why, how, and what we hoped to learn—as worked out in the proposal process with Julie Sulc and others at Pew, and subsequently reviewed and refined. It conveys some of the more detailed definitions, ideas, assumptions, decisions, and methods making up the research design.

Two workshops with scholars held in March and April 2015 helped test the project’s assumptions, refine questions, and sharpen the methodological tasks of the research design. The project team sought input from scholars and experts (from a diversity of disciplines and fields, but with experience analyzing complex urban conditions) on the framing of research questions, data collection methodology, the logic behind our analysis of data, and the balancing of quantitative and qualitative research methods. We sought advice on whether we are asking the right kinds of questions, collecting the right kinds of data, and planning for the most promising kinds of analyses (within the bounds of the project’s resources).

Our research plans called for the twin approach of 1) building an inventory of all Philadelphia HSPs and 2) sampling from it a small number of sites for in-depth interviews. To address the first approach, we built and analyzed an
extensive, geolocated database of all historic purpose-built sacred places in Philadelphia, field-checking each site, and associating each with a wide range of related data (based on an inventory assembled by the Philadelphia Historical Commission, the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, and Partners for Sacred Places in 2011). From that inventory, we identified a subset of historic sacred places to study more intensively through ethnographic research and site inspection. The data categories were then incorporated into a GIS framework, prompted by the definitions and hypotheses about vulnerability and resilience explained in the next section.

As mapped out in the original proposal and scope of work, the following phases of work constituted the overall sequence of research tasks:

- **Winter - Spring 2015**
  - Formulate and validate research design
  - Update existing, baseline database of sacred places (2011)
  - Characterize and analyze updated survey population with descriptive statistics and mapping
  - Choose 20-30 sites for ethnographic research
  - Create and test data collection protocols for both inventory and ethnographic sample

- **Summer 2015 – Winter 2016**
  - Collect database information
  - Conduct field survey
  - Conduct interviews/architectural surveys at 20-30 sites

- **Fall 2015 – Spring 2016**
  - Code and analyze data
  - Prepare findings document

**D. ASSUMPTIONS**

**Defining Key Terms**

- **Historic sacred places** are defined as properties (single buildings or complexes) within Philadelphia purposely built for religious worship before 1965. These HSPs are the focus of the present study – not the congregations presently inhabiting the sites. They include churches, synagogues, meeting houses and temples created for worship, religious education, and outreach by a wide range of religious denominations. HSPs extant but reused for non-religious purposes remain part of our inventory. The extant population of such sacred places is 839, based on our project team’s field surveys and research. HSPs extant but reused for non-religious purposes remain part of our inventory.

- **Resilience**, in the context of this study, is the capacity of sacred places and the congregations inhabiting them to adapt to challenges. Resilient HSPs survive and thrive by changing, responding, adapting in myriad ways.
Resilience relates to uses and decisions as well as material changes or maintenance of structures. And it takes many forms: sometimes one congregation inhabiting a place for very long time; sometimes multiple congregations using a place through time, or even simultaneous; cases where congregations share space with other organizations serving the community; even the reuse of an HSP for non-religious purposes is a mode of resilience.

- **Vulnerability** stems from the inability of an HSP or congregation to adapt to change. It is manifest in signs of weakness, deterioration, inactivity or failure. Many factors contribute to vulnerability by undermining sacred places’ ability to continue operating as sites of religious worship and/or provide civic value. Vulnerability may stem from some combination of the waning congregational membership, ineffective leadership, fragile finances, deteriorated buildings, and declining neighborhood contexts. This study is centered on understanding the factors influencing the sustainability of sacred places’ civic values (which is to say not principally their effectiveness in terms of religious life).

- **Civic value** refers to the non-religious uses and functions of HSPs – the value they provide to the community at large. The civic value of religious congregations and the sacred places they inhabit is widely acknowledged, and documented in a growing line of academic research and related advocacy work on behalf of congregations. The civic value of an HSP can be thought of as a set of qualities or a collection of services provided. They consist of the faith-motivated or faith-based outreach, activities, functions and meanings of sacred places: the social-service functions they host (food pantries, classes, community meetings); the cultural values represented by architectural and art works; the economic value generated by the sacred places (from operational and capital spending, spending by visitors, shared use of space, etc.); the senses of stability, orientation, well-being, memory, etc. stemming from their presence in the urban fabric. (We acknowledge that this term is elsewhere used to describe a quantity of economic impact calculated for said non-religious uses/functions of religious places. We do not intend civic value as a measurable economic value, direct or indirect – though the term is elsewhere used in the literature on religious and congregational advocacy in this sense.)

### Theories of Vulnerability and Resilience

This study is fundamentally concerned with how HSPs react and adapt to change as reflected in decisions about managing physical assets (buildings and land), financial and human resources of their congregations, and relationships with external entities. HSP responses to myriad kinds of urban change can be organized in two categories: engaged response and adaptation (evidence of resilience); lack of response and failure to adapt, leading to vulnerability. In this study, resilience and vulnerability are the two principle capacities or conditions explored.

We use vulnerability and resilience to describe different orientations toward change, how well the physical structures and resources are employed/fitted to the organizations inhabiting them, resulting in different tendencies
in the life of HSPs (toward weakness and failure, or toward strength and adaptation). This research seeks to build an account of vulnerability and resilience manifest in HSPs by looking across a wide range of types (types of buildings, types of congregations, types of neighborhood), using a combination of empirical quantitative techniques and narrative qualitative methods, and adopting a long-term perspective in a search for common issues, trends, and responses characterizing the experience of Philadelphia’s HSPs.

The notion of “vulnerability” arose from empirical evidence of HSPs emptying, failing, and facing the specter of demolition – phenomena very evident in the media and in professional circles. As buildings and social institutions, HSPs are susceptible to changes in the urban fabric and urban society around them; conversely, they can also be bulwarks that help communities weather broader changes. At first, our study focused solely on vulnerability; as our research design has evolved, we have come to consider resilience as well as vulnerability as two sides of a more robust spectrum of HSPs’ responses to change.

There are many ways of modeling urban-architectural and social change and how individuals and institutions respond to it. One of the most influential models currently employed is resilience. Based on systemic understanding of phenomena, envisioning likely (if not fully predictable) types and vectors of change, and using such maps of dynamic systems to prepare for individual and social actions as change happens. The resilience debate puts people and organizations in a mindset of anticipating change, understanding one’s part in the greater system, and valorizing responsiveness and adaptability. This orientation to change, we think, is clearly applicable to the situation of urban HSPs such as those of Philadelphia.

Resilience has become an influential concept for holistic management of change in a number of disciplines and professions (business, non-profit management, environmental conservation, urban planning). Judith Rodin’s resilience model is one that broadly captures the thinking derived from these several spheres. Rodin’s resilience framework stands out as the most current and widely applicable framework or theory of resilience – applicable to institutions, agencies, corporations, settlements or any other complex entity dealing with complex changes. The five points of Rodin’s model are:

- being aware of one’s situation and vulnerabilities;
- being diverse, in order to mount a range of responses;
- being integrated, in order to ensure collaborative solutions;
- being self-regulating, in order to prevent disruptions from cascading through the system; and
- being adaptive, in order to improvise in the face of challenges.\(^4\)

Based on the literature review, media scan, and experience of the project team, a number of theories can be postulated why sacred places experience increased vulnerability. In broadest terms, vulnerability is a function of the

building’s condition, the fit between building and congregation, the congregation’s ability to sustain their function as both a religious organization and civic institution, and the urban/social context of the site. This is conditioned by a variety of factors internal and external to the congregation. This framework is not intended to enable yes/no judgment of whether a particular sacred place is vulnerable or resilient (in other words, it is not an either/or question). Rather, each sacred place should be understood as having, in different measure, qualities contributing to vulnerability and qualities contributing to resilience. Following, we list a number of competing theories/hypotheses that informed our analyses and have helped prompt our data collection strategies.

Vulnerability and resilience are distinct tendencies of HSPs in relation to change. It is tempting to describe them as “opposite” tendencies; more accurately, they represent different sides of a spectrum of responses to change affecting the relationship between congregations and their spaces. Both vulnerability and resilience are affected by internal factors as well as external factors. They are both shaped by the creativity and resourcefulness of leadership, the financial health of the congregation, the character of the HSP’s estate (buildings, grounds), and its immediate urban and social contexts. And each of these factors call forth the methodological question of what data can be collected, and how can that data be analyzed, to explore the role of the factor in pushing HSPs toward resilience or vulnerability. Referring back to Rodin’s model, indicators could be devised to serve as proxies for each of the qualities contributing to resilience, suggesting some utility for empirical, quantitative research. More to the point of the resilience theory, however, is the extent to which decision-makers/organizations respond in integrative ways, demonstrate awareness of change, and ultimately adapt – knowledge about these qualities are much better aligned with qualitative methods such as interviews that our team conducted with a small sample of HSPs.

Conceptually, as tendencies of organizations and sites, vulnerability and resilience are dynamic and relational – they are not static, fixed qualities. They have to do with a congregation’s use, management and relation to the HSP they inhabit. Correspondingly, as a matter of research, we cannot “see” vulnerability and resilience and “find” them (or not), but we can collect data that indicate the two tendencies. In simplest terms, resilient means adaptable and vulnerable not adaptable. But vulnerability and resilience are not simply found in inverse proportion to one another (in other words, more resilience doesn’t necessarily mean less vulnerability, but it may result in more effective means of managing or surviving vulnerability).

Theories of resilience/vulnerability focused on internal factors:

- Leadership capacity and effectiveness influences vulnerability and resilience directly, and this is expressed differently in large vs small congregations, in different faith traditions/congregation types/polity frameworks.
- Independent congregations become vulnerable, because they face local, internal challenges and lack a denominational support system or safety net.
- Parishes that belong to Roman Catholic and other hierarchical systems are vulnerable to system-
wide decisions made at the judicatory level.

- The smallest congregations are the most vulnerable, because they are more likely to have fewer financial and leadership resources.
- Sacred places inhabiting buildings/complexes in poor physical condition are more vulnerable. Corollary to this: congregations inhabiting larger, more extensive building complexes are more vulnerable, or sacred places inhabiting older building complexes are more vulnerable.

Theories of resilience/vulnerability focused on external factors:

- Areas with higher, stable property values have fewer vulnerable sacred places.
- Areas with significant, rapid changes in property values have more vulnerable sacred places. Areas that have seen a recent rapid increase in property values (i.e., gentrification) have a higher percentage of vulnerable sacred places.
- Congregations with more relationships to external partners and collaborators contribute to more resilient sacred places.
- Sacred places listed on the local or National registers of historic places, or located in historic districts, are less vulnerable.
- Greater mobility (% people moving in/out of a neighborhood) is correlated with higher vulnerability.

Differences between these two tendencies can be summarized by considering how they are constituted by factors internal and external to the HSP. In the matrix below, specific factors are identified; specific data collected in both the inventory and interview parts of the study were checked against these factors to ensure alignment between our conceptual models of resilience/vulnerability and our data collection methodology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>Internal forces</th>
<th>External forces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Vulnerability | • Ineffective leadership or limited laity-clergy relationship  
• Poor financial condition  
• Poorly maintained building  
• Shrinking or distant congregation  
• Building(s) size and configuration  
• No sharing of space or other connections to community  | • Diocesan/hierarchical policy  
• Societal trend away from piety  
• Declining neighborhood context (in terms of QOL, property value, high residential mobility, high crime rates, etc.)  
• Macroeconomic downturn  |
Vulnerability stems equally from internal (more controllable) and external (less controllable) factors. The influences are many and not formulaic, but the literature suggests that the most common vulnerabilities are those resulting from leadership failings. These underlie the second greatest vulnerability of financial instability.

Greater resilience should stem from:

- More focus on realizing civic values and embracing non-religious uses of the HSP (as long as they are not in conflict with religious worship); mixing uses is an indicator of resilience;
- Stronger financial condition – specifically a stable, sustainable annual budget and some access to contingency funding;
- Thoughtful and adaptive leadership, involving both senior clergy, lay leaders, and other congregation members;
- Location in neighborhoods that are not changing rapidly (for worse or for better);
- Congregational cultures that facilitate (versus inhibit) the mission, values and religious and civic purpose of the congregation.

Some more particular hypotheses, based on the experience of project team members:

- Independent congregations, often African-American, are more vulnerable due to a combination of factors: they are smaller on average, have no access to denominational resources, have fewer financial resources, and tend to be located in more disadvantaged parts of the city or in rapidly gentrifying areas of the city. As a result, they are over-represented in the set of sacred places lost/demolished/closed.
- The charitable giving within a congregation: if too low a percentage comes from newer members of the congregation sustaining the HSP will be more difficult.

Each of these theories of vulnerability suggest corresponding methods of analyzing data – operations that will be carried out in the late fall/early winter after all data has been collected during the summer/early fall.

In general, the nature of this study and the methodologies chosen purposefully is not attempting to see HSP dynamism through the lens of spirituality or theology. While those have some influence, the broad hypothesis...
behind this research holds that what shapes the fate of HSPs most profoundly is a combination of practical, non-
religious factors having to do with the materiality of buildings, the effectiveness of leadership, and the changing
urban and social contexts of the HSPs.

E. INVENTORY OF HISTORIC SACRED PLACES

Background and Methodology

As a foundation for field research and congregational interviews, the 2015 Historic Religious Properties Inventory is
a compilation of past and present research regarding the state of purpose-built religious buildings citywide that are
greater than 50 years old. The current study has built upon the 2011 Inventory of Historic Religious Properties in
Philadelphia: An Assessment of Significant and At-Risk Houses of Worship (Lester, Preservation Alliance of Greater
Philadelphia) in order to define a comprehensive landscape of these resources in Philadelphia. However, in light of
the rapidly changing social, economic, and religious landscapes of Philadelphia, substantial work on the 2011 had to
be done in order to capture the existing nature of purposely-built historic religious structures in the city.

The first step was to identify, verify, and modify all 747 buildings included in the 2011 inventory. Each of the
buildings catalogued in 2011 were cross-checked against their current status, including use, owner, affiliation (if still
applicable) using data from the Philadelphia Office of Property Assessment and the Department of Licenses and
Inspections, records from the Athenaeum of Philadelphia and other historic map repositories, perfunctory
examinations through Google Maps, congregational and denominational websites, and news publication articles
from the last five years. Historic religious buildings were then added to that had not been recognized in the earlier
work, including a total of 54 buildings constructed within the extended time frame of this 2015 study (inclusion in
the 2011 inventory was limited to buildings constructed before 1960, whereas the 2015 study will be considering all
purpose-built religious structures built prior to 1965), as well as sacred places identified by consulting parties after
the publication of the 2011 inventory. Finally, 14 buildings were removed from the inventory that had not been
purposefully built for religious worship and 22 recently demolished sacred places were extracted for future analysis,
leaving field surveyors with 774 known extant, historic religious spaces purposefully-built prior to 1965.

An additional 65 properties were discovered by researchers while surveying in the field; these properties were
verified for inclusion based on research by the data manager and project manager. The final inventory thus includes
a total of 839 purpose-built historic sacred places constructed prior to 1965. For properties that include old and new
worship structures that are attached or incorporated into the newer structure, the inventory considers them one
resource with a single identifier (PPID). For properties that include old and new worship structures that are
freestanding OR connected by a secondary hyphen, the inventory considers them separate resources, but notes the
PPID of the associated structure.

For more on the field survey of these 839 HSPs, see Section III: Field Survey.
Inventory
The data catalogue for these buildings also includes several new classifications of data to reflect variables such as use; years of change; property assessment; and existing forms of documentation, design, and support. Sources for updated data sets include (but are not limited to): (1) OpenDataPhilly; (2) City agency record requests, including but not limited to inspections; (3) Real estate listings to determine what properties are currently on the market (or recently sold); and (4) news clips from a variety of local media outlets.

A data dictionary, with descriptions of these and all other categories, is located in Appendix F; these definitions provide insight into the organization of the inventory and serve as a guide to the types of data included in the inventory, how it is applied, and the source of the information. The data dictionary is broken out into eight parts: (I) Basic Information; (II) Locational Information; (III) Political Identifiers; (IV) Listing Status; (V) Architectural Description; (VI) Documentation and Support; (VII) Building Information; (VIII) Market; (IX) Map Codes and Notes; and (X) Field Survey Data.

Mapping
We produced initial maps of these data and used preliminary spatial analyses to help refine questions and choose sites for ethnographic sample. These first maps visualized and characterized the survey data (the entire population as well as different subsets). One purpose of this initial mapping was to examine if there were early, discernable patterns of risk or strength regarding “external” factors.

We mapped the geography of HSPs against social data from Census, City, and other sources to gain a richer portrait of the communities in which these sites are located and explore correlations with a number of social, economic, and other urban factors. Such social data included: income, race/ethnicity, housing tenure, educational attainment, age of population (youth and elderly factors), vacant parcels, crime (property and personal), walkability, and location of public amenities/facilities.

Additional mapping and spatial analysis was conducted at the conclusion of the field survey. See Sections III-A and VI for more information.

F. SAMPLING AND ETHNOGRAPHIC RESEARCH (INTERVIEWS AND ARCHITECTURAL SURVEYS)
The scope of our research called for an ethnographic component to complement the database – conducting in-depth interviews with representatives of approximately 20 congregations. The goal for this phase was to build a
complex understanding of risk and responsive congregational decision-making, to gain a stronger understanding of the interplay between internal dynamics and external forces that shape the fate of religious sites in contemporary Philadelphia. Interviews with congregational leaders gleaned information about congregational culture, management, finances, leadership structure and capacity, membership, community impact/services, outreach, history, property, and neighborhood presence. All these factors, we believe, contribute to vulnerability and resilience – we considered learning about them via the experience of congregational leaders and representatives to be essential intelligence.

Vulnerability and resilience result from some interaction of external conditions (constraints and opportunities) and internal dynamics of congregations inhabiting the sacred places (decisions about financial, maintenance, worship, service and other matters). Tendencies toward vulnerability and resilience are present in different measure, in different ways, in the various congregations researched. These congregation interviews helped us understand the dynamics that shape congregational decisions, and identify the pressure points that cause stress or can reveal opportunities for change.

Resources limited the number of sites we could interview directly. Our approach was to identify several sacred place “types” based on lit review, research workshops, analysis of descriptive statistics/mapping, and the research team’s professional experience. Each type was expected to represent particular combinations of vulnerability and resilience factors. Catholic parishes vs independent African-American congregations, for instance, exhibit vulnerability and resilience differently owing to their institutional structure, principles of worship, modes of sociability, location in Philadelphia, and congregational culture.

In keeping with the scope of our research contract, 22 congregations total were engaged directly to collect ethnographically a variety of data. This constitutes 2.5% of the total population of 839 HSPs. This sample was chosen in two stages: the first 20 sites represented types of historic sacred places we regard as most typical of Philadelphia historic sacred places. After studying these 20, we reserved the option to add additional sites to the study.

In order to choose the interview sites, we filtered the total inventory (as of fall 2015) for buildings constructed between 1865 and 1929 – the period when the largest number of extant HSPs were built citywide. These represented approximately 559 sites out of the entire inventory (then consisting of 774 HSPs), or 68% of the total.

Second, we hypothesized that decision-making habits, constraints, and institutional conditions affecting the internal capacities of congregations are very important influences on vulnerability and resilience of HSPs. Therefore, distinctions between types of congregational “polity” – the basic structure of decision-making, are key. Polity and internal structures of governance of significant decision-making are fundamental characteristics of the difference between religious traditions as well as expressing the similarity between denominations that share historical roots but may be have divided at a later date because of theological difference, etc. For example: using the codes that Partners created, the Presbyterian Church (USA) and the Presbyterian Church in America would both be classified as
Concilar / Semi-Hierarchal. Other codes using different organizing principles might classify them in different categories, such as Mainline Protestant and Conservative Protestant, respectively.

There are several important reasons, illustrated in the above example, that highlight how the codes that Partners has developed are useful:

- They are politically and religiously neutral. These codes do not position the categories in relation to latter-day cultural and theological controversies within these traditions.
- They gather groups of denominations by historical origins/traditions that at present may be unaffiliated or connected. This, in turn, helps to include historical background as part of the organizing principles.
- They foreground and clarify the relationships and authority in decision-making regarding religious property within the tradition and denomination. For Partners’ work, it has been important to concentrate on knowing these relationships and internal structures when working with religious communities to preserve their historic buildings.
- They also help to focus on the internal decision-making and power structure within congregations.

These are the typologies we used to categorize Christian congregations:

**Independent/Associational Protestant** (“Bottom Up”): Associational is a wide category that encompasses at least four major traditions within historic Christianity: Baptists, Congregationalism, Anabaptist/Mennonite, and Pentecostal. Across these traditions and the many independent churches (which have no denominational affiliation) are the following consistent characteristics:

- Individual congregations can make decisions about property and most other matters independent of any other denominational body, agency or official.
- The primary authority within the denomination is derived from individual congregations’ consent to ‘associate’ as a larger body. Denominational bodies are generally weak and hold moral but not ultimate administrative authority.
- Individual congregations are governed by lay leadership and clergy, though in some traditions clergy may informally hold more authority or informally exercise more informal control over administration and management (some independent and Baptist churches); while in others, the clergy’s authority may be limited over any non-liturgical or spiritual matters (such as in the United Church of Christ.)

**Concilar, or Semi-Hierarchal Protestant** (“In the Middle”): This category includes both the Calvinist traditions of Christianity, such as Reformed and Presbyterian Churches; as well as many of the Protestant traditions that retained the religious and administrative office of bishops (who work in cooperation with an elected body.) The following principles exist across all of the denominations in these categories:
• Principle decision-making for property and other major matters is with an elected body (judicatory) that governs a cohort of congregations and includes representatives from each, along with clergy (Presbytery, Diocese, Classis.)

• Individual congregations’ clergy and elected lay leadership are empowered to handle most issues related to personnel, budgets, liturgy, and spiritual matters. However, there is significant oversight and potential for the governing body to intercede in congregations’ affairs, especially in times of crisis or transition.

• Elected officials (bishops, moderators, etc.) may have significant leadership responsibilities, but do not exercise complete executive decision-making on their own.

Hierarchical (“Top down”): This category includes potentially the smallest number of denominations, though these have typically large numbers of adherents/members. The Roman Catholic Church and the various Orthodox Churches are included, and in general share the following consistent characteristics:

• Decision-making within individual congregations is managed primarily by clergy who retain ultimate authority in most matters except for major issues related to property and finances, which are overseen by the judicatory (dioceses.)

• Congregations are organized into geographic cohorts with appointed clergy leadership who likewise retain ultimate authority for major decision-making, including property, finances, and personnel, along with other clergy and lay administrators.

Our first 20 sites were thus chosen by applying two filters and several sampling considerations to the entire inventory:

First, HSPs were filtered by era. Focusing on HSPs initially constructed between 1865 and 1929 concentrates our efforts on the most predominant era of HSP in Philadelphia (see Appendix D for statistics) and the type of place most subjected to pressures of change, both internal (they are often elaborate, multi-building complexes embedded in dense neighborhoods during the era of intensive industrialization) and external (because many are located in parts of city where populations are most quickly changing).

Second, they were filtered to represent proportionally the three main polity groups:

• Independent/Associational Protestant: making property decisions independent of any denominational body; Baptist, United Church of Christ, Unitarian-Universalist, Pentecostal, Church of the Brethren, other independent churches (n= 214; 46%)

• Conciliar/Semi-Hierarchical Protestant: (most decisions made by congregation’s governing board, but property decisions are influenced or approved by judicatory; Presbyterian, Reformed, Methodist, AME, AME Zion, Lutheran, Episcopal (n=146; 28%)
• Hierarchical: property and personnel decisions are fully controlled or highly influenced by judicatory leadership; Roman Catholic, Orthodox; (n=68; 13%)

One “other” group of HSPs will be sampled in the second round of 5-10 additional sites:

• Other: mix of polities; Jewish, Buddhist, Quaker, etc. (n=10; 1%)

Five considerations shaped the sample further:

• Within each of the three polity categories, we ensured geographic diversity (no more than a quarter of the sample of 20 were clustered in any one part of the city, based on the City Planning Commission’s districts, e.g. West/Southwest, South, North Philadelphia, Greater Northeast, Northwest)

• We aimed to have the sample of HSPs reflect the composition of the city’s population. In particular, we aimed to include a number of predominantly black congregations proportional to the percentage of the city’s black population, which is 44%. We also aimed to represent other ethnicities, including primarily Latino and Asian congregations.

• Half of the sites sampled house the original congregation for which the HSP was built; the other half of HSPs in the sample fell into the “hermit crab” model, in which the buildings have been used by different congregations over time.

• A little more than half of the sample consists of congregations that have worked with Partners for Sacred Places in some way in the past – ensuring that a substantial part of the sample would be new to our project team’s particular discourse about congregational lives and preservation of sacred places.

• Finally, the sampling considered indicators, when known, such as size of congregation, building condition, historic designation status, and neighborhood conditions to ensure a variety of experiences is represented.

After studying the first 20 HSPs, we supplemented the study with 2 additional sites, in order to more fully reflect these considerations and represent the geographic and religious polity diversity of the overall population.

A final category of HSP, those “Not in Religious Use” (vacant or adaptively reused for non-religious purposes; n=82; 10%) will not be sampled. However, this category has been culled as a subset of the overall inventory. Another sidebar inventory identifies those HSPs known to have been demolished in the past five years. Both of these smaller inventories could be the subject of distinct, sidebar reports characterizing them as a group (Adaptively reused HSPs; demolished HSPs).
Based on these considerations, the following 22 HSPs constituted the subset of inventory sites. Interviews and architectural surveys for these sites were conducted between August 2015 and April 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>19th Street Baptist Church</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1253 S. 19th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructed: 1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Congregation in Bldg? No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Congregation: Memorial Chapel of the Holy Comforter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designations: Philadelphia Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building or Complex: Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Buildings: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Congregation</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polity: Associational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Location</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning District: South</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Congregation B’nai Abraham</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>527 Lombard Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructed: 1908, 1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Congregation in Bldg? Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designations: Philadelphia Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building or Complex: Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Congregation</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polity: Jewish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Location</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning District: Central</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAMPBELL AME CHURCH
1657 Kinsey Street

Constructed: 1870
Original Congregation in Bldg? Yes
Designations: Philadelphia Register Building or Complex: Complex
Additional Buildings: 1

Congregation
Polity: Concilar/Semi-Hierarchical

Location
Planning District: Lower Northeast

CHURCH OF THE CRUCIFIXION
620 S. 8th Street

Constructed: 1883
Original Congregation in Bldg? Yes
Designations: None
Building or Complex: Building

Congregation
Polity: Concilar/Semi-Hierarchical

Location
Planning District: Central
DEVEREUX MEMORIAL UMC
2527 W. Allegheny Avenue

Constructed: 1904
Original Congregation in Bldg? Yes
Designations: None
Building or Complex: Building

Congregation
Polity: Concilar/Semi-Hierarchical

Location
Planning District: North

FIRST CHRISTIAN ASSEMBLY
1900 S. 11th Street

Constructed: 1890
Original Congregation in Bldg? No
Historic Congregation: Bethany Methodist Episcopal Church
Designations: None
Building or Complex: Complex
Additional Buildings: 1

Congregation
Polity: Associational

Location
Planning District: South
GARDEN OF PRAYER COGIC
2800 W. Diamond Street

Constructed: 1907
Original Congregation in Bldg? No
Historic Congregation: Most Precious Blood of Our Lord Catholic Church
Designations: None
Building or Complex: Complex
Additional Buildings: 2

Congregation
Polity: Associational

Location
Planning District: Lower North

HOLY APOSTLES AND THE MEDIATOR EPISCOPAL CHURCH
260 S. 51st Street

Constructed: 1921
Original Congregation in Bldg? Yes
Designations: None
Building or Complex: Complex
Additional Buildings: 1

Congregation
Polity: Conciliar/Semi-Hierarchical

Location
Planning District: West Park
LIBERTI CHURCH
123 S. 17th Street

Constructed: 1900
Original Congregation in Bldg? No
Historic Congregation: First Baptist Church of Philadelphia
Designations: Philadelphia Register; National Register
Building or Complex: Building

Congregation
Polity: Conciliar/Semi-Hierarchical

Location
Planning District: Central

LIFEWAY BAPTIST CHURCH
9554 Bustleton Avenue

Constructed: 1885
Original Congregation in Bldg? No
Historic Congregation: Pennepack Baptist Church (new building);
Lower Dublin Baptist Church (new building)
Designations: None
Building or Complex: Complex
Additional Buildings: 1

Congregation
Polity: Associational

Location
Planning District: Upper Far Northeast
METROPOLITAN BAPTIST CHURCH
3500 Baring Street

Constructed: 1873
Original Congregation in Bldg? No
Historic Congregation: Northminster Presbyterian Church
Designations: None
Building or Complex: Complex
Additional Buildings: 1

Congregation
Polity: Associational

Location
Planning District: University Southwest

OUR LADY OF LOURDES CATHOLIC CHURCH
1941 Wynnewood Road

Constructed: 1895
Original Congregation in Bldg? Yes
Designations: None
Building or Complex: Complex
Additional Buildings: 2

Congregation
Polity: Hierarchical

Location
Planning District: West Park
PREAH BUDDHA RANGSEY TEMPLE
2400 S. 6th Street

Constructed: 1904
Original Congregation in Bldg? No
Historic Congregation: Saint Andrew’s Lutheran Church
Designations: None
Building or Complex: Complex
Additional Buildings: 1

Congregation
Polity: Buddhist

Location
Planning District: South

SAINT JOHN THE BAPTIST CATHOLIC CHURCH, MANAYUNK
146 Rector Street

Constructed: 1894
Original Congregation in Bldg? Yes
Designations: None
Building or Complex: Complex
Additional Buildings: 4

Congregation
Polity: Hierarchical

Location
Planning District: Lower Northwest
SAINT MICHAEL’S LUTHERAN CHURCH, KENSINGTON
2139 E. Cumberland Street

Constructed: pre-1875
Original Congregation in Bldg? Yes
Designations: None
Building or Complex: Building

Congregation
Polity: Concilar/Semi-Hierarchical

Location
Planning District: River Wards

SANCTUARY CHURCH OF THE OPEN DOOR
5923 Walnut Street

Constructed: 1912
Original Congregation in Bldg? No
Historic Congregation: Richardson Memorial Presbyterian Church
Designations: None
Building or Complex: Complex
Additional Buildings: 2

Congregation
Polity: Associational

Location
Planning District: West
SHILOH BAPTIST CHURCH
2040 Christian Street

Constructed: 1903
Original Congregation in Bldg? No
Historic Congregation: Church of the Holy Apostles
Designations: Philadelphia Register
Building or Complex: Complex
Additional Buildings: 1

Congregation
Polity: Associational

Location
Planning District: Central

SUMMIT PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
6737 Greene Street

Constructed: 1926
Original Congregation in Bldg? Yes
Designations: None
Building or Complex: Complex
Additional Buildings: 1

Congregation
Polity: Conciliar/Semi-Hierarchical

Location
Planning District: Upper Northwest
UNION BAPTIST CHURCH
1910 Fitzwater Street

Constructed: 1913
Original Congregation in Bldg? Yes
Designations: None
Building or Complex: Building

Congregation
Polity: Associational

Location
Planning District: Central

UNITED MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH
2500 W. Thompson Street

Constructed: 1883
Original Congregation in Bldg? No
Historic Congregation: Hebron
Memorial Presbyterian Church
Designations: None
Building or Complex: Building

Congregation
Polity: Associational

Location
Planning District: Lower North
URBAN WORSHIP CENTER
2036 E. Cumberland Street

Constructed: 1873
Original Congregation in Bldg? No
Historic Congregation: Cumberland Street Methodist Episcopal Church
Designations: None
Building or Complex: Complex
Additional Buildings: 1

Congregation
Polity: Associational

Location
Planning District: River Wards

VISITATION BVM CATHOLIC CHURCH
2625 B Street

Constructed: 1879
Original Congregation in Bldg? Yes
Designations: Philadelphia Register
Building or Complex: Complex
Additional Buildings: 3

Congregation
Polity: Hierarchical

Location
Planning District: Lower North
Procedure

Interviews, surveys, and fieldwork at each of these sacred places explored in greater detail themes of congregational leadership, financial conditions, activities (religious and civic), building uses and condition, and neighborhood linkages. Structured interview/survey protocols and associated sacred place data categories were devised, as well as a more in-depth (exterior and interior) architectural survey for the sites where interviews were conducted – see Appendices N and O.

A team of field workers collected this data between summer 2015 and spring 2016. The team consisted of a lead interviewer experienced in ethnography/interviewing, a content expert experienced in historic sacred place architecture/issues/lives, and an architectural surveyor familiar with historic buildings. Outreach for interviews was conducted by a member of the Partners for Sacred Places staff, and each congregation was represented in the interview with 1-3 members of the congregation’s leadership, most commonly senior clergy. Interviews were recorded and subsequently transcribed. We offered a small donation ($100) to each congregation in appreciation for their time.

Each interview lasted approximately three hours, covering the five thematic areas of questions, including roughly 20 structured questions apiece and a few more open-ended queries and follow-ups (again, refer to Appendix S). We recognized the need to introduce ourselves and build up to a level of confidence with the congregations that would enable potentially difficult conversations about finances and leadership. Both the outreach and interviews were time-consuming.

To start each site visit, the interviewers also requested a tour of facilities. As the interview was conducted, the PennPraxis architectural surveyor conducted a detailed survey of building conditions of each of the primary sites and associated buildings. Surveyors were provided with: an Android tablet equipped with the application Pendragon to collect the necessary data; paper copies of the survey form for backup; a field guide detailing common materials and forms of church architecture in Philadelphia; and a photo checklist. Due to technical issues with Pendragon and occasionally field conditions, surveyors also completed their field surveys using paper forms, inputting these into prepared spreadsheets to be cross-checked and incorporated into the master inventory by the team’s data manager. The collection process ran from August 2015 to April 2016.

Data and Analysis: Interviews

After the interviews, recordings were transcribed (using an online service) and then verified by project team members by listening back through interviews, to ensure that transcripts were error-free. Transcripts were backed up to Praxis’ secure servers before being imported into the software used for coding analysis. Concurrent to the coding of all transcripts, research team members Dan Hotchkiss and Rev. Katie Day conducted interpretive analyses
on a select number of interviews based on their management and finances (Hotchkiss) and congregational narrative (Day). See Section V for more on the interviews and their analysis.

Within 48 hours after the architectural surveys, surveyors were asked to either 1) submit their data via a prepared spreadsheet, or 2) sync the forms to an external Pendragon server, at which point the team’s data manager could retrieve the data and save it to Praxis’ secure server. All architectural survey photographs were also saved to Praxis’ secure server. Site plans and summaries of conditions were then prepared for each site. Research team members, including one surveyor and one non-surveyor observer with preservation experience, characterized their observations and interpretations of the architectural surveys in a summary analysis. See Section IV for more on the architectural surveys.

**Synthesis**

This study explores the challenging factors facing Philadelphia’s purpose-built historic sacred places. We sought to determine which places may be at risk or those that may be thriving, the nature of those conditions, and how to characterize them in terms of vulnerability and resilience factors. What are the warning signs of vulnerability? What are the key ingredients to resiliency? What is the interplay between these conditions and the layered values of sacred sites—from spiritual to social, architectural heritage to community institutions? By combining quantitative and qualitative methods, the project team attempts to identify different typologies of risk that may help indicate tendencies toward closure, sale, demolition, or other transformation—or tendencies toward resilience, adaptation, growth, and survival.
III. FIELD SURVEY
   A. INTRODUCTION

A primary goal of this project was to identify, document, research, and assess the total extant population of Philadelphia’s purpose-built historic sacred places, from 1965 and earlier. Field surveyors visited all 839 sites in the inventory to record property information and document each through photography. This represents the most comprehensive and current picture of Philadelphia’s HSPs.

   B. METHODOLOGY

Key information in the 2011 survey was gleaned from property inspections by the Department of Licenses and Inspections as well as Google Earth/Streetview. For this current study, we validated vital property information via site visits and field research, rather than relying on remote data, based on a standardized survey form. In addition to updating the inventory with the most current data sets available from public sources, the project team used temporary staff to conduct field research citywide. The project team then built a project database and GIS framework.

The project team pilot tested the field survey in early summer 2015 at several sites to determine the speed and efficacy of this design, and created a survey manual with data collection protocols to ensure as complete and uniform a process as possible. The project manager spent a half day surveying with each individual researcher to ensure clarity and uniformity in data collection.

Surveyors were provided with: an Android tablet equipped with the application Pendragon to collect the necessary data; paper copies of the survey form for backup; a field guide detailing common materials and forms of church architecture in Philadelphia; a photo checklist; and an informational handout for property owners. To best approach the vast number of resources requiring survey, the HSPs were arranged into 86 clusters based on the density of sites in a particular area, size, or location. Properties and the clusters were geolocated and then layered into Google Maps, so that surveyors could locate properties in real time from a mobile device.

Between August 2015 and January 2016, a total of five researchers fanned out across the city, visiting the 774 sites identified as extant in our preliminary database and identifying an additional 65 HSPs based on observations in the field. A research manual and clear protocols guided the data collection work for the entire population of 839 inventoried properties. This canvassing effort confirmed our baseline information and collected current observations, including, but not limited to: building configurations, design, materials, current condition, current

5 Copies of the field survey, field guide, and informational handout may be found in Appendices H, I, and J.
congregation and denomination, social/civic activities, contact information, and baseline environmental conditions. Field teams completed an 81-question survey form based on visual inspection.

Once the properties were surveyed and photographed, surveyors were asked to sync the forms to an external Pendragon server within 48 hours, at which point the team’s data manager could retrieve the data and save it to Praxis’ secure server. Due to technical issues with Pendragon and occasionally field conditions, surveyors also completed their field surveys using paper forms, inputting these into prepared spreadsheets to be cross-checked and incorporated into the master inventory by the team’s data manager. All field survey photographs were also saved to Praxis’ secure server. The collection process ran from August to January 2016.

Data Analysis of Inventory

The completed database documents many dimensions of the city’s 839 extant historic sacred places, including their location, density, architectural legacy, state of repair, shared users, associated community activities and services, and relationship to overall neighborhood and urban-development dynamics. The project team began statistical and spatial analysis on the entire population of extant HSPs in the final inventory.

In early 2016, a GIS specialist was engaged as part of the team to start to analyze survey inputs, helping to visualize the spatial dimensions of vacancy, risk, strength, and begin to identify similarities and trends of risk and strength. Because the database is geolocated, the project team developed and tested hypotheses about vulnerability, including the interplay between external urban conditions (crime, poverty, walkability, proximity to civic amenities, income, education). For more on the spatial analysis of the inventory, see Section VI.

Additionally, based on the insights gained from the ethnographic parts of the overall research design, the project team created a building conditions index to analyze indices of vulnerability and resilience (combining several variables) of the physical fabric of all HSPs in the inventory.

C. BUILDING CONDITIONS INDEX

This index evaluates the building condition of the full population of 839 HSPs based on physical characteristics and observations from the field survey. It does not, however, attempt to rank the extant HSPs based on these conditions.

The conditions index is premised on 13 of the 81 field survey questions — those that serve as measures of physical vulnerability. These questions address the following physical conditions (see Appendix F for data definitions):

- Overall condition of primary material
- Overall condition of doors and windows
- Presence of multiple boarded-up openings
- Presence of visible crack(s)
- Presence of bulging wall(s)
- Presence of a tower
- Visible evidence of a former tower
- Overall condition of the roof
- Sections of the roof missing
- Visible holes in the roof
- Presence of temporary roof patching
- Drainage system attached/detached
- Maintenance of property

The index assumes that some characteristics (e.g. holes in roof) indicate more significant physical vulnerability than others (e.g. drainage detached). Individual queries are thus weighted and assigned point values according to their severity, from 0 (a positive characteristic) to 1 (a negative characteristic) to 2 (an acutely negative characteristic). A limited number of queries (e.g. roof condition) allow for a possible response of “not visible,” resulting in no data for that query.

Point values were totaled and averaged based on the number of possible points for contributing queries; responses of “no data” were thus nullified in the overall conditions score.

\[
e.g. \quad \frac{\text{Total accumulated points}}{20} = \frac{20}{20} = 1
\]

[for properties with responses to all queries]

OR

\[
\frac{\text{Total accumulated points}}{20 - \text{(Possible points for queries with “No Data” as response)}} = \frac{20}{20 - (\text{Possible points for queries with “No Data” as response})}
\]

[for properties with a response of “No Data” to at least one query]

The Building Conditions Index results in a possible score of 0.0 to 1.0. Actual index results from the field survey range from 0.0 to 0.85.

Vulnerability queries were assigned points as follows (points assigned, in parentheses):

1. Overall condition of primary material (e.g. masonry, wood, etc.), from inventory field MAT_CONDT.
   a. Good (0)
   b. Fair (1)
2. Overall condition of doors and windows, from inventory field DWCONDT.
   a. New/Very good (0)
   b. Fair (1)
   c. Poor (2)
   d. Not visible (No data)
3. Multiple boarded up openings, from inventory field MULTI_BOAO.
   a. Yes (1)
   b. No (0)
4. Visible cracks present, from inventory field CRACKS.
   a. Yes (2)
   b. No (0)
5. Bulging walls present, from inventory field WALLSBULGI.
   a. Yes (2)
   b. No (0)
6. Presence of a tower, from inventory field TOWERABOVE.
   a. Yes (1)
   b. No (0)
7. Visible evidence of a former tower, from inventory field FMRTOWER.
   a. Yes (1)
   b. No (0)
   c. N/A [indicates a tower is already present, see #6] (0)
   d. Unknown (No data)
8. Overall condition of the roof, from inventory field ROOFCONDТ.
   a. New/Very good (0)
   b. Fair (1)
   c. Poor (2)
   d. Not visible (No data)
9. Sections of the roof missing, from inventory field MISSROOF_Y.
   a. Yes (2)
   b. No (0)
   c. Not visible (No data)
10. Visible holes in the roof, from inventory field VISI_ROOHO.
    a. Yes (2)
b. No (0)  
c. Not visible (No data)

11. Presence of temporary roof patching, from inventory field TEMPROOFPA.
   a. Yes (1)  
b. No (0)  
c. Not visible (No data)

12. Drainage system is properly attached and directing water away from the building, from inventory field DRAINAGEOK.
   a. Yes (0)  
b. No (1)  
c. None visible (1)  
d. Not visible (No data)

13. Property is tended, from inventory field PRO_TEND.
   a. Yes (0)  
b. No (1)

The final average score for each property was then analyzed/mapped for the full universe of 839 historic religious properties. See Section VI for more on mapping and spatial analysis.

D. SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS

The field survey for this project identifies, locates, and characterizes the basic use, form, and condition of Philadelphia’s 839 extant Historic Sacred Places (HSPs), based on information visible from the public rights-of-way. Field surveyors followed a survey form and photo checklist. (Appendices I and K) The field survey data captures the primary building of the HSP, although in cases where the primary building is part of a complex (as is true for 379, or 45%, of the HSPs), the survey documents the presence and use of additional buildings and the condition of the overall property.

This project builds substantially off of a 2011 survey undertaken jointly by Partners for Sacred Places, the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, and the Philadelphia Historical Commission (Appendix B). That survey identified 748 purpose-built historic religious structures in Philadelphia constructed before 1960. Our study expanded focus to include buildings constructed between 1960 and 1965. Our preliminary research confirmed and updated basic information about each property, such as current owner, historic designation, and known denomination. In updating the 2011 inventory, our team identified 794 purpose-built historic religious structures

---

6 See Appendix F for the data dictionary of field survey classifications.
and removed 14 properties because they were either not purpose-built for religious use or not built before 1965. Our team’s initial research confirmed 20 properties included in the 2011 survey were demolished and 66 were found to be vacant. As field survey work progressed, more properties were verified for inclusion in the survey and others were removed. The majority of newly-identified properties for this inventory are located in Northeast Philadelphia; these updates to the 2011 inventory were identified based on the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia’s Midcentury Modern Initiative, an expanded date range for inclusion, additional archival research, and discoveries made during field surveying.

Geographically, Philadelphia’s HSPs are distributed relatively equally throughout the city and often along commercial corridors—particularly Broad Street (north and south), Germantown Avenue, and Ridge Avenue. The highest concentration is, as expected, in the Central planning district; 109 HSPs (13.0%) are located within the boundaries of Center City. The Lower North hosts the second highest population of HSPs, with 84 (10.01%). Overall, the field survey found that the majority of Philadelphia’s HSPs are in generally good condition; indeed, 61 (or 7%) of the city’s HSPs did not exhibit any negative conditions on any elevations visible from the public rights-of-way. Although these are exemplary cases in the context of the overall inventory, the general population of HSPs is nevertheless in fair to good condition. This does not mean that these 778 remaining properties do not suffer from deferred maintenance—most have at least one necessary capital project (ranging in severity from a detached downspout to a hole in the roof). However, few appear to be uninhabitable or unsafe. For most buildings, the primary material fares well, while the doors and windows need repairs or replacement. (A significant portion of HSPs have already substituted their doors or windows with non-historic replacements.) This finding runs contrary to the common impression that the overwhelming number of historic sacred places are poorly maintained and badly deteriorated.

Use
The vast majority (83%) of extant HSPs retain their primary religious use—field surveyors found that 698 of the 839 buildings exhibited evidence (in the form of signage, active users, etc.) of regular worship services and congregational activity in most or all of the building. The second most-frequent classification of use was “Vacant”: surveyors determined that 39 (5%) of Philadelphia’s HSPs were inactive and unused. An additional 16 properties (2%) serve as “worship sites”, a technical category for buildings used only occasionally (but not fully, predictably, or regularly) for worship services. Thirteen properties (2%) function as “mixed-use,” a classification used for those sites that are subdivided in ownership (often with a congregation as one of the owners) or one (or more) tenants clearly occupied a significant portion of the building or complex. For 5 of the surveyed HSPs, the use could not be determined.

A full 10% of Philadelphia HSPs (82) inventoried have been adaptively reused for other functions. As expected, the Central planning district hosts more adaptively reused properties (19) than any other district. However, those 19
properties represent only a quarter of the adaptively reused properties in Philadelphia; the majority (63 sites, or 77%) are distributed fairly evenly throughout the remaining planning districts. (The University Southwest district hosts the second-highest concentration of adaptively reused HSPs, with 8 properties within its boundaries.)

Functionally, multi-family residential was the most common adaptive reuse of historic sacred places—17 HSPs throughout the city have been repurposed as apartments or condominiums. A further 7 sites have been adapted as single-family residences. Additional adaptive uses include: service (e.g. nonprofit use), which was true for 11 properties; arts/culture (8 properties); school (8 properties); child care, daycare or preschool (6 properties); professional offices (5 properties); and commercial or retail (1 property). (See Maps 14 and 15 of adaptively reused sites)

Form
The field survey instrument included a query about the building’s dominant structural form, as the research design theorized that the complexity of different building typologies may relate to their condition and use. This required some simplification of the dominant form of the primary building into common typologies, some traditional and others descriptive. The following types and definitions were used to survey the 839 extant HSPs:

**Asymmetrical/Spread-Out**
Highly complex structures that draw from a multitude of traditional sacred place forms and adopt an irregular footprint.

**Hall (Assembly)**
Square or rectangular plan with *one simple, coherent interior volume with a simple, unified roofline* (as distinct from Basilica). It may or may not include an interior balcony (or balconies), but it is structurally concentrated on one story above-grade (as distinct from Stacked Rectangle).
Basilica
Longitudinal (not centralized) plan with a complex interior volume (as distinct from Hall/Assembly). Typically a long name, and may include side aisles (with distinct rooflines) and/or a semi-circular apse at the end.

Stacked Rectangle
Structure of relatively uniform height, built upwards with additional space (offices, school, etc.) in the space below the main room of worship. Lower story or stories may be partially or fully exposed above grade.

Cruciform
A building in the shape of a cross in plan, formed when transepts (transverse arms) cross the nave.

Other
Complex, stylized, and non-traditional building plans, including octagonal.

Rowhouse
A sacred place purposely built into the shared-wall fabric of the neighborhood. It may be attached or semi-attached.

The most dominant building type of HSPs was stacked rectangle; this structural form represents 283, or 34%, of the properties in the inventory. Notably, the stacked rectangle typology represents an even higher percentage—44%—of the adaptively reused properties: of those 82 HSPs, 36 buildings are classified with a stacked rectangle structural form. While there are many factors involved in the site selection for adaptive reuse projects, the disproportionate representation of this typology suggests that stacked rectangle buildings (in contrast to cruciform structures, for example) presents more attractive opportunities for adaptive reuse than any other building type. This may be due to the relative flexibility of the stacked rectangle’s simple floor plan, or to the scale of the building’s interior volume; this survey did not address the interior layout of the building. (It is therefore worth noting that 20 of the 39 vacant HSPs have a stacked rectangle form.)
The second most frequent building form identified in the field survey was cruciform—a common typology associated with historic sacred places. It is unsurprising, therefore, to find that 184 (or 22%) of the HSPs occupy a cruciform footprint. (Unsurprisingly, the complexity of this typology does not seem to lend itself to adaptive reuse, as only 13% of the adaptively reused properties have a cruciform building type.)

The hall (or assembly) building type applied to nearly as many properties as cruciform, as 182 extant HSPs have this building form. An additional 90 buildings (11%) have an asymmetrical or spread-out form, and 69 buildings (8%) are constructed with a basilica form. The least common building form was rowhouse, which represented only 5 (1%) of the full universe of HSPs in Philadelphia.

**Condition**

The field survey found that the majority of Philadelphia’s HSPs are in good or very good condition overall. This is surprising, as the common narrative of the city’s historic sacred places assumes that they are generally deteriorated and often in poor repair. Instead, this field survey found that for the vast majority of HSPs—781 sites, or 93% of the inventory—the primary exterior material was in fair or good condition. The field survey was limited to observations from public rights-of-way (including views from alleys, sidewalks, etc. that offered views to side and rear elevations). The survey duration varied based on the extent of conditions to document and the scale of the building or complex, but most surveys were conducted in an average of 30-40 minutes. Their findings are thus cursory but complete with respect to conditions visible from the street.

From these data points, a simple numerical index was created (see Section III-C), which assessed the severity of physical conditions at each property. The index suggests that 61 HSPs can be considered to be in very good condition overall, including 39 properties for which all features were visible from the public right-of-way (for example, the roof was not obscured from view) and positively characterized for all conditions. (An additional 22 properties exhibited entirely positive conditions for all visible features, but had at least one feature that was obscured from view so its condition thus could not be classified.)

Nevertheless, the vast majority of the city’s HSPs exhibit at least one negative condition—a total of 778 historic sacred places with physical conditions that range from untended property to significant roof deterioration. Of these properties, the most dominant deteriorated feature is windows/doors: 623 HSPs have windows or doors in fair (521) or poor (102) condition. Although the field survey did not attempt to count the number of properties with Plexiglas covers in place over windows (historic or otherwise), surveyors did note that such covers are prevalent on the city’s historic sacred places, and many are unvented. Moreover, in many cases, such covers are themselves often deteriorated, obscuring the condition of the windows that they cover. In addition to these identified issues with the
extant windows and doors, 121 properties (13%) have multiple boarded-up openings, in which the historic windows are either covered or replaced by temporary infill (e.g. plywood).

The second most pronounced conditions issue was related to the primary building envelope material (e.g. masonry, wood, vinyl): for 482 (57%) of HSPs, the primary material was in fair (426) or poor (56) condition. This includes the 39 HSPs with at least one bulging wall, as well as the 213 properties with visible cracks in the primary material. (The field survey did not attempt to classify the severity of the crack, nor was it possible to determine whether or not cracking was recent or structural in nature.) Twenty-one HSPs exhibit both a bulging wall and a visible crack. (Unsurprisingly, these properties also exhibit other negative conditions such as fair-poor windows or multiple boarded-up openings.)

The majority of roofs are in fair condition, representing 322 (or 38%) of HSPs. However, the roofs on 184 HSPs were not visible from the public right-of-way; their condition is thus unknown and unclassified. A total of 306 roofs (36%) are in very good or new condition (representing nearly as many properties as those known to have roofs in fair condition); of these 306 roofs, 219 are surfaced with asphalt shingle—suggesting that the roofs in very good condition have been replaced fairly recently and cost-effectively (and that they are likely not historically-listed buildings, since such replacement materials would generally be considered incompatible with the historic materials of a designated structure).

The 27 properties with roofs in poor condition exhibit missing sections of roof (9 HSPs), temporary roof patching (8 HSPs), and/or visible holes in the roof (7 properties). Seven of these 27 properties exhibit more than one negative condition on their roofs; one property exhibits all three conditions.

Drainage systems for the building presented a common concern for those properties with conditions issues: for 124 (15%) of the extant HSPs, the drainage system was detached in at least one area (e.g. downspout disconnected from a gutter). Though a simple fix, this indicates a level of care missing in a critical area of concern: preventing water damage and potential leaks. Additionally, the property was untended on 133 of the 839 HSPs. This generally reflects the presence of trash or debris, unmown grass, deteriorated steps, etc.

For those properties with negative conditions or building concerns, 7 HSPs had posted citations, while 27 HSPs had posted permits for building projects. Two properties had both citations and permits posted—presumably, the permits were secured in response to the citations. Overall, 49 HSPs had active work underway at the time of the field survey (including 14 of the properties with posted permits and 3 of the properties with posted citations).

NOTE: The survey also classified the overall architectural integrity and approximate count of vacant lots surrounding the HSP, but these categorizations may vary according to the surveyor.
IV. ARCHITECTURAL SURVEY
A. INTRODUCTION

The 22 interview sites offered an important opportunity to collect more information about HSPs than the field surveys permitted. We hoped to gather further insights about building conditions, adaptations, and ways interior spaces are used and/or shared, and these surveys were designed to complement the in-depth interviews that occurred simultaneously.

B. METHODOLOGY

Surveyors used two architectural survey forms (Appendix M): One with 114 possible fields for the Primary Building, construed as inclusive of the original main worship space, and another with 102 fields for any Secondary Building(s). Surveyors were asked to follow a detailed photo checklist and naming convention for photographic records (Appendix Q). After surveys were completed, most commonly using paper forms, the data were input into a running Excel spreadsheet and photos labeled, sorted and stored on the project server. Surveyors were also responsible for completing a summary of conditions observed. (See Section IV-D: Conditions Recaps)

C. SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS

Dr. Aaron Wunsch, an architectural historian and Assistant Professor in the Graduate Program in Historic Preservation at PennDesign, was part of the PennPraxis project team. The following are his summary observations, excerpted from a review of the collected Architectural Surveys, as well as interviews, at 22 interview sites.

Overview

The religious structures on which the most intensive part of the Penn Praxis research was conducted were well chosen. They exhibit a broad geographical and historical spread, and, to the extent that they concentrate more in some places and construction eras than others, this concentration remains representative of local church-building trends. It is reasonable, for instance, to study more churches in the city’s core than in its periphery because fewer churches are found in the latter. The temporal scope is justifiable, too. Between the Civil War and the Great Depression, much of American urban life outside the factory or store was organized around religious institutions. But this was also a period of rapid growth and change – the moment at which Philadelphia became a sprawling metropolis. The city had a tradition of religious pluralism from its founding (an important distinction from places like

7 For convenience, I will often use “church” as shorthand for “religious structure” or “historic sacred place” but it is certainly worth underscoring that such generic use of the term would be unpalatable to most non-Christian faiths and even to some Christian denominations, e.g. the Society of Friends.
Boston) and had obtained its current municipal boundaries in 1854. But it was over the next 75 years, in the age of the streetcar, the automobile, the department store, and the electrified factory and office building that the “Middle Class City” filled out.

The PennPraxis study focuses accordingly on the products of Philadelphia’s church-building heyday. It captures the polychromatic masonry structures of the High Victorian era (Shiloh Baptist, 19th Street Baptist), more spread-out and sedate complexes of a later date (Summit Presbyterian), traditional classicizing boxes (Urban Worship Center) and radical remodelings that defy easy stylistic classification (Preah Buddha Rangsey Temple). Many of these buildings have managed to accommodate demographic, theological, and economic changes in their membership – a full 45% of the entire set of HSPs do not house their original congregation. Not all HSPs have fared equally well; some buildings are now run down, others altered significantly from their original form and style. Yet the simple fact of their endurance – often after more than a century – is remarkable, and the ongoing functional value to congregations of reused HSPs should arguably be more celebrated that the integrity of original fabric and design.

Some Conclusions Based on the Architectural Surveys

1. The Paramount Importance of Spatial and Financial Flexibility

In reading through the 22 case studies, it is hard to miss the fact that most of the congregations that use these buildings are shrinking. However, their ability to adjust to that shift varies widely. Some may have an advantage that comes from being in wealthy or gentrifying neighborhoods (not every congregation can aspire to rent space to a theater company or yoga studio). On the other hand, those same conditions presumably make these buildings more vulnerable to purchase by an unsympathetic developer.

From our perspective, the more significant advantage may stem from a congregation’s ability to shuffle programmatic needs among a variety of spaces – thus, the importance of studying HSPs as complexes, not simply as landmark sanctuaries. When congregations shrink, they naturally seek out smaller worship spaces in Sunday schools, social halls, chapels, etc. Examples in our study include Shiloh Baptist, 19th Street Baptist, and St. Michael’s Lutheran, Kensington. Devereux Memorial, Summit Presbyterian, and Visitation BVM show signs of the same phenomenon, perhaps in its early stages.

Spatial flexibility apparently correlates only indirectly with the exterior form of a church complex. Depending on internal divisions, a “stacked rectangle” may contain as good an alternative worship space as a more spread-out complex in which programmatic functions are assigned to discrete buildings. But there may be dimensions to this distinction that we are missing. Do shrinking congregations prefer to worship in a smaller part of their main building, or would they move to a separate wing or structure if they could? It is hard to tell and will probably remain so without more targeted data and additional research.
In any case, it stands to reason that any congregation would want as many options as possible for making use of its spaces. This is as true of room configurations (note the drift toward movable pews or folding chairs in main sanctuaries) as it is of entire complexes. This might merit more detailed study. When trying to raise money, it surely helps to be able to rent out space to a performing-arts group and a residential tenant, as may be the case at the Church of the Crucifixion. Nor is there anything especially novel about this predicament. Church fathers surely debated which crops or tenants made the glebe most profitable a thousand years ago, and Trinity Church in Manhattan was, for a time, a leading real-estate developer and landlord in a city where rents have always been high. These were pragmatic decisions that depended heavily on local knowledge and resources, and knowledgeable engagement with real-estate processes and markets.

What may be urgent now is the need to assist congregations in figuring out how their long-term prospects align with their fixed assets. At 19th Street Baptist, for instance, the congregation finds itself owning multiple buildings and rowhouse lots in a rapidly gentrifying neighborhood. Should they sell some lots to satisfy short-term needs and keep others as long-term investments? Or should they adopt an all-or-nothing approach to all of their holdings? This is a difficult calculation because it simultaneously requires the skills of outside experts (financial planners, realtors, etc.) and involves questions of rootedness, memory, and the geographical distribution of members that lie at the core of a congregation’s identity. In any case, it seems fair to say that the more options a group has, the better. It may also be true that owning some rentable residential space is always advantageous. (There’s a reason tiny congregations have survived as “storefront churches” in rowhouses.) Finally, if a future study were to delve into such questions, it might examine which real estate decisions look wise in retrospect. When did Garden of Prayer COGIC (or the previous congregation) sell off its school building? Would it do so again now? Indeed, the liberty to make such decisions is itself worth studying. Baptist congregations, for the most part, have considerable autonomy to dispose of real estate, while Roman Catholic parishes do not. The implications of that distinction affect the resilience and vulnerability of HSPs in different faith traditions.

2. Form and Materials Are Important but Rarely Determinative

The data in this survey point to a reasonable conclusion about the role of building materials in a church’s durability: some materials hold up better than others. There is no question, for instance, that serpentine stone weathers poorly over time, even when maintained. When maintenance stops (see 19th Street Baptist), the results can be dire. Brownstone and sandstone may differ in quality, but their setting is at least as important. Vertical bed planes are a recipe for spalling; horizontal ones help keep buildings like Shiloh Baptist in good shape. (As a side note, it is worth observing that buildings with decaying stone veneers are not necessarily unsound; the rubble walls behind them are often quite solid unless exposed directly to water and the freeze-thaw cycle for extended periods.) None of this will come as a surprise to professional building conservators, nor will the structural risks and maintenance challenges of
tower, spires, finials, and other vertical protrusions. In all of these cases, maintenance is key and water penetration is pernicious. The devil is in the details of a building’s life. Regarding this overarching study, the great variety of physical forms, material types, and congregational abilities to address problems as they arise make further generalization difficult.

3. Skin-deep or Substantive? Interpreting Observed Conditions

The architectural survey does a good job of flagging major problems (structural cracks, holes in roof) and may offer key insights into their genesis. Deeper diagnoses of building pathologies takes a trained eye and careful, individual study. There are a few cases, however, where future study might better establish the seriousness of conditions observed in this study. (Even if all the data collectors in this project were professional building inspectors, their opinions on conditions would differ.) For instance, does Summit Presbyterian’s dirtiness point to larger issues or is it purely cosmetic? These questions are critical when considered against current regulatory issues in Philadelphia – notably, the lack of specialized HSP expertise among surveyors from the Department of Licenses and Inspections, and their related readiness to categorize HSPs as “imminently dangerous.”

In a related vein, some apparently problematic conditions may actually be assets. The sun-damaged plexiglass at Holy Apostles and Sanctuary Church is a case in point. At 19th Street Baptist, the stained-glass windows that received such protection are in far better shape than those lacking it. A change that superficially reduces integrity may actually increase it overall.

A more interesting branch of this line of inquiry involves changes that compromise “integrity” more directly. Campbell AME has lost its historic finishes. The same is true of Preah Buddha Rangsey Temple, which has been partially re-clad and appears to be a modified church. The preservation field fetishizes original building fabric, but a religious structure’s “resilience” may hinge on its ability to change (including change that alters or eliminates some original fabric). While the philosophical and theoretical preservation issues at stake here are beyond the scope of this study, they should be acknowledged because they help shape decision-making about preservation listing, about restoration design, and of course about investment decisions. If nothing else, a word of caution about the double-edged nature of architectural “integrity” may be in order.

A final category in need of further exploration is biogrowth. This label covers everything from fungi on the surface of masonry to trees growing out of roofs and mortar joints; in other words, some biogrowth is benign, others signal serious issues in need of conservation attention. In future investigations, a finer breakdown and glossary of biogrowth conditions should be employed to better correlate specific conditions with the levels of risk/urgency they pose.
4. **The Importance of Tipping-Point Repairs**

As someone who has worked directly on the sorts of buildings in this survey, I am struck by the urgency of what appear to be tipping-point situations. Loose or misaligned downspouts or gutters (such as those identified at Urban Worship Center and Garden of Prayer) are small things to fix but lead to big problems if neglected. The same is true of trees that take root in mortar or on roofs. If a group of volunteers or a small non-profit organization had access to a mechanical lift and proper insurance, many potential crises could be nipped in the bud by carrying out simple repairs and maintenance before they reach the tipping point of a major failure or capital project. Conveying guidance and material support on such issues to congregational leaders would make an interesting and useful advocacy project.

**Some Conclusions Based on the Interviews**

1. **Tension between Spiritual and Material Values Inevitable but not a Cause for Despair**

   In the age of the internet, social media, ongoing population shifts, and social fragmentation outlined by scholars such as Robert Putnam, it might be reasonable to ask if massive religious structures from the last two centuries are more of a burden than blessing to the communities of believers that use them. Among those interviewed, there are clearly doubters (e.g. Campbell AME). However, based on Philadelphia’s body of evidence, it is striking how much emphasis continues to be placed on the value of the building itself. Some interviewees stressed the importance of spiritual community -- an abstraction, to be sure, but one clearly tied to the assembly of bodies in a particular space (see, for instance, B’nai Abraham). The genius loci of purpose-built sacred places is an old idea in most religious traditions and does not seem to be easily supplanted by online forms of interaction. Other interviewees lauded more concrete architectural qualities: their building’s physical, historical, and symbolic significance, not just to members, but to the public at large (see: United Missionary Baptist, St. John the Baptist, B’nai Abraham); one perceptive interviewee went so far as to suggest that “using” and “stewarding” the building were central to its **religious** function for members (Liberti).

   In one sense, none of this is surprising. People who have come together for a common spiritual purpose, and done so for a long time, understandably value the setting for that experience. Yet this information does tend to counter the fashionable suggestion that electronic “communities” will inevitably replace face-to-face ones. It also tends to undermine the simplistic charge that preservationists value “buildings” over “people.” As the ambiguous term “church” itself implies, the two categories are often inextricable – we use it to refer to the building as well as the group of worshipers.

2. **“Change” is Central but Ineffable**
“Change” was an important topic in many of the interviews, and that in itself is significant. The prospect of change and related estimations of a congregation’s receptiveness to it are clearly sources of anxiety for many interviewees, and for good reason. As mentioned above, the sheer massiveness and potential inflexibility of an old masonry building might strike an evolving congregation as an obstacle or deadweight (Lifeway Baptist). But beyond this sort of straightforward challenge, the meaning of “change” gets murky. The kinds of challenges facing an established African-American congregation in a rapidly gentrifying inner-city neighborhood (19th Street Baptist) are quite different from those faced by a white congregation in a relatively stable and suburban part of the city, or even in a dense, old neighborhood where gentrification has made little headway (Lifeway Baptist). “Change” also need not amount to liberalization. While Holy Apostles’ interviewee associates the term with multiculturalism and Visitation BVM’s with multilingualism, B’nai Abraham’s connects it to greater orthodoxy.

In light of all this, the interview coding and analysis elsewhere in this study takes on greater significance. Understanding what kinds of change, different attitudes toward change, and how responses to change can both support resilience and reveal vulnerability is important to governing these HSPs individually or as a group.

In subsequent rounds of inquiry, drilling more deeply into the kinds of change HSP leadership faces vis-à-vis building stewardship, future research should explore more narrowly defined categories, such as specific theological, demographic, cultural, geographical, and architectural changes. These may be interrelated, but their differences are as acute. Likewise, Stephanie Boddie’s analysis (elsewhere in this study; see Appendix V) elaborates very specific manifestations of change most urgent to congregational leaders.

The abstract definition of change employed in this study provides a different kind of information, but this may be useful nonetheless. When change is framed in this way, its very abstraction seems to make it more menacing, prompting some interviewees to describe their churches as sanctuaries from it (Devereux Methodist). Before embracing openness to “change” as an unalloyed good, future users of this study would be wise to remember that perspective, too.

3. The Importance of Networks.

Like “change,” the concept of “resilience” should be specified to make it more meaningful and useful. Congregational and architectural resilience are probably related, but they are obviously not the same thing. If there is one concept that comes close to bridging them, it is likely that of the network. A passing reference to the Northwest Interfaith Movement (Summit Presbyterian) underscores the importance of trans-denominational support networks for some urban congregations. Establishing networks within a particular denomination is a more common notion of congregational or faith networks and is important, especially when those denominations come from a tradition of loose hierarchy or diffuse organizational structure (e.g. Baptists) as opposed to more hierarchical
(e.g., Roman Catholic). Finally, among extra-congregational networks, we should recognize the value of collaborations with non-religious institutions (e.g., universities) and professions (e.g., architecture), as exemplified by 19th Street Baptist. That church’s interviewee might also have highlighted the importance of internal networks and skill sets. Congregants who work in the building trades or are good with their hands can be rallied; in some cases, their places of worship might have vanished without their help (Visitation BVM).

Conclusion: A Promising Category for Future Investigation

With the exception of Preah Buddha Rangsey Temple, the architectural survey lacks buildings that have passed entirely from one major faith to another. (Several surveyed buildings passed from one Christian denomination to another.) As mentioned above, such instances challenge us to take up questions of integrity vs. resilience. These are important questions and will probably become more so over time. In Europe, for instance, it is possible to find Greek temples that have been rebuilt as mosques and churches through the ages. If some American religious structures prove worthy of such long-term adaptation, which will they be and why? While one could probably identify many such cases in the Philadelphia area, I would like to propose future study of two prominent ones:

Phat Quang Buddhist Temple (formerly Emanuel German Evangelical Lutheran Church)
Address: 1001 S. 4th Street
Built: 1869
Architect: Collins & Autenreith
http://www.qvna.org/qvna/venue/phat-quang-buddhist-temple/

AICP Mosque (formerly St. Andrews Methodist Episcopal Church)
Address: 4431 Walnut St.
Built: ca. 1922
Architect: C. E. Schermerhorn
http://m.philaplace.org/story/958/
D. CONDITIONS RECAPS
Date of Survey: August 18, 2015

Critical conditions issues:
- Wood window frames in poor condition; wood doors in fair to poor condition
- Extensive cracking and mortar loss on all elevations; areas of masonry cladding loss
- Water infiltration and damage throughout interior
- Evidence of pigeons roosting in sanctuary

19th Street Baptist Church is composed of two buildings of roughly equal size and shape, connected by an enclosed passageway on the east end of the complex. The primary building is the northern of the two. This building was long used for worship, but due to significant conditions issues is currently used only for storage of building materials and as a worksite when active repairs are happening.

The serpentine stone exterior cladding of both the main and secondary buildings shows expansive and significant deterioration. Some areas of the main building exhibit complete loss of the serpentine stone, with the underlying rubble wall exposed. The main building has faced significant damage from a previous roof failure, leading to extensive water infiltration. The roof has since been repaired or patched helping the interior conditions not to worsen. The interior exhibits significant damage around the windows, and on the ceiling and floors.

The main building is currently unused due to the building conditions issues, but it is apparent that when it was used it was a beautiful and inspiring space. The wood truss system appears stable and allows an expansive view of the sanctuary. The stained glass is mostly intact, and many of the original building materials have been saved for reuse during restoration.
Date of Survey: August 18, 2015

The secondary building is in fairly good condition, despite a few issues. Some water infiltration is apparent around the windows on the first floor, likely due to a compromised wood window frame. The primary worship space for the church is located on the second floor of the secondary building. This building also contains offices for the pastor, business manager, and small group meetings. The stained glass windows in this building are covered, at times, by plastic sheeting on the interior. This is for insulation purposes, not due to water infiltration.

The worship space in the secondary building is free of support columns, allowing for great flexibility in the rooms usage. Seating is chairs which can be easily moved. Aside from the platform from which sermons are delivered, the room is open and easily modifiable. There is a restroom adjacent to the worship space, and this building is air-conditioned. The room receives abundant natural light. A chair lift has been installed for accessibility to the second floor. The pastor mentioned a future plan to add a chair lift or other ADA modification for access into the building, as the front stairs are currently not accessible.

The pastor’s office features a number of very personal artistic creations, from church and community members. His carved wood desk was passed down to him from the former pastor.
B’nai Abraham has a stacked rectangle design and is constructed with brick exterior walls and terra cotta trim. The building occupies nearly the entire footprint of the site, with no site features and neighboring parking lots on its east and west elevations. Its primary entrance is at ground level on the south elevation, with a prominent porch above.

The primary elevation features yellow-brick walls in fair-good condition, while the secondary exterior walls are red brick and in fair condition. The masonry exhibits efflorescence and staining, particularly on the secondary elevations. Doors and windows are in fair-good condition, depending on the elevation; some frames on west elevation were being repaired at time of survey. Drainage is intact. The roof is not visible from the street and could not be assessed.

The interior has a limited number of rooms other than the primary worship space, which are concentrated on the lower level and are well used and well kept by the preschool program and temple activity. The building’s primary conditions issues relate to water infiltration, as seen on the sanctuary ceiling and in the southwest and southeast stairwells (where the building sprung a leak several years ago).
The property features two buildings: the primary, historic church building and a house that functions as the church offices; this office building is detached from the church but attached to an unrelated house. The primary building is constructed in a stacked rectangle design with stucco walls and a (non-historic) metal roof. A small burial ground is located on the north side of the property. The site is generally well-maintained, with mown grass and tended plants.

The exterior exhibits staining and some biogrowth. Moreover, cracks are visible on several elevations, particularly around windows and above the second story. Most (if not all) of the walls appear to bulge somewhat. The wood eaves are in good condition, but the wood trim is rotting in areas, and the paint is peeling in various locations. The windows are in fair condition overall. The first floor windows are non-historic and have exterior storm windows. The second floor window frames are peeling and rotting in areas; the glass is somewhat intact. The roof is new, with no visible failures.

The interior of the primary building features a limited number of rooms (primarily the fellowship hall and kitchen on the first floor, and the sanctuary on the second floor). It is well used by the church for religious worship and a feeding program. The sanctuary has evidence of water damage around the windows. Finishes are non-historic.
Church of the Crucifixion is a single asymmetrical building with entrances on both South 8th Street and Bainbridge Street. The building features a large sanctuary, which is accessible via Bainbridge Street, and parish house, office, theater, and chapel, which are accessible via South 8th Street. A large basement is mostly unused, aside from some space devoted to systems and storage. The west exterior elevation is decorated with mosaic ceramic, in the style of Isaiah Zagar.

The building is not actively used for services due to ongoing maintenance and repair.

The building exterior is in fair condition, some vertical cracking in the bricks is apparent, along with efflorescence and spalling. Some areas of mortar are missing.

The parish house portion of the building has several areas with severe conditions issues. Conducting the building survey on a day with heavy rainfall made apparent at least five areas of significant roof failures, allowing extensive water infiltration into the building interior. Two leaks were located in the chapel, one each in two adjacent 2nd story rooms, and one in the theater over the seating area. There were standing water puddles in the basement during our site visit, which grew throughout our time there.

The interior of the sanctuary is in fairly good condition, though there is deflection apparent in the wood trusses. The sanctuary had no seating set up at the time of the survey, but pews were being stored in an adjacent room. Stained glass windows in the sanctuary are in good condition, and notably, have been altered to reflect darker skin tones on the figures represented. The pastor noted that the roof of the sanctuary had recently been replaced, but did not specify the date of replacement. A performance group, Luna Theater, occupied the theater and an adjacent room. During my visit, they were mid-run in a Fringe Arts Festival performance. The pastor mentioned an apartment being part of the building, but I was not allowed access to it.
Devereux United Methodist is a single cruciform building, plus a low corner tower, with its primary elevation facing West Allegheny Avenue. The building features a large sanctuary, a fellowship area and offices on the main floor. The basement level has a bi-level social hall and large commercial kitchen as well as multiple storage closets.

The building exterior is in good condition, some cracking and separation of the mortar from the granite is apparent. A large ivy vine is covering the one of the east walls, growing behind the fenced in air-conditioning unit.

The interior of the sanctuary is in fairly good condition. There is some water damage apparent around a few of the stained glass windows. The stained glass windows appear to be in good repair.

The fellowship area offers a flexible space adjacent to the sanctuary. Downstairs, the large social hall appears to be actively used for a variety of church and community events.
First Christian Assembly is a two building complex. The primary building is a two-story, brick building with a hall form, located on the southwest corner of S. 11th and Mifflin with its primary elevation facing east. The secondary building is a three-story converted row house, on the northwest corner of S. 11th and Mifflin Streets, with its entry facing S. 11th Street.

The exterior of the primary building is in fair condition. Areas of widespread delamination and efflorescence are apparent. A large ivy vine is growing on the rear elevation and needs attention immediately to prevent serious damage to the building.

The primary building features a large sanctuary, an office, a sound booth, and a small gathering space on the main floor. The sanctuary once had a balcony, but this space is in poor condition and has been walled off from the sanctuary. A drop ceiling has been installed with pressed metal inserts. The drop ceiling was constructed as a way to lower utility costs, according to the pastor, and was constructed by a member of the church. Almost all of the church's original stained glass has been removed and replaced with clear glass blocks. The remaining stained glass is located above the entry doors on the primary elevation, and above one door on the north elevation. The pastor noted that two of the stained glass windows were sold to someone from Texas. The rest was disposed of.

The balcony level features cast iron columns, to which the wood truss system is connected. Extensive water damage is apparent in the balcony, primarily in the northeast corner of the space. This section of the building looks to have had a tower at one point.

The basement level has a social hall and large kitchen, as well as a classroom for Sunday school. Portions of the basement floor are extremely uneven, specifically noticeable in the kitchen. This is an indication of a potentially serious issue with the foundation, but an engineer would need to evaluate.

The secondary building is a converted rowhouse. The building houses the church's Philadelphia Access Center, a social services non-profit. This building is clad in brick and stucco. The interior has little original architectural detail. Multiple offices and conference rooms are contained in the building, with storage space in the basement.
The church occupies 2 of the 3 original buildings in this formerly Catholic complex; the former school building is now separately owned and occupied as apartments. (It was not available for interior survey.) The church has a cruciform design and is constructed with brick exterior walls and terra-cotta tile roofs. It features planting beds and small grassy areas around the building, with a small paved lot between the primary and secondary buildings.

The exterior exhibits significant mortar loss and staining. Drainage is detached in areas and causing extensive damage to brick. The doors/windows on the primary elevation are in fair condition, but secondary elevation windows are in poor condition, with bowing/sagging glass. One pane is broken. The roof is in fair condition, with some broken or loose tiles but intact material overall. Vines grow on the south elevation and there is a tree growing in gutter at rear.

The interior of the primary building is minimally used in colder months due to heating issues in the large sanctuary. There is water damage evident throughout, including stains, peeling paint, and furry plaster on walls and around windows. Floors are damaged in areas. Storage is cluttered and includes hazardous materials (e.g. lawnmower and gasoline). Restrooms are in poor condition with inoperable plumbing. Some alterations affect integrity.
The administration building is associated with the current church and functions as church offices and vacant space. The former school is under separate ownership and completely separated from the church by fencing. Both buildings are freestanding three-story structures.

The administration building has brick exterior walls with limestone trim. Exterior conditions include efflorescence, significant mortar loss, staining, cracking (in porte cochere), and detached drainage. Windows are non-historic and in fair condition. The roof is not visible. The school building is in significantly better condition than both the church and the administration building. It has brick exterior walls, and its roof is not visible. It exhibits minimal staining in areas. Drainage is properly attached and no major structural issues are evident.

The lower floors of the administration building are used by the church for worship, meeting, and office space. The building had heating issues on the day of survey (the gas oven was open to heat the kitchen). The third floor is currently vacant, with debris and extensive conditions issues and unfinished repair projects. Wiring in the basement was hazardous. The school building was inaccessible.
The property has two buildings connected by a hyphen at the first story. The primary building has a cruciform design, schist exterior walls, and limestone trim. The buildings are surrounded by small grassy areas and planting beds, with hedges and some chain-link fencing around the perimeter of the property. The site is well maintained.

Masonry conditions on the primary building include spalling, staining, and significant mortar loss in various areas throughout the exterior. The windows are in poor condition, with glass sagging in most units. Murky plexiglass obscures the windows. Drainage is detached in some places. Tower conditions seem equivalent to other walls. The roof is not visible.

The primary building includes the sanctuary, which is used by the primary congregation and by a second congregation that rents the space on Sunday afternoon. Most interior space is in the secondary building. The interior of the sanctuary has extensive, dark staining and efflorescence throughout; conditions appear to relate to roofing condition rather than window seals.
Date of Survey: November 19, 2015

Critical conditions issues:
- Detached gutters/downspouts in areas
- Window repairs

The secondary building (education wing) is a 2.5-story addition to the primary building. It features red-brick exterior walls and limestone trim.

Masonry exhibits efflorescence, spalling, significant mortar loss, and staining on all elevations. Windows are in poor condition, with deteriorated metal frames and major cracking in tracery. Glass needs repairs and is non-historic. The roof is not visible.

The education wing includes the church’s offices, classrooms, and a large Sunday School hall/stage at the second floor. A basement gym is used by local rec leagues and community groups. There are areas of water stains on the interior, and there is possible timber deflection at one end of the Sunday School hall. Building is tidy overall, although unused spaces at basement and second floor are cluttered.
Liberti Church has an irregular form, with a centralized-plan sanctuary section and a stacked rectangle education section; the two sections are fully interconnected. Exterior walls are gneiss, with brownstone trim. The building is constructed to the lot line and has no site features.

The building was under extensive renovations at time of survey. The masonry has some mortar loss and staining, but is in generally good condition. Windows (in worse condition than the doors) are in fair condition; frames and glass need some repairs. The asphalt shingle roof is in very good condition with no visible issues. Renovation plans do not include significant exterior alterations.

With the exception of the sanctuary, nearly the entire building was under construction at time of survey. Most rooms were active construction zones, with associated debris and minimal use as a result. Sanctuary has water damage, including staining, furry plaster, and peeling paint. Rehab plans include renovation of kitchen and some offices/classrooms; construction is phased.
Date of Survey: April 28, 2016

Critical conditions issues:
- Deflecting timbers in sanctuary
- Cracking and peeling stucco on secondary building (particularly north elevation)

The property features two attached buildings: the primary building, constructed in a stacked rectangle design with brownstone walls and a tower (its upper portion faced with vinyl siding); and the secondary building, a single-story stucco structure that abuts the rear elevation of the church. Together, the buildings occupy an L-shaped footprint with a small grassy area behind that is small but tended. The property includes a parking lot.

The exterior is in generally fair-good condition. The brownstone exhibits spalling and some cracking, but stone appears to be stable and cracks have generally been patched (sometimes with incompatible mortar). The first-floor doors and windows are non-historic and new. The second-story windows (corresponding with the sanctuary on the interior) are historic and in fair condition; their wood frames need repairs and are covered with exterior storm windows. The drainage is almost entirely intact and properly connected; one downspout on the secondary building is detached. The roof is new, with asphalt shingles that are designed to resemble slate.

The interior of the primary building is very well-maintained and in generally good condition. However, all of the timbers in the sanctuary appear to deflect toward the pulpit. (These timbers and the wood ceiling are character-defining features of the building.) The interior is otherwise in good condition, with little to no water damage around windows or on walls.

The interior of the secondary building is also in very good condition. It has been renovated in recent years with all new finishes. The secondary building is divided into just two rooms at the first floor: the large fellowship room, used for youth programs and congregational activity, and the large kitchen.
The church has a stacked rectangle form and schist exterior walls, with a large tower at the northeast corner. The site has a small parking lot on its west side, and planting beds and grass surround the church on its west, north, and south sides.

The church’s schist walls and tower are extensively stained. The masonry also exhibits spalling, and vines are growing on the north elevation. Windows are in fair-poor condition, with frames that need repairs. Eight windows are broken or missing. The asphalt shingle roof is stained, and shingles look worn. Damage/patching are evident at the north end, near the tower.

The interior is well used, both by the church and by the Powell School (including basement classrooms). Building is tidy and clean, but significant conditions and structural issues are evident in the sanctuary, including water damage throughout and deflecting timbers/structural deformities on the north wall of the sanctuary, near the tower.

Date of Survey: November 9, 2015

Critical conditions issues:
- Roof failures near tower, with associated cracking/deflecting timbers on interior of sanctuary
- Window repairs
The three-story church office building is connected to the primary building at the first story, and the two buildings share an elevator. It features brick exterior walls with wood trim and features, including a porch on the primary elevation.

The exterior is stained, and some wood trim/features are rotting; the porch is in relatively good condition. The brick needs repointing. Windows and doors are in fair condition, although the frames and glass are intact. The asphalt shingle roof is in very good condition, with no visible roof failures.

The first floor is well used as church offices, and is clean and maintained. Some water infiltration was evident, with some staining, peeling paint, and furry plaster. The second and third floors were inaccessible for survey.
Date of Survey: October 4, 2015

Character-defining features:
- Position, siting, and landscape on prominent corner
- Spacious interior

Our Lady of Lourdes is a three building Catholic Church complex. The main building is a cruciform plan stone structure with a large finished basement. There is also a former convent used for offices and a rectory.

A well maintained lawn fills the space between the main building and the rectory. Placed here are two memorial stones and a statue dedicated to Pope John Paul II. The lawn is open on all sides and available for public use.

The administrative offices are located about one and a half blocks away in what was the church’s convent. The three-story stone building is situated on a gated parcel.

The three buildings are all very well maintained. Only minor conditions issues were noted. The east side of the main building exhibits some cracked mortar, but visible repairs have been made to maintain the condition. A very small shrub was seen sprouting from a chimney on the main building.

The rectory’s porch and stairs are wood, and show slight wear.

The spacious sanctuary features a rib vault system, decorative painting on the plaster surfaces, and colorful stained glass windows. The basement level of the main building is used as a social hall, as well as a space for community meetings, after school programs, and wedding receptions. A grotto chapel is also on the basement level, and features a small space for silent worship and prayer. The chapel has a punch-code entry system and is available to worshipers 24 hours a day.

A passageway connects the main building to the rectory. The three-story rectory contains a small chapel for daily use by members of the clergy. There are also intimate parlors, a dining room, a spacious kitchen, and private bedrooms.
The temple features a three-story stacked rectangle primary building, with granite and stucco walls, and a three-story red-brick secondary building. The primary and secondary structures are entirely interconnected on the interior. The site features a large courtyard at the north end of the parcel, and a wall/fence surrounds the perimeter of the property.

The primary structure has been reconstructed at the third story, where the primary elevation features stucco walls. The north elevation has been entirely resurfaced in a non-historic material. The building exhibits significant and extensive mortar loss, and the east elevation has cracking throughout. The rear section of the building (at west) appears to have structural deformities. All doors and windows are non-historic.

The interior is very clean and well-kept, and is well used by the Vietnamese Buddhist community. Interior features are minimal, with generally open floor plans that are used for worship and communal gatherings. All finishes are non-historic (although historic finishes and conditions may be intact behind). The third floor of the secondary building was inaccessible for survey.

Date of Survey: January 18, 2016

Critical conditions issues:
- Cracking in masonry on east elevation and piers
- Rear (west) section skewed, with possible bulge in wall
St. John the Baptist is a Catholic Church complex located at the corner of Rector and Cresson Streets in the Manayunk neighborhood of Philadelphia. The complex includes: a main sanctuary building with a semi-subterranean social hall, a convent, two school buildings, a rectory, and a burial ground.

The stone exterior is in fair condition, with some areas showing much more damage than others. The tower at the northwest corner of the building is surrounded by scaffolding under which is a protected walking path, and repairs to secure the tower are ongoing. Some vegetation is growing on the tower.

The main building features a large sanctuary with a barrel vault, an organ loft with the second largest pipe organ in the City of Philadelphia, and a triforium. Under the sanctuary, a large social hall with commercial kitchen accommodates many neighborhood and church events. The sanctuary has a particularly beautiful rib vault system, that appears to be in good condition with only some minor paint chipping apparent.

The highly ornamented altar and statuary around the perimeter of the sanctuary are among the highlights of the space. At one time, attempts were made to alter the sound of the pipe organ, so holes were cut into many of the pipes. A current member of the church is collecting replacement pipes to repair this damage. These pipes are stored throughout the organ loft and triforium.
Two school buildings are adjacent to the main building. To the rear of the main building is the former convent, which is currently vacant. Across Rector Street, the rectory stands as a markedly different building. It is the only brick structure on the campus, which contrasts with the stone buildings across the street.

The burial ground wraps around the buildings, filling the rest of the city block. Some headstones have fallen, or are experiencing displacement. Other headstones are unreadable due to their age and deteriorated stone conditions. The burial ground is normally locked; a key was needed for access. A small grotto is set into an alcove of the cemetery, facing Rector Street. This stone grotto has a low unlocked fence and a statue inside. Adjacent to the rectory is a larger grotto, featuring colorfully painted statuary. This grotto is situated behind a high fence.

The exterior of the convent shows significant vegetation growing on the rear elevation. Access to the interior of the convent was not granted during our site visit. The rectory has some serious conditions issues on the exterior; vertical cracking in brick support columns; significant mortar loss; and badly deteriorated wood bases on the Ionic columns on the front elevation.

The lower school (closest to the main building) appears to be for younger pupils. The first and second floors feature well-lit classrooms and hardwood floors in the classrooms. The basement and third floors were inaccessible during my visit.

The upper school appears to be used for older pupils. The gymnasium and stage were in use as furniture storage. The kitchen appears to be in poor condition, and some walls near the kitchen show extensive plaster damage from water infiltration. This building offers an elevator for ADA accessibility. A double-loaded corridor leads to each floors’ classrooms. The classrooms are spacious, carpeted, with large windows.
St. Michael's is a brick building with a stacked rectangle form. The church is generally built to the lot line, with no major site features or open space. The perimeter is swept and maintained. An ADA ramp leads to an entrance on the secondary elevation.

The church's asphalt shingle roof is in fair condition, with some patches (not temporary). The masonry exhibits efflorescence, spalling, and staining in areas, including the primary elevation. There are also areas of mortar loss on the primary and secondary elevations, and the wood trim has peeling paint throughout. There are no major structural issues visible, such as cracks or bulges. The doors and windows look better on the interior of the building than on the exterior, where they are in fair condition. Many windows/doors are non-historic and obscured by heavy screens.

The building is well-used by both the congregation and several short- and long-term space-sharers, including Rock to the Future, Greensgrow Kitchens, Alcoholics Anonymous, yoga classes, etc. One room is being converted to coworking space. The building has two worship spaces: the historic sanctuary, which is generally used by Rock to the Future now; and a smaller chapel, which serves as the congregation's worship space. There are some water infiltration issues visible around several windows on the interior. In general, the interior is actively used and tidy. The congregation has undertaken several repair projects in recent years to upgrade the condition of their building, although it continues to be in better condition on the interior than on the exterior. Interior alterations include the downsizing of the main sanctuary's balcony, and the installation of a non-historic suspended ceiling.
The property features three attached buildings: the primary church building, constructed in a cruciform design with limestone walls and a large tower; the two-story education wing, with limestone construction; and the 2.5-story parish house, with limestone construction. Together, the buildings occupy a U-shaped footprint around a small grassy lawn/gardens and a small paved area. The site has some debris throughout, but plants are generally tended.

The exterior exhibits spalling, missing stone, mortar loss, and staining, particularly at the piers, as well as some cracking on the primary elevation near the base. The doors and windows are generally non-historic; murky plexiglass obscures the windows. The drainage is not directed away from the building. The roof is in very good condition, with no visible failures.

The interior of the primary building is well used by the church for religious worship and church offices. The sanctuary has evidence of water damage, including stains on the walls and around windows. The upper portion of the sanctuary walls were reconstructed after a fire in the 1980s. The beams at the rear of the sanctuary may deflect; this could not be confirmed.
The three buildings are architecturally consistent on the exterior and are interconnected on the interior.

The education wing has a crack in the masonry near the entrance, and spalling, staining, missing stone, and mortar loss in areas throughout—particularly at the piers. The windows of the education wing are in fair condition; the doors are non-historic and in good condition. The roof of the education wing is not visible.

The education wing is in better use and condition than the parish house, but both buildings had significant interior conditions issues on the day of survey. The education wing has a large Sunday School hall that is used as a secondary worship space; the building's other rooms are generally inactive. The Sunday School hall has deflecting timbers and a sagging ceiling at the west wall. Water damage is evident throughout, and there was a burst pipe and active leaks on the day of survey. The parish house is almost entirely inactive and in poor repair.

Date of Survey: January 28, 2016

Critical conditions issues:
- Burst pipe and active leaks on day of survey
- Deflecting timber/sagging roof at rear of Sunday School hall (west wall)
Critical conditions issues:

- Tree growing over the main door of the sanctuary
- Extensive areas of water/moisture damage on interior

Building complex features the primary building (the oldest on site), which was expanded through a series of six building campaigns, resulting in an interconnected interior maze taking the outward form of an U-shaped building with a central courtyard. For the purposes of this survey, the primary building was considered as what appeared (from the interior) to be the original rectangular building including rooms that appear original. All of the interconnected building additions are counted as the secondary building. The primary building forms the western portion of the U and the secondary building forms the connection and eastern portion of the U.

In the primary building, notable architectural features include the memorial stained glass windows which are well-maintained, the carved wood stair rails and sides, leaded glass windows separating the entry lobby from the sanctuary, and the organ pipes situated on both sides of the altar.

The primary building had a fairly recent roof replacement, which is helping the interior conditions not to worsen. However, conditions issues in the sanctuary need to be resolved. The extensive paint peeling/flaking requires intensive cleanup of the space prior to any new use. Past water damage is apparent in some portions of the ceiling. The wood truss system shows significant deflection and damage. This has been mitigated by a steel truss system that supports the weight of the roof, but diminishes the beauty and view that the wood truss system allowed.
Date of Survey: August 3, 2015

Critical conditions issues (additional bldgs):
- Roof failures in portions of the secondary building, specifically the gymnasium and stairwell leading to Junk Acrobatics rehearsal space, are leading to water infiltration issues. Currently these failures are being managed, but the mechanisms in place are not long-term solutions.

The secondary structure is the center of most of the activity at Shiloh Baptist Church. Some areas of the building are in excellent condition, obviously maintained and used. Some areas of moderate use are in need of maintenance and upkeep. Extensive portions of the building are used as storage space. The secondary building offers a variety of rooms that could be better used, as they are a variety of sizes and configurations. If the storage items were consolidated into one space, and conditions issues resolved, the building would offer a variety of flexible spaces for a broad range of possible uses.

The secondary building features a number of beautiful spaces and architectural features. The stairs, handrails, and paneling are all wood and most are extremely well maintained. This portion of the building features a library with built in cabinetry storing all of the books in individual slots; many of the books are quite old.

The former Sunday School room is now used as rehearsal space for Junk acrobatics company. This room features high ceilings with an open central volume and a beautiful dark-wood truss system that appears to be in very good condition. Many of the truss beams feature painted patterns and symbols that appear to be original to the space. The gallery level of this room features numerous small rooms that are open to the central volume, but are otherwise enclosed. These small rooms are mostly used for storage presently, but have great potential to serve as flexible rental space, perhaps even a co-working setting.

Connected to the Sunday School room/rehearsal space is a former gymnasium featuring high ceilings. This space is now used for storage, and the roof is exhibiting multiple failures resulting in water damage. The only mitigation that appears to be in place for this water infiltration are plastic children’s pools placed under the major leaks.
The site features two interconnected buildings: the primary church building, with schist construction, a stacked rectangle form, and a tower; and the three-story schist education building. The buildings occupy an L-shaped footprint around a grassy lawn, and planting beds surround the site. The property is well-signed for its many outside space-sharers.

The masonry exhibits spalling, significant mortar loss, and staining throughout. The tower has clearly had structural issues that were repaired recently with incompatible patching. Some cracking still exists at the northeast elevation and at various buttresses (where mortar loss is also concentrated). A wood porch on the side elevation is in fair condition. Windows are in poor condition. The asphalt shingle roof is in fair condition, with some sagging sections.

The interior of the primary building consists of the sanctuary at the second floor, with classrooms and mechanical rooms at the first floor. The sanctuary has water stains, peeling paint, and furry plaster on walls and around some windows. The sanctuary floors, seating, electrical conditions, etc. are otherwise in good condition. In general, the primary building interior is a little dirty, but well-kept and maintained overall.

Date of Survey: November 12, 2015

Critical conditions issues:
- Window repairs
- Masonry repointing, stone loss, and cracking in buttresses
The education wing was added to the sanctuary building after its original construction. The two structures are architecturally consistent on the exterior and fully interconnected on the interior.

The masonry of the education wing is in generally better condition than that of the primary building, with fewer indications of mortar loss evident. There is some cracking at the second floor over the entrance. The windows on this section have metal frames, which are in fair condition and need repairs. The slate shingle roof is in fair condition, with some missing shingles.

The education wing is very well used and is occupied by several exclusive-use tenants, including nonprofits and community organizations. The church offices and meeting rooms are at the second floor. The interior is generally tidy and maintained, although there is evidence of water infiltration in some rooms.
The church has one building (including a smaller addition at the southeast corner) and an adjacent garden/lawn in the northeast corner of the property. The structure has a stacked rectangle form and granite walls with limestone trim. The garden is enclosed by a chain-link fence.

The masonry is in good condition overall, although various areas need repointing. The doors and windows are in fair condition; several windows have bowing or sagging glass. The asphalt shingle roof is in fair condition, with some missing shingles, sagging, and patches concentrated on the west end.

The church is used for religious use, with no evidence of outside space-sharers. Water damage is evident in the sanctuary, and the truss system deflects in several areas of the sanctuary and adjacent stairwells, where the wall bulges and the timbers are pulling away from the wall. Most rooms are well kept and generally tidy.
United Missionary Baptist is a single hall building with its primary elevation facing North 25th Street. The building features a large sanctuary, and an office on the main floor. The basement level has a social hall and large commercial kitchen. A second level containing a small room currently used for storage, and a chapel currently used for storage is at the rear of the church.

The building exterior is in fair condition, some cracking and separation of the mortar from the granite is apparent. There are three areas of biogrowth that need urgent attention. On the south elevation, a large vine has engulfed the area and is expanding along the walls of the church. On the east elevation, a tree is growing either out of or adjacent to a drainage pipe. On the north elevation, a small tree is sprouting from a seam in the cast stone trim. Detached drainage systems are apparent around the building. The wood trim around the windows needs repainting, and some areas need repair.

In the sanctuary, water damage is apparent in the northwest corner. This has damaged the walls, and possibly has damaged a structural beam also. The sanctuary, along with most other rooms of the church, is cluttered and untidy. The stained glass windows have been repaired and are in good condition. The basement exhibits significant damage from water infiltration. Most of the wood shows significant moisture damage and a musty odor permeates the room.

Date of Survey: September 22, 2015

Critical conditions issues:
- Trees and vines on exterior
Date of Survey: November 30, 2015

Critical conditions issues:
- Blocked/barricaded egress doors in sanctuary and social hall
- Ceiling repairs throughout first floor
- Detached drainage and associated water damage

The site has two buildings: the primary church building, including an addition at the south end, and a neighboring rowhouse, which functions as the church offices. The church building has a stacked rectangle form and brick exterior walls with wood trim. The three-story rowhouse has brick exterior walls. Together, the buildings form a U-shape around a small enclosed courtyard.

The church building exhibits several masonry conditions, including spalling, extensive mortar loss (particularly on secondary elevations and at rear), and cracking between the first and second stories. The window frames are in fair-poor condition; both the window glass and the doors have been replaced. The wood trim is rotted through in areas, with open holes. Drainage is not properly attached on the west elevation, causing further damage, and the east elevation may bulge. The associated rowhouse is in fair condition overall. Neither roof is visible from the street.

The interior of the building features classrooms, a kitchen, and a social hall at the first floor, and the sanctuary at the second floor. Other than the sanctuary and social hall, the interior appears to be minimally used. There is some evidence of water infiltration in the sanctuary, although the suspended ceiling is a recent alteration (predating the current congregation) and may conceal additional issues. The sanctuary has several blocked or blockaded doors. The church office rowhouse was not accessible for survey.
This parish has a large complex with four buildings: the primary church building, with a cruciform plan, two spires, and brownstone construction with limestone trim; the three-story attached rectory, with brownstone and stucco walls; the 3.5-story detached school building, with brownstone walls; and the detached community center, with stucco and brick walls. The church, rectory, and school share a triangular city block, while the community center is separated from the other buildings by a small street. Site features include an enclosed playground adjacent to the community center.

The exterior masonry is in fair condition, with efflorescence, spalling, and staining in various areas throughout. The windows are in fair-poor condition; several have sagging, bowing, or broken glass.

The slate shingle roof is in fair condition, with some missing shingles and a sagging structure. The copper trim is rusted in some areas, and some seams in the gutters and cornice appear loose.

The interior features two worship spaces: a lower sanctuary at ground level, and the large upper sanctuary above. Both spaces are well used for multiple services, and the interior is well kept and tidy. Interior conditions include water damage in the upper sanctuary, particularly around the clerestory windows. The upper sanctuary retains its historic finishes.

Date of Survey: November 16, 2015

Critical conditions issues:
- Water damage in upper sanctuary ceiling and around clerestory windows
- Broken windows, and general window repairs
The rectory and school buildings share a material palette with the church building. The community center features an older brick section (visible on the front and rear elevations) and a recent stucco addition.

Masonry conditions on the rectory and school include spalling and staining. The rectory also has a crack on the south elevation. Due to its recent renovation campaign, the community center is in better condition than the other buildings. All three buildings feature non-historic windows and doors. The school’s roof is in very good condition; the other buildings’ roofs are not visible.

On the interior, all three buildings are well used by the parish; the community center is also used by some outside organizations. The school has some water damage on the interior, but in general, these additional buildings do not exhibit as many interior conditions issues as the church building does. The rectory and school retain more interior material integrity than the community center.
V. INTERVIEWS
A. METHODOLOGY

Interviews with the sample of 22 congregations were conducted by Kalen Flynn (PennPraxis) and Rachel Hildebrandt (Partners for Sacred Places). Interviews proceeded according to a scripted list of questions covering five broad categories: building, congregational composition, leadership, finances, and connections.

Having an interview team composed of a lead interviewer with experience in conducting and analyzing qualitative research and a secondary interviewer with expertise in the unique needs of historic congregations, often with experience working with the congregations we interviewed, made for a powerful data collection process. The secondary interviewer’s pre-existing relationship with the congregations facilitated our initial contact, but was difficult to keep fully separate from the interviews we conducted. This is because Partners is highly regarded among congregations, and the senior clergy were often reflecting on this past experience.

Interviews lasted anywhere from 2-5 hours and each was voice recorded. Transcripts were commercially made from the recordings, then edited by Flynn for accuracy, clarity and consistency. The edited transcripts are included in the additional materials submitted digitally.

The first step in analyzing the qualitative data from the 22 interviews was the creation of a code book that used both a priori (previously defined) codes and inductive codes (themes that emerged from the data). The two a priori codes- resiliency and vulnerability - were determined by the overarching goal of the study as specified in the research design. The purpose of including these in the coding process was not to be definitive about what causes a congregation to fall on one side of the spectrum of resiliency and vulnerability, but rather to show the nuanced ways in which congregations embody both concepts, and the complicated relationship between these concepts and the emergent themes of the data.

Inductive codes were created through an immersive process that began with a small team doing a deep read of a diverse sample of cleaned transcripts (Church of the Crucifixion, Summit Presbyterian, and Metropolitan Baptist) in January 2016. The lead interviewer, Kalen Flynn, then compiled and refined the themes generated by the team, and broadly defined each theme to create the code book (Appendix X), which guided the primary phase of qualitative analysis.

Nvivo 11 software was used to manage the qualitative data and to facilitate the coding process. Using this software, the lead interviewer coded all twenty-two cleaned transcripts applying the themes defined in the code book to sections of interviews. In order to assess the appropriateness of the codes for the data, two additional persons (Hildebrandt, Boddie) coded a subset of four transcripts (Saint John the Baptist, Summit Presbyterian, Metropolitan Baptist, and Church of the Crucifixion). The coding completed by these individuals had 85% agreement with the use of the codes by the lead interviewer. This small team of three met to discuss areas where they were in disagreement.
to come to consensus, and to develop a list of possible sub-codes for the data based on emergent themes. Due to time constraints, secondary coding for the sub-codes was not completed for this project, but this process would make the findings from the qualitative data all the more clear.

B. SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS

The 22 in-depth interviews provided the team with a rich, extensive data source. The following categories were identified as key themes in the data, and were then elaborated as codes: adaptability, building stewardship, civic value, financial stability, leadership, lifecycle, membership, and neighborhood context. For definitions of these codes, see Appendix T. Through primary coding, it became clear that each code was intimately related to other codes as clear patterns developed. Perhaps one of the more salient things to emerge from the interview data was the importance of leadership, both in terms of the hierarchal structure of the broader polity (or relative independence) as well as the leadership style, experience, and attitudes of the senior clergy. The polity and leadership structure of the congregations provided both resilience (protection from threats) and in some cases had the potential to increase vulnerability. For example, a congregation that was a part of a highly structured judicatory had the potential to be protected by things like umbrella insurance, in-house lending and loan structures, and other resources; yet they also could be vulnerable through the ways in which decision-making process were restricted. An independent congregation, on the other hand, may not have the same broad protections available to them but would be able to make relatively unconstrained decisions.

Leadership style and attitude of senior clergy were equally important for congregations, and senior clergy interviewed offered wide-ranging examples. Most leadership styles captured in the interviews fell on a spectrum ranging from authoritarian (e.g. Sanctuary Church of the Open Door) to democratic (e.g. 19th Street Baptist). Equally important to the styles of the leaders was their attitudes. The senior clergy interviewed varied in attitude, including those who tended to be pessimistic, optimistic, futuristic, or fatalistic in outlook. The leadership styles of senior clergy, coupled with their overarching attitude, greatly affected many aspects of the other codes. For example, if a leader was future-oriented and democratic, clergy interviewed seemed to regard their membership as more engaged and more adaptable; whereas if a leader fell more toward the authoritarian side of the spectrum and was more pessimistic, they seemed to regard their membership as less engaged and more pessimistic toward change.

Some senior clergy had a more theological outlook, saying multiple times throughout the interview that they believed God would provide needed resources or that their fate rested within God’s will. For example, Garden of Prayer stated multiple times in our interview that they believed God would provide needed resources for their building, and Liberti had a firm belief that their leadership was called to move to Philadelphia to found their church. In these cases (among others), this strong viewpoint rooted in deep faith shaped the narrative arc of the congregations and their relation to their physical buildings/places.
We found membership skewed toward females with many senior clergy citing them as the backbone of their respective congregations. Congregations also often cited financial struggles in terms of affording staff, but many retained paid musicians and few required rental fees for one-time space rentals.

Many of the themes we identified, like adaptability, building stewardship and financial stability had a dual dimension of attitude and evidence. For example, senior clergy may state that their congregation is open to change, but through the answers to other questions we see that there is little evidence of change. In terms of the building, that could manifest as the congregation having an overall strong sense of stewardship but little capacity to care for the building (either through manpower and/or finances). Many of the senior clergy we interviewed recognized the challenges of historic buildings, and most struggled with the competing demands of modernity and the historical integrity of their buildings. For example, Lifeway Baptist and Urban Worship Center were trying to balance the needs of an aging and growing congregation with the limited space and amenities of a historic building.

Among the challenges of residing in a historic building is the context of working with and being in the city. Some areas of Philadelphia are gentrifying, and this presents a variety of challenges for many of the congregations we interviewed. For some, the neighborhood change has resulted in their membership dwindling and community context rapidly changing. Union Baptist, for example, is situated in a neighborhood that is quickly becoming a majority white, middle to upper class neighborhood. This change marks a demographic shift away from the primarily African American, working class population on which their membership was based. The congregation, in this case, has responded by turning inward, effectively isolating themselves as they redefine themselves. For a deeper look at emergent themes with pull quotes, see additional files submitted digitally (Pull Quotes by Code; Indexed Data from Codes).

C. NOTES ON POSSIBLE FUTURE RESEARCH
Though each congregation’s story was highly individualized, researchers felt that thematically for the purposes of our study, we had reached a saturation point with data collection. It is an incredibly rich set of stories. If time and budget permitted additional coding, based on sub-codes identified by researchers could further illuminate qualitative findings.8

D. QUALITATIVE DATA FINAL REPORT
This is an overview of themes and patterns that emerged from the 22 coded interview transcripts. The report is organized by code, each of which corresponds to a major theme emerging from the interviews. For each code, the

8 Coding for this project was done using the Nvivo 11 software. Working files from Nvivo are not part of the data delivery, but the raw data and outputs from Nvivo are included. Should additional sub-coding be pursued based off of this work we will certainly convey the working files to Pew.
section below contains: a summation of the theme; suggestions for potential sub-coding based on our assessment of patterns in the data; and key illustrative quotes. While the interviews captured directly the point of view of senior clergy, the data do reveal a great deal about the mindset of the congregations, their leadership, and their current state.

Overall, analysis of the interview data reveals the several gross factors shaping the congregations’ ability and willingness to be stewards of their historic sacred homes. No one factor emerged as the decisive or even dominant influence across the several types of HSP congregations interviewed. The fate of HSPs and their congregations is buffeted by many factors – there is no one factor that guarantees resilience (not even a healthy budget), and no single factor that leads to the demise of an HSP. The following coding analysis of interview data sorts through the complexity of decisions faced by congregational leaders and parses out ten distinct factors.

**Adaptability**

Adaptability was defined as the ability for congregations to change, weather a setback and/or challenges. This included examples of identifying creative solutions to problems, a willingness to share space with entities outside of the congregation, as well as responsiveness to new directions in leadership. There were some congregations for whom adaptability became a challenge: What happens when the congregation is constantly changing and the only constant is leadership? What happens when congregations are adaptable but are still marching toward closure? For other congregations, adaptability demonstrated strength: Sharing space meant having a larger purpose in the community and stronger engagement in the HSP’s potential for higher civic values. Or creating an agreement to rent a school parking lot meant increased numbers on a main day of worship.

It became apparent that adaptability does not automatically equate to resiliency. Congregations like Church of the Crucifixion and Holy Apostles and the Mediator illustrate times when adaptability (either through sharing space or creative problem solving) is not necessarily resiliency, and is born out of necessity.

It is important to distinguish between attitudes or beliefs regarding change and evidence of change, as some congregations (or their leaders) may see themselves as open to change when they may actually be unwilling to take steps toward creating change (see Union Baptist).

*Possible sub-codes: Attitudes toward change, and Evidence of change*

*The evidence sub code derives from leaders who are adept at negotiating between the members of their congregations that are more resistant to change and those who are in favor of the changes.*
Adaptability Quotes

We can look at the register and see all the people who are leaving and transferring to actually the Church of the Assumption, which was at 12th and Diamond and then moved up to Lincoln Drive. That was really the beginning years of major, major decline. The church drew inward on itself, kind of a "Don’t tread on me. Don’t bother me please" attitude. It completely missed the blossoming of Bella Vista the first round and really struggled.

Church of the Crucifixion

And then they began subletting. Just more and more rentals began. I think the Northwest Interfaith Movement came in in the early 80s, and really that’s how the church has maintained a full-time pastor. I'd have to look at our annual report, but we get something like 60% of the income from rentals at this point, and we have decent pledge income, given the size of our congregation, but the rentals really do support the running of the church and a full-time pastor, office administrator, custodians.

Summit Presbyterian

My focus since I have been here has not been so much on the history but on the condition of the church, and the reason why is that as you can see and I told you the sanctuary will hold 2500 people easily. However, because of the nature of the neighborhood changing and what has been going on over the past few years, the congregation has been dwindling.

Union Baptist

Which is a unique challenge in its own because not only trying to do that, but also if we are looking to just have sustainability in a certain thing, it’s difficult because you have people come, people go. It’s hard to get people in leadership because they don’t stay long enough or some people will say, ‘Why don’t we have that.’ I'll say, ‘Stick around and we will have that. But if you keep leaving, I can't have that.’

First Christian Assembly

Again, we have changed in our mindsets. Romans 12:1 and 2 says, "I beseech you therefore brother by mercies of God that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto God which is your reasonable service. Be not conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind." Let me tell you what I did, and I was very intentional. I taught that passage word for word for six months. Then I started doing change. See, here's the thing. A lot of times pastors just want to change stuff. "Let's go buy some cameras. Let's get some tripods. Let's do this. Let's do that." The folk are sitting in the audience going, "Excuse me. Why do we need that?" You teach first, then you do.
Metropolitan Baptist

People are very consistent about they don't like change, being uncomfortable. But on the other hand, if you don't have change in a positive sense on a regular basis, then you really have no growth. If you're maintaining the status quo all the time, then there's no growth. You're like on life support.

Our Lady of Lourdes

And there have been four churches in South Philadelphia that have moved since I've been here and one of the biggest issues was parking. What I did three years ago, I worked out an agreement with the school district, okay. We now have free and unlimited parking at the elementary school on Webster Street anytime school is closed, okay, we can park there, okay. Uh and what we do is, we have our own security, we make sure that its only Shiloh parking because our insurance basically says that it has to be a Shiloh event. And what I didn’t realize, and this is a blessing, what the school district has told everybody is that the school is closed, we cannot give you permission to use the parking lot, only Shiloh can give you permission to use the parking lot.

Shiloh Baptist

That all has broken down, and like many of the large parishes in Philadelphia, we’re really in a transition time, and trying to redefine ourselves as a parish and community, or more accurately trying to be open to inspiration how we’re being called to the church today. It's very different from what I understand. I've been only here a year, so I hear the stories. It's a different population.

Saint John the Baptist

For me, I think the biggest strength for the people here at Saint Michael's was their willingness to be open to change and to entertain some crazy ideas, things that they wouldn't have thought of. I come in all excited and have all these different ideas and I've been told by different parishioners, "Pastor, if we close, it wasn't because you weren't trying," and that they were able to get excited and get on board with things. That then excites me, that I felt free to throw out these ideas. Other people are now just getting excited and, "What about this? What about that?" We could throw it out there. That would be the biggest strength, would be an open ... They don't want to live behind locked doors.

St. Michael’s Lutheran

The most obvious example is just the ethnic makeup and the willingness to different communities to come together, work together, like for Thanksgiving, we have a trilingual mass, for example. We have a couple trilingual masses a year and the people, they like it, so that was probably the biggest.

Visitation BVM
We are at the junction where we have to change in terms of our ... we functioned for 15 years as a single congregation which encompass of older people who speak Russian and younger people who speak primarily English. Now is the time due to our space constraints and desire to grow and be more appealing to the community as a church. We want to have separate English services, separate Russian services. That is not an easy decision because it's understandable that it will introduce some separation of younger from old. That is a difficult change to go through. But we are at the, I think, at the junction when this change will have to take place. However, we will do, we will make every effort to stay as one church even though we will have essentially two congregations.

*Lifeway Baptist*

We will do the fixing up so that you can occupy our space, that's way is not, we have been through the tenant and landlord thing personally so we would not ever want someone to be like we helped you and ask us to vacate. It would be a business sound decision that we would operate and then they would be able to rent from us.

*United Missionary Baptist*

Here I do assessments. I do surveys. I need feedback. We did one in June. How would you rate all the different things? I need feedback, what do you like, what do you don't like? You got to change. So we can't stay locked in. If you don't change you die. Bottom line - if you don't change you die. So we got to, you know, keep our ear to the ground, figure out what's going on.

*19th Street Baptist*

Let me choose my words carefully. Most of the time, the mind frame is we haven't done it this way before. They're used to doing things their way. They're used to their desired results and coming in with another way of doing things ... In regards to fishing, another way to catch a different type of fish. If it's not something they're used to, then they're not going to buy in. It's not the whole congregation. It's always some that want, some that don't want. You work with the ones that do and fight the ones that don't. That's what makes the change not take place--because you're spending all your energy fighting instead of trying to foster the change.

*Campbell AME*

Now, someone else wants to rent the space from us for a preschool, a nursery or something, so we're in the process of trying to see what we can do. We still got the classroom space and nothing is being done with it right now, so we're sort of in limbo and she wants to rent the space with her preschool and so we're planning on doing that.

*Sanctuary Church of the Open Door*
Certain changes, which are rooted in the tradition would not be subject to change or would not happen. There's always a conversation about bringing the separation of men and women--changing the physical separation--making a partition down here so the women can be over here and the men over here. It's not going to happen, but the conversation comes up every other year.

_B’nai Abraham_

We came to a building that was not as appealing. We were sharing now instead of sharing with one other congregation. We were sharing with three other organizations. It took some transition. It was an interesting transition but over time, we're here alone. It's working out very, very well. We've had people come and wanted to rent. It's like unless we sense that God is really in it, we're really not open to all that because... anyway.

_Urban Worship Center_

I think that there's so much change that's in your world that when you can hold on to this church being the same, you insist. Everything around you is changing. You go to McDonald’s and you can’t even buy the dollar meal anymore, right? Everything changes, so when I come to church, I want to see the same thing.

_Devereux Methodist_

We have on a couple occasions. People needed to use the church. We've done that. It's like if I asked to borrow your car, you're going to put gas in it. That's just being courteous. When they share space here, if a congregation has to share space, I know they're going to say, "Here is a donation towards we burned your lights, we used your water or whatever."

_Garden of Prayer_

The church has to grow. It has to exist for those who were not a part of it. That should be what we should be about. I think that there’s going to be some resistance to that because there are a lot of sacred cows that are going to have to be slaughtered in order for us to be a more welcoming place. There's going to have to be a greater acceptance of people who are different in every aspect, gender, orientation, and race. All of that has to be not only welcomed but celebrated and so I think that that is a cultural shift that many of our congregation has to go through.

_Holy Apostles and the Mediator_

I think it’s always been we’ve tried to be really centered around the church’s vision and then flexible around how we’re expressing it and new opportunities to pursue it. Our vision as a church hasn’t changed, but for something like this, for example, we can serve the city in greater ways because we’ve gone from being building renters to building owners.

_Liberti_
Building Stewardship

Building stewardship refers to the way the congregation regards the building and their capacity to actively care for and maintain their building/complex. This code was used to capture statements about the congregation’s views regarding the overall importance of the building in its story, as well as the ways in which the congregation and leadership choose to invest resources into the building. The code also includes the ways in which (if any) the costs or maintenance associated with the building affects ministries.

For some congregations interviewed it became clear that the will to maintain the building (or the overarching understanding of the building’s historical importance) is strong but the resources – either in the form of finances or in terms of people – are not available. There is a mismatch. 19th Street Baptist offers a particularly illustrative example of this. The congregation and the leadership recognize the historical significance of the building, and have tapped into outside resources, such as experts from Penn, but they do not have the financial resources required to do the necessary repairs and maintenance of the building. Building stewardship could also reflect, positively, an understanding of the historical trajectory of the building. Building stewardship is also inclusive of the struggles of having a historic property and the negotiations of staying true to the historic significance while updating the building to meet modern needs.

Possible sub-codes: Lifecycle (of building), Attitude toward building stewardship, Capacity for building stewardship

Building Stewardship Quotes

The less building issues there are, the more aspects, at least from our experience, the more the focus can be on ministry and various types of ministry. When the building becomes the main focus, it is the main focus. It’s very difficult. I should put it this way, when there are building problems and very little money, then it becomes overwhelming and we just focus on the building. It actually becomes depressive for the entire ... A collective depression.

Church of the Crucifixion

That said, I think the congregation wants to be a good neighbor and feels that by renting out, especially the hourly rentals to the very different groups that come here, they ... maybe mission is too strong of a word ... but they feel that's good stewardship of the space, rather than either not letting anyone use it or having it all for-profit offices so to speak.

Summit Presbyterian
Again, with the pride that we take in not only having this facility, but maintaining it in the manner that we’ve had, to the degree that we have, I just think that... I have to be careful because recording is on. I think that we would take strong exception to anyone and anything trying to compromise this building for any reason other than what it’s intended for.

*Union Baptist*

It's a factor, but it’s not the overriding factor. It is a factor though. Yes. We have to always make sure that one of things we’re able to do is keep the building in good shape, obviously. We want to keep the building, so we can use it properly. Again being a good steward of it. We don’t want it to fall into disrepair for a lot of reasons. So, we’ll always make sure we have funding in case something major would happen. We always want to keep a reserve.

*First Christian Assembly*

We took the report and we began to attack the areas that weren’t the most, that needed our assistance the most, then in some cases we’ve done that. We’ve done that with walls, with ceilings, with caulk and windows, all that kind of stuff. We’ve done that, and even just giving you that basic stuff, for a building this size cost a tremendous amount of money.

*Metropolitan Baptist*

I like that in a sense because they do take some ownership of their building. Because it is theirs, technically the parish, for me at least, the parish belongs to them. Even if the diocese holds the deeds. A parish belongs to the parishioners so it’s their church.

*Our Lady of Lourdes*

The temple in Cambodian heart is very important. It's kind like the home, the community, their identity.

*Preah Buddhist Temple*

In a big place like this, these big buildings ... if it was between heating the school or renovating a room in the church, obviously they’re going to heat the school but that room in the church still needs to be scrapped and plastered and renovated, so things were really let go off for a while. I understand why, they have to have done just like in every Roman Catholic parish there is.

*Saint John the Baptist*

We view this as an asset. As much as it can be falling down or ... I was really grateful in the past, the men, because it was men that were in charge of the council at the time, they really felt maintaining the building was important. As
you see other churches in the area where they are literally falling down, this one is fairly in very good shape. Most people are just surprised how good it is.

*St. Michael’s Lutheran, Kensington*

We’re very blessed because we have a lot of people who are very handy, so most of the Vietnamese, they own nail salons and do hardwood floors. That’s their businesses, so they’re very good with fixing things. We have a plumber, so they put in ... We had one bathroom in the lower church and they remodeled the whole thing. We now have 3, which is a huge benefit. They did all that.

*Visitation BVM*

Well, I kind of thought when you called that our conversation will be focused on how a congregation today uses a 130-year-old building. We are going through ... It is challenging. It is challenging in many ways, starting with the fact that we do not have air-conditioning in this building. We have to do this. No one thought 130 years ago that we'll need a chairlift in this building because there was no such thing 130 years ago. People are getting older, live longer. Quite a number of people in our congregation need a chairlift and those needs would increase where we’d need to build some ramps and more accessibility for elderly people. That is a challenge in an old building because everything is difficult in an old building. In a new building, you know how it’s built. You just knock the wall and make it new. Couple of days and you’re done. With old stone buildings, it’s like a ... This is like a fortress. You try to put something in here, it’s very challenging. Things like that. Bathrooms. For some reason, they thought that 130 years ago that two bathrooms are perfectly sufficient for this building. Not in our day. We have to address that. It’s constant.

*Lifeway Baptist*

Yeah, because I think in a world where everything is kind of becoming, I’ll use the word “worldly”, this is a stability to them. You know, it looks like a church so it’s not a center it reminds us back to scripture - what God says “Upon this rock; I shall build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” So when they have so many of things that look contemporary this kind of reminds them that we are a part of a church even that we are the church but it’s the church building that reminds us of a church.

*United Missionary Baptist*

We lean on the University of Pennsylvania. We lean to Professor Frank and Professor Aaron; they’re the two with the history of the church. So we won’t do anything, for example we’re going to do cleanup on Saturday. Don’t pull anything, don’t hank, don’t spray some, you know, kill or don’t do anything major because we don’t want to do anything that’s going to be a detriment to the building.

*19th Street Baptist*
If we’re going to progress, then I believe a building committee is needed, just in case whatever we decide to do ...
There was a plan a while ago to expand the church. You see the capacity is only 180, and if we end up having an
influx of people, you want to be able to seat everybody. The plan before I got here was to actually grow or expand
the building, but because of it being part of the national historical registry, then they can’t do anything to the
outside of the building. I’d rather have a building committee together so just in case we ever get to a point of
wanting to build another edifice. I want to have a committee together to be able to handle those issues.

*Campbell AME*

I don’t have any professional training, but having been in it for a couple, I think I know pretty much. I count on these
guys to tell me what needs to be done. Some of them have expertise in that area.

*Sanctuary Church of the Open Door*

Well, it’s what we call a spiritual home, so you know, you can ask somebody, "What relationship does a home have
to your family life?" Obviously, there’s a very strong connection that people feel about their homes, where they
raise their families, and it’s an emotional connection that people have. I would say it’s very similar to a spiritual
home. People come to a place not just to pray, but to feel that they’re part of a community. What we’ve tried to
maintain throughout the years is that space where people can come and celebrate being part of the Jewish
community in an environment which is conducive to that. This was to be considered their spiritual home.

*B’nai Abraham*

We would like to do more missions, but we have to take care of the home front. On those months where you got to
pay that gas bill in addition to the electric, it’s a challenge to do more ministry or do something with the children or
do something with the youth. We want to put money into their programs and we can’t. Yeah, you got to juggle that.
Again, if we were a historic church that had an endowment, that would be different. You just have a slush fund set
aside. We’re operating by faith. We could have one bad month and things could be totally different.

*Urban Worship Center*

Although I’ve been in buildings where the people built it themselves. This is an inherited building, so there’s not the
same sense of ownership as when the people did the brick and mortar, or like if their ancestors did it. Because it’s
something that they came into in the 70s and 80s, the congregation is very close, very loving with each other, and
they love the building, but I don’t think that there’s that sense of connection as if they had built it themselves. You
know, this is the only place that we’ve worshiped in, so there is a care for it, but I think it’s a little different.

*Devereux Methodist*
I mean, we all love God and believe in God. But God’s house has to be maintained. God’s house is going to be maintained by the people of God. The struggle for some people is, like you said, I got to pay my bills. I don’t care what Rev. Rachel says. I’m paying my bill. I’m paying my bills. I got to keep my lights on. I got to keep my heat on. I want to keep my cable television. St. Rachel’s needs $300 for the gas bill, they’re not going to get it from me. That’s the struggle. If I am in a place economically where I can give the church $300 and still maintain my household, then because I’m a follower of Christ, then I give it.

_Garden of Prayer_

I mean you know, we have a beautiful building but it’s a mother trying to keep up and with a small congregation, it’s almost impossible. To be able to have such a historic building in the middle of Philadelphia, it’s a real treasure but it’s also something that this is trouble to keep going. You'll only get that then that's worth it.

_Holy Apostles and the Mediator_

We try to make sure that, as we go forward, that this building serves the mission of the church rather than inhibiting it. It actually helps us to move forward. We think about the space and how it fits into the mission and all the different things that we want to accomplish in our philosophy of ministry and our strategy and our vision. I think that makes people excited because it’s not a matter of just owning a building, it’s a matter of using a building, stewarding the building for the mission, what we want accomplish, what we feel like God has for us as a church.

_Liberti_

_Civic Value_

Civic value refers to the ways in which the HSP and its congregation relate to the urban fabric of the community. This code includes whether neighborhood or community groups use the space (overlapping somewhat with Adaptability), the perceived overall reputation of the congregation within the surrounding community, and the ways in which the congregation’s leadership regards the connections between the congregation and the community (in human and physical senses). The challenge with this code is untangling some aspects from leadership and some from neighborhood context. So much of the involvement with an HSP’s surroundings is dependent on the overall mentality of the leadership regarding community participation and involvement. The interrelatedness between civic value and neighborhood context is in part due to the fluctuation of populations, demographic shifts over time, and gentrification processes occurring in many of the areas surrounding the congregations we interviewed.

*Given the complexity of this code, and its interdependence with overall neighborhood context (which should be broadened – see that code description for details), civic value could be recast a sub-code for neighborhood context.*
We are active at times and as needed with the local community groups we're active as needed in zoning issues. We have much more presence in the neighborhood. We've held extra community meetings here that we normally haven't such as the local community garden association and things so people know of the church in ways that they haven't known before and a lot of that has been because I'm out and about much more.

*Church of the Crucifixion*

I think our congregation does feel also is some sense of responsibility to be a good neighbor and to well, not let the church fall into disrepair but also to be a resource.

*Summit Presbyterian*

We have had several neighbors contact us and either partner with us to help maintain the garden area and maintain the outdoors if you will try to keep the curve appeal up. And we've had some neighbors who view our garden area and our parking lot as a trash dump. We've not had an opportunity to sit down... Let me say, we've not made an opportunity to sit down and talk with the community at large because we need to be more prepared to do that.

*Union Baptist*

The ministry of the Access Center. God provided the building for us and the whole bit; so that's really the extension of our church that's for the community. That's our real outreach. People from all over the community, from all over the city, even further... They come and they get help. That's what we do at the Access Center, provide help in need.

*First Christian Assembly*

We don't allow our building to totally fall apart so that we become an eyesore to the community. We keep our grounds clean for that reason because we are part of the community, we are part of the neighborhood even though probably 85% of our membership base live somewhere else. We don't live in this neighborhood, but because our church is in this neighborhood, we have a stake in this neighborhood.

*Metropolitan Baptist*

To let the community see that we are still alive, and so that was the key. And a lot of your major community meetings, they ask to come to Shiloh to hold. So we host them, okay, at no charge, okay. Because, my attitude is that we want you to know that we're a part of the community. So all of the zoning committee meetings that are too large are held here. And to be honest with you, I think that the organizers are glad because they always tell me, ‘Reverend Sparkman, people act differently when they're inside a church building.’ (laughter) So I say, okay. (laughter) And we've become more community oriented by letting them see the inside of the building.

*Shiloh Baptist*
The church is bigger than life, right? You see it from the expressway. The archbishop told me he prays for me every
time he passes us on the expressway, prays for us because it's so big. They play a significant role for the people who
are part of the congregation, but they also are very significant to the community. You know, as you indicated
yourself, they really indicate an important aspect of the community. It's been said to me that, the church itself is
probably the second most significant structure in Manayunk after the bridge. If you look at all the work that artists
have done, and somewhere in their depiction of the area, the steeple of St. John the Baptist, the tower is present.

Saint John the Baptist

For a lot of people who feel buildings are more of an albatross we saw this as an asset because it's large enough and
in good shape that we could open it up to the public so that we could share our space with the other ministries. We
say, "Okay, if this is an asset how can that then be used?" It just kind of snowballs into opening ourselves up to be a
community church. That's how we wanted to view ourselves as a community building.

St. Michael's Lutheran, Kensington

In the past they have had, but because of, like again, you can't control the people that come in. We have lost a lot.
We lost copper tubing. We have lost like a lot of stuff. I have had to scale back on letting people come in and use the
church unless we could have ... and because we have a lot of people who work. It is really kind of the scheduling and
get it ... unless we can really get somebody to man it. Then we can't have the ... because we have part time staff and
a lot of volunteers.

United Missionary Baptist

I think the community is watching what's going on? Some people don't even know we're here. Developers know.

19th Street Baptist

A lot of them grew up here, so they've been dealing with the Frankford Civic Association for years, or the
Neighborhood Advisory Council for years, or the Frankford CDC for years. It's almost like it's just part of their nature.

Campbell AME

Even community members that are not a member of the church thinks very highly of the building. One group is our
community group. We meet every month at night at Devereux United Methodist Church for the past 15 years.
Before that, there was a lot of action within the community to try and bring in new faces and programs.

Devereux Methodist
The neighborhood action committee, Strawberry Mansion NAC, we partnership with them. We allow them to use our building for neighborhood meetings and sometimes...people have died. We've just given the church to a family. You can have the funeral here. We do stuff like that.

*Garden of Prayer*

We are very concerned with being hospitable to people who are struggling. We open, at night this courtyard is filled with people sleeping. Part of recognizing the worth and dignity of every human being is somehow lived out, I hope, in every aspect of what we do. The building to me is our biggest asset for making that happen. Because it's big, because it has room, and because it's in the middle of all this urban sprawl, there's this sanctuary. I think that the community is beginning to see this as that.

*Holy Apostles and the Mediator*

They're invested serving. I would say that everything after the mention of Liberti Church-First Baptist, the support groups, partner ministries, and rentals that 90 percent of the people that come into those things are not Liberti people. It's the community. It's other people outside of our community.

*Liberti*

**Financial Stability**

Financial stability refers to both specific financial details provided by interviewees (i.e. who gives to the congregation and whether the congregation has savings or an endowment) as well as to more nuanced and subtle factors related to financial stability, such as leadership's decisions around investing in the building and the cost of utilities. (This code was broadened a bit to include such nuance.) Some of the data coded under this could be wrapped into a sub-code for leadership, but overall there is a value to keeping this code independent, as financial matters transcend particular leadership regimes in a congregation. Data related to this code also appear in the larger spreadsheet reflecting the more “quantitative” aspects of the data.

Financial stability is construed here to include both attitudes and beliefs about the leader’s role in finances as well as the actual facts and figures, sources of revenue, and categories of cost. For example, some senior clergy did not believe that finance should be a part of preaching, and thus would not mention financial struggles or make appeals to the congregation when finances were needed. Others were much more transparent with the congregation on financial needs.

*Possible sub-codes: Attitudes about finances; Sources of finances*
Financial Stability Quotes

When the building becomes the main focus, it is the main focus. It’s very difficult. I should put it this way, when there are building problems and very little money, then it becomes overwhelming and we just focus on the building.

*Church of the Crucifixion*

Let me look at my profit and loss. I mean, really, the annual recurring is staff. We underpay our staff. I don’t know if you should put this out loud there, but we underpay our staff, but we do give health insurance for full time, but much evangelist work is building related, tenant scheduling, that kind of thing.

*Summit Presbyterian*

I never talk about money. I don’t ever, I mean, I’ll teach on what the Bible says about tithing and I can’t remember the last time I did that, but we do not stress money. We do take an offering, but we don’t say, ‘Hey, get your money out; get your pocket book ready.’ We don’t do that. In fact, we go way the other way. People aren’t really forced to give at all... And many can’t give. A lot of people who come here are clients of the Access Center or guests of the Access Center. I’m not going to beg for money from somebody who I know can’t even make their rent or their heat. No. God doesn’t need their money. He provides.

*First Christian Assembly*

I don’t mean to sound like it’s a money thing, but you can put 500 people in that sanctuary, every week but if no one is giving, you’re still not achieving anything because the church does not sell a commodity, we don’t sell anything. We survive based on the generous donation of its membership but if people are not generous in their giving and you still got the same expenses.

*Metropolitan Baptist*

I think they did in the past, when the school was open. Because the school was financially so draining. Maintaining the school with a full faculty is extremely expensive. That probably took most of whatever we raised in the collection weekly. That probably ... I would say 80% of it went to the school. Not to the building but to the actual running of the school. That was a significant drain. Without the school, it’s a whole different world.

*Our Lady of Lourdes*

The temple survives by donation. As long our people make donations then it’s okay. We don’t have any problem yet since, have this temple.

*Preah Buddhist Temple*
One time when the water was backed up, they said ‘Reverend Sparkman, are we gonna close the bathrooms’ and I said no, leave them open. I need people to see how bad it is. And for a long time with churches it was like well we’ve got a committee to handle this, let the committee deal with it. And my attitude is no, especially within the last 10, 15 years, let the congregation see. And that gives us more funds to work with.

_Shiloh Baptist_

The parish in the merger process, parish where other communities are merged into, it inherits the debt and the assets among those communities. The Roman Catholic Church ... if any of their parishes that merged with St. John’s had a debt it's now the debt of the entire parish. We did inherit significant debt. We had debt, we inherited more debt. We also inherited a capital needs trust fund, that was held by one of the parishes. We have about a million dollars in a trust fund.

_Saint John the Baptist_

Well, even some that do not come to church on Sunday still make a donation but then we do have people who aren’t members but come every Sunday. Some of those donations might be like a dollar or two. This is all they have. A lot of them are food pantry people and some of them are living on the street. Sometimes it will be a postage stamp that they put in the plate. It runs the gamut.

_St. Michael’s Lutheran, Kensington_

I think for us, they’re fairly understanding. I hope so. I know our business manager got a call, so after they took this money and used it to pay down the debt, they called about this year’s cathedraticum and said, "How come you haven't paid?" I said they're very happy I did not answer the phone because I would not have been very nice. There was like 200-some thousand dollars that was technically ours that they took because we owed, which was fine, but the next week they’re asking me for more money. I’m like, "I don't have it." I think overall, they know what neighborhood we’re in. This is the second-poorest congressional district in the United States. That's the reality. I think we do really well as far as our collection goes. We do better than a lot of other surrounding churches, even in the burbs or even in the northeast. Last week, we got over $6000, so usually I'd say our average last year was $5300 for a weekend, so I think that's pretty good.

_Visitation BVM_

Pretty much, every small separate congregation, its finances are a scenario where they’re struggling to, basically, not to make ends meet, but to appropriate funds to all the necessary needs. Sometimes, you have to cut somewhere in order to meet certain need within the congregation. I never met a congregation of a smaller size, which said, "We have so much money, but we don't know what to do with it.”

_Lifeway Baptist_
Because there isn’t a lot of fluff and extra with salaries and it is not padded with all of that. It is what it is. Our budget is factual. It is not we got to approve the sexton’s salary and we have to prove the pastor’s salary. We don’t have all that fluff. The budget is ... if we don’t do this, your lights are going to be cut off. Our budget is pretty much. It is what it is. It is not a whole lot of we got to vote on this. Take it back to the church. It is a cut and dry budget to operate. That is exactly what it is an operating budget. That is what it is.

*United Missionary Baptist*

I haven’t looked at the numbers since we were on vacation, but there’s no red flag. The first Sunday in August, it was over $5,000 for that Sunday, which really is good for us. Basically on our budget, I tell people, in order for us to get nervous, if we come in under $2,500 a Sunday on a consistent basis, then we get nervous. That means we’re right there. If we have $2,500 per Sunday, nobody gets nervous.

*19th Street Baptist*

We don’t go to the district too much about whatever our financial ... You know, our needs are. We go to the congregation and say, "We’re trying to raise a certain amount of money because we’re trying to do certain things." If an organization wants to pledge a certain amount, or a person wants to pledge, or a family wants to pledge, then we’ll take your name and whatever your pledge amount is.

*Campbell AME*

I think we’ve done it one time here recently, just one time and I’m planning on doing it again over the summer when they don’t have to spend, for their own utilities. That’s when I plan on putting on a rally. We call it a rally to get money to keep it going.

*Sanctuary Church of the Open Door*

By being creative at fundraising. We’ve had a couple of galas where we honored somebody, and hopefully they opened up their Rolodex to us. And the last two years, two years ago we partnered with the National Museum of American Jewish History and we brought the Irena Sendler project *Light in a Jar* to Philadelphia. I don’t know if you’ve ever heard of Irena Sendler, but her story, it’s an amazing story of this Polish social worker that saved 2500 Jewish kids in the Warsaw ghetto. That program netted us $30,000. We had the concert a couple weeks ago this month, that program netted us about $25,000.

*B’nai Abraham*

Fortunately, even though we’re still week-to-week, month-to-month, but at least everything is current. We don’t need nobody coming in to pay us rent for us to survive. A lot of churches couldn’t survive if they didn’t have some
outside income stream. We're not in that situation. The good thing for us is when that income stream comes, it's going to have a lot of benefit to do more service and add more people to do more service. We're looking forward to that.

_Urban Worship Center_

I think the shift that you see, and I think we're going to see it in all Philadelphia churches, when Philadelphia had the jobs here, the people who worked here had more money. Now, we're living off the people who are on their pensions from the jobs that they had here in the city. The younger members don't ... That's why they tend to be low-income, or no-income, is because there's not the jobs in the city. That's a major shift that we can really see coming down the road as the people who are giving regularly are giving off of retirement from work in the city.

_Devereux Methodist_

Our style of worship, finances, I don't like having to ... What's the word ... rally for finances, that's something that irks me. It does. I feel less than ... I'm not going to lie, I feel less than a minister when I have to something like, "Listen, our insurance bill is going to be due next month. I need you to make sure you give towards the insurance or give something extra." I hate doing that but I have to do it. I came from a congregation where we never had to do that.

_Garden of Prayer_

We have had to go to outside sources like finding the Able Center, coming with you guys to try and find rentals with this other congregation coming in. At present the congregation is made up of mostly people on fixed incomes and those who aren't on fixed incomes, they give and give generously, but they can't shoulder all of the needs.

_Holy Apostles and the Mediator_

We've been worshiping for six years and raised six times our annual budget for the purchase and renovation of this building, which is mind-boggling. It's surprising to us, so yeah.

_Liberti_

_Leadership_

Leadership is the broadest code used. It encompasses a broad range of factors relating to the capacities, decisions and influences affecting the senior leadership of congregations. Leadership includes the ways this helps or hinders decision-making processes, the outlook of the leader (optimistic, pessimistic, fatalistic), familiarity with the congregation and its history, leadership style (e.g. strong, inclusive, etc.), and how mission guides the leadership,
among other things. This code also encompasses the influence of the polity structure of the congregation. Many of the other codes also include aspects that relate to leadership – such as financial stability and civic value.

It should be noted that leadership is not limited to senior clergy, though our interviews mainly addressed these individuals; member leaders can play a huge role within congregations, and interviews included many questions about the role of these other forms of leadership and capacity.

So many issues are entangled with this code that it would be useful to sub-code to gain a clearer picture of the patterns emerging within the data. Possible sub-codes include: Member leadership; Denomination hierarchy; Leadership style; Political connectedness; Knowledge of member assets (or connectedness to the congregation); Tenure

**Leadership Quotes**

I think it goes back to, as much as they may not view it this way, and the current leadership are all very new members within the last 3 or 4 years, they don’t really understand the workings. As much as we’ve talked about it and tried to be leaders so it’s a struggle for them. They don’t quite know what to do in a sense of sheep running around without a shepherd.

*Church of the Crucifixion*

What really cannot happen is sale of real property without Presbytery approval. So, theoretically, at least there is constrain on what the church can do, but they are not micro managers.

*Summit Presbyterian*

We’re still in the process of doing that. I actually have somebody else tasked with that, but I probably will get involved if I don’t any hear any progress. I’ll probably get involved next week.

*Union Baptist*

From a strictly human standpoint... at times it can. It’s freeing for us also. We don’t have any constraints put on us either by a denomination or other groups. We are self-determining in that way. It keeps our reliance on where it should be, on God, in prayer, seeking him, making decisions as our group, as we pray, trust God for it, watch his provisions. Not saying, ‘Oh, we don't have to worry about that; Big Brother will take care of us over here.’ Or them saying, ‘You can't do that because we don't want you to affiliate with that,’ so on one hand yes--there may be some constraints because we don't have this big umbrella over us. On the other hand, it's very freeing for us because we do what we do and stay within our means, and we are self-determined that way.

*First Christian Assembly*
Now, could that decision be made just with you coming to my office and you and I talking, absolutely it could. I don’t need to call an executive ministry because look at this, I said I don’t want to be king, but watch this, the bible gives me full authority to act on religious things just like that.

*Metropolitan Baptist*

People are very consistent about they don’t like change, being uncomfortable. But on the other hand, if you don’t have change in a positive sense on a regular basis, then you really have no growth. If you’re maintaining the status quo all the time, then there’s no growth. You’re like on life support.

*Our Lady of Lourdes*

The leaders have to understand the community, and the surrounding problem. That is what the leader have to understand and need to understand. Also for, us the is the monk important role in practice Buddhism, so all the monks are part of leadership community. What we focus on this to more strict in practice Buddhism. To purify the mind and to follow the three main teaching of Buddhism, which is not to do any evil, to do good, and to purify the mind and to understand the situation of our own community. What the need of the community? That is the thing that, the leaders are here to help in order to lead the community.

*Preah Buddhist Temple*

No, only that we have grown spiritually, if not numerically, in the sense of what more can I do. That was my goal. I came here with a purpose of how many people can I bring in, and I realized that was not the purpose. How many people can I reach out to, and that’s the purpose, and that’s what I want them to stay focused on.

*Shiloh Baptist*

Two weeks ago I wrote a, maybe three weekends ago I did a financial report. It was four pages long. Part of it was talking about the fact that, I had decided we need to market some of the property namely St. Mary of the Assumption. I knew how tough it was for people to hear that, so I really spent some time there talking about how tough it is to let go, especially to let go of things that have significant meaning to us.

*Saint John the Baptist*

Then that’s a big tune of a lot of pastors these days are talking about having to be bi-vocation. This is my second career also. I had been an office manager and doing administration. Yeah. I’m the secretary now. Planning things or doing the bulletin, doing the flyers and what not the ministry forced me. Slowly pushing it off to other people helping them to … To empower them because again I’m trying to put myself out of business and take over more and more of it. It’s always happening with our food pantry. We have someone who is doing all the flyers and planning
and she also does for the flea market and the Christmas bazaar. I don't have to prepare any of that stuff. So it's fantastic.

*St. Michael's Lutheran, Kensington*

Effective leadership would be trying to get people, at least here, would be getting people to work together and to understand that we're all in this together, bring the communities together while recognizing the differences and respecting those, but try to have the idea of bringing about unity among the diverse communities.

*Visitation BVM*

For instance, our deacon of finance, he works in the financial field. He's a professional of that. People who do our audits are professional auditors. As members, they use their skills to that. Our IT people who do our PowerPoints, computers, maintain our website, they are professional IT people. We have a lot of musicians, but none of them work professionally, but some have music education, but they don't work as musicians. It's hard to make money being a musician.

*Lifeway Baptist*

It is like you want to give everybody, as led by the Holy Spirit, the opportunity to be in a leadership position. So that what they learn in church, they use in corporate America and I think sometimes we get it backwards. Where what I use in corporate America I am going to bring into the church, but most of my skills that I acquire in church I gave to corporate America. Not corporate America giving it to me and then I brought it back to the church. We want to give people the opportunity to be developed here so they can be good at their jobs, secularly.

*United Missionary Baptist*

Effective leadership, again it goes back to consensus-building leadership, collaboration and consensus, because the previous style was autocratic, and so we’re moving away from autocratic, which was kind of a culture shock for them.

*19th Street Baptist*

There's a 3 or 4-level process that has to happen before the church gets sold. First, the church itself has to hold a meeting. Once we hold the meeting to say we want to sell the property, it has to be taken to the next level, which is our Presiding Elders District. If it gets passed there, then it goes to our Annual Conference. Once it goes to the Annual Conference, then it goes to the Board of Trustees. Then the Board of Trustees takes it to the General Conference Board of Trustees. Then they decide if it's going to be worth it for us to sell the building, because it's not our building. It's the AME church's building.

*Campbell AME*
I must say I've been basically a dictator as "We going do this." "Yes, pastor." We were here when they came. They didn't send for us. We were here when they came and we started the church and then they came. They basically, they ask questions, but if I make a decision, I say, we're going to do this or that or I think it'll be a good idea. I don't usually get a lot of flak. I'm not really a dictator, though, but I guess I sound like one.

*Sanctuary Church of the Open Door*

Effective leadership would include having a vision where the needs are of the Jewish community is, and how to fulfill those needs within the parameters of our mission statement. My attachment is not to Orthodox Jewry--because I'm not Orthodox and I don't keep kosher at home--is to the building and also to Rabbi Goldman ... But it is to the building. It's to the historic connection, the beauty and the legacy of the Jewish community.

*B'nai Abraham*

We're to protect ourselves. We want to do it that way, so it's like man, how am I going to get this done? With the relationships that we have, we worked with the council woman's... It's not even our council person, it’s the next council person over. On Wednesday, they came in on a day they were supposed to be closed, and they got me a meeting with somebody in city planning and we figured out how I could submit a building permit for the bathroom because it's just for that address. The city accepted the application. We got to first base. In the past we never even got to first base. Without that connection getting us to the planning department we wouldn't have been able to figure that out. We just would have been kept butting our head.

*Urban Worship Center*

Well, we have episcopal leaders that change every eight years. It can be a lot of trouble, but like I said earlier, Reverend Sly was here 20 years, which made the congregation very, very stable. There are other churches that have pastors changing every three years. Those are the ones that are usually struggling and full of conflict.

*Devereux Methodist*

Well, the church still maintains the vision to most of all be that organized body of believers that, as we say, lead, love and lift a community to an abundant life in Christ. The building doesn't determine whether we do that or not. It's our obedience to the Great Commission that determines whether we do that or not, often said a great commitment to the Great Commission will produce a great church. That's what we're about, obeying the Commission. We have the type of faith that we believe that the God that we serve is going to allow us to do what needs to be done just like Pastor Thompson believed that God allowed him to purchase this building so they will have a place to worship. I too believe that the same God will allow us to sell these buildings and find another place to worship.
Garden of Prayer

I'm still finding because I think that that leadership has to conform to the particular context in which it's in. I know what particular leadership style I have and it's different from Israel Carver. It's different from the other priests that were here. I had to somehow merge my style and their expectations and somehow find a middle. What I would perceive as effective leadership is to provide an atmosphere where others will feel empowered to do ministry. I see myself as a utility, as a connector, a bracket, something that holds two things together to one another.

Holy Apostles and the Mediator

If you think about the intangibles, and they’re very practical things, I think our preaching, our worship, our mercy efforts, our small group model, but those are all things that are a part of our vision and our mission and our strategy how we live that out. It’s a safe place for people to come and investigate faith and ask questions and have doubts. We don’t talk about non-Christians or skeptics. We talk to non-Christians and skeptics. We genuinely care and we work very hard to create a safe environment for people to explore faith.

Liberti

Lifecycle

Lifecycle is defined in two ways. First, lifecycle refers to the history and life of the building itself. Second, it refers to the lifecycle of the congregation. This code was particularly helpful in capturing the rich histories of the congregation and how senses of history inflect the ongoing worship and management of the HSP, as well as the overall trajectory of the building – especially in terms of major repairs and thought of selling of property over time. Like all things, congregations and HSPs have natural lifespans, sometimes including many cycles of strength or adversity.

Lifecycle is essential to understanding the key questions with which this project is grappling. That said, it may be best to separate the lifecycle of the building as a sub-code under building stewardship. This could allow a more nuanced understanding of the ways in which the lifecycle of a congregation’s physical presence impacts its vulnerability and resiliency.

Possible sub-codes: Health of congregation (declining, growing, and the like); historical trajectory of the congregation

Lifecycle Quotes

The really significant challenge is remaining open or not. By that, remain open means probably merging with St. Mary's. Unless there's a lottery win, the financial ability is not there to sustain the congregation. How to make that
transition? So whether to merge even though there probably will be very few people, extremely few people if not none, who will continue on or to decide to close the parish and end Crucifixion's historic existence. It’s a little complicated also what the Diocese is going to do. I think no one wants to close such a historic parish but also there is a time where history ends. There are endings.

Church of the Crucifixion

My predecessor I think was a more take-charge guy. He was just the right person for the time, because they had kind of come off a bad fit and was reeling from that a little bit and that pastor had also been authoritarian even more so, I think. Authoritarian sounds, maybe that is not quite the word, but more directive or more imaginative.

Summit Presbyterian

Next big challenge is to embrace the newness of where we're going. As you can see, most of our members are older members. What has worked for them--to give that up is frightening for some of them. To embrace something that is new, that's pretty much for everyone. To embrace something that's new that you don't know the impact that it's going to have on your history, it's a challenge. To embrace the new faces that will become Union Baptist Church.

Union Baptist

Some of them moved away. A few people had become part of a new church plant that came down here. They had been meeting with them and they left to go there. There haven't been any that have left because of real bad reasons or anything, but just left. We've seen a little change over, but a church our size--I mean, you guys probably know better than I do, but my understanding looking at Barna and all those other people that do all the different studies, the average church in the United States is 80 people. I believe that's what average is, so I guess we're average or slightly above average. When you're dealing with what we consider the smaller size of that, you know when 10 people leave, that's a lot. When we drop down from that say 100, 100 plus attendants. You can see the difference in there, but that has happened over time. Other people have come and gone.

First Christian Assembly

I do because Metropolitan was a, and still is in some respects, a major stakeholder in this area. They proved that to be so in the 50s, in the 60s, in the 70s because they enjoyed neighborhood membership.

Metropolitan Baptist

We have grown, you had asked this earlier, when the diocese did make some decisions one of the things they looked at when they clustered the parishes... One of the criteria that they looked at what they called vibrancy. Was in the number of baptisms you do as opposed to funerals. The number of weddings. I will say, of the nine in our group, we did more baptisms than the others eight combined. We average about 50 baptisms a year. There is still a
lot of life in that sense. Funeral-wise we only average about 10 or 12 a year. We don’t have as many people dying as we do coming in.

*Our Lady of Lourdes*

Yes, I believe because, first we bought the house in Fifth Street, and even we consider as a house, I mean as a temple. Nothing different from the house. Just the monk living there, and the Buddha statues. Not really as a temple because a very small space, and the temple in Cambodia is huge. We have worship building, we have ceremony building, we have like plenty of monk rest there. Cafeteria, cemetery, Buddhist high school or university. When we have just a house, it’s very hard, even though we move to Sixth Street here, it’s much better. Even it is not exactly as the temple in Cambodia, but they consider us unique Buddhist temple in Pennsylvania and also you see the gate, the building, the wall is great. This is the first, this temple that have the symbol of Buddhist temple in Cambodia.

*Preah Buddhist Temple*

Because we’ve been more open, more open to listening, more open to sharing. Like having a narcotics group meet here, that would never have happened before I got here. We did have an AA group was meeting here, that would never have happened. And I just said, you know, we gotta do some things differently, we’re supposed to be a community church. And I’m not taking any credit for it, I’m just saying that it would never have happened. Knowing the history of the church.

*Shiloh Baptist*

We have some families, unfortunately when the school closed; we lost a lot of families. They went and registered their children in other area schools, and as Catholic Church would have it as their tuition structure is set up, if you're a member of the parish, you pay less in tuition so a number of them have joined other parish communities even though they still live in the boundaries of Saint John's.

*Saint John the Baptist*

We were growing and now we're kind of plateaued, but I'm hoping we'll start growing a little bit. I think with the economic situation in Puerto Rico, I've noticed there's a lot of Puerto Ricans moving here. There have been, for the last couple years, a lot of Dominicans moving here from New York, so I think that's going to continue.

*Visitation BVM*

Right now, the building suits us. Number one, location. It is very convenient to majority of our congregation. I'm talking currently. Also, the size of the building fits our current congregation size, however, I cannot predict what's going to be in the future. Our preferred action plan for future growth would be, number one, we'll start the second service. We're already making plans for that, for English service. Number two, we would branch off and start
another congregation somewhere else, in some other location. Once again, these are the preferred options for us
today, but I don't know what kind of shift will happen in the future. The reason I'm making that qualification is that
the community is changing little by little. For instance, people, as they get established, they try to move to better
housing, better schools.

*Lifeway Baptist*

It's a passion and knowing her skill set I think she is just a perfect match and to some degree it's our family business
even I'm the pastor ... you know it's a family business. So outside of, you know my father being the longest pastor,
this is our family business and if that is your skill set then that's where you need to rise and where she's definitely
going to tell you she's not the preacher or the pastor but you know this is my contribution.

*United Missionary Baptist*

Yeah, we're in ICU. We're like in survival mode. We want to get to therapy. We're trying to get walking. The church
is tired. It's a tired church. I'm not there long and I'm tired, so the goal is to get into therapy, active, moving, develop
partnerships, sensible; we need help, collaboration. We need help.

*19th Street Baptist*

We do know that we were at least at the first general conference of the AME church because when we look at the
documents from all of the churches represented; Campbell is listed as being at the first general conference of 1816.
That's officially that we were there, but anything before then is just ... They were old traditions. We've been in
existence for about 208 years, so it makes us the ... Claiming the second oldest, simply because even on the top of
the building ... On one of the signs in front of the church, it actually says, "Second AME Church," but there's another
church that's claiming that as well, so that's why we can't ...

*Campbell AME*

We had some young people that wanted to go to another church and some of them were good givers, and I'm
beginning to adjust ... I found out this was a generational thing and I had to adjust some of my thinking and my
activities to be more current in music and in the way I did things. I had to adjust that to meet ... That tells me
something that they were looking. Maybe my church had become a little bit too steeped in tradition, and I had to
change to meet their needs. Of course, now you got the old people that wanted the old.

*Sanctuary Church of the Open Door*

The history is that there was a very large wave of immigration from Eastern Europe between 1880 and 1920, and
this particular congregation was started by Eastern European immigrants at the early part of that immigration in the
1880's. They started a congregation in another location and after some time, they collected money to buy this
property which was ... There was a church standing on this property, which was a breakaway of Mother Bethel next
door. I don’t remember the name of that church, but they completely demolished the building that was on this site,
and they built this synagogue. It was dedicated in 1910. The way they built this was ... trying to build a synagogue
which was familiar to them from Eastern Europe. That's what they wanted to preserve, that tradition.

*B’nai Abraham*

Ultimately, we're still a pastor run church. We're in a long term transition to being an elder driven church cause that
way the longevity of the church is more secure. We're definitely a pastor led church in transition to being an elder
led church.

*Urban Worship Center*

It needs to get stabilized and grow. It's got to find its equilibrium because ... I think because of the pastoral shifts,
that there's a lot of competition for who the headcheese is. Eventually it's got to stabilize that this is how the church
is run. Then, I think it can, it has to grow. It has the potential to grow, because it's in a very good, accessible spot.
They really have to adjust to who the congregation is now. We have had several people who have passed away. It's
not a large number, like Emmanuel is, but they have lost some key leadership through death, or just age. Not
functioning, able to function, so it's had to shift because of that to make that transition.

*Devereux Methodist*

I'm coming full circle. I was a child of this church and left this church. In 2001, I found myself back in this church.
Trust me; it didn't click until the day I was installed. I was standing in front of the congregation and I started thinking.
I said, "Wait a minute. This is where I started." Not in this building, but in this ministry.

*Garden of Prayer*

Well, I can't speak for those who aren't here, who aren't currently worshiping here, but I do know that those who
are here have baptized, married and buried most of their family out of here. This was, with this being an African
American parish, this was one of the few Episcopal Churches where many African Americans felt welcomed, wanted
and so there's a sense of ownership of this building.

*Holy Apostles and the Mediator*

The reason why we did the Mainline Campus is because we have this relationship that's going on all the time. A lot
of people that live on the Mainline and work Center City, it's ... People who were coming in and would be like, 'Oh,
there is a church here that fits who I am as a person,' so they started attending and then a lot of people out on the
Mainline started asking, 'Would you consider planting another campus out here?' Through a discernment process,
we did that.
Membership

Membership is a broad code that encompasses the ways congregation members are invested in the organizations’ health (regarding both buildings and finances) and the (changing) make-up of the congregation. Aspects of this code have the potential to be included under some the suggested sub-codes presented in this document. Membership engagement with the congregation as a whole and with the buildings is important; this could take the form of financial giving or sweat equity/time. Some patterns around membership emerged through the data, though again it is important to keep in mind that, for the most part, this represents the senior clergy’s view of the membership.

Possible sub-codes: Lifecycle of membership; Member engagement level

Membership Quotes

I think it has to do with, one, is the majority is older. I think that there are a number of reasons if I really dig and go deep. For the older retired set, its "I've done that, I'm retired. Don't ask me." You've got a lot of teachers, educators who don't want to teach Sunday school even though they would be great at it. They are just not doing that. The middle group, the 65 and under, I believe it has to do with buy-in and the viewing of church as a commodity where we provide a service and I give you my monthly envelope or my weekly envelope. I know that they would not view it this way but that's the reality. We provide a service for them even though they love Crucifixion, they love me, or they love the priest.

Church of the Crucifixion

The congregation built each building. The congregation considers itself very much rooted in the neighborhood, and most people in the congregation either live in the neighborhood or perhaps they used to live here and now retired just a little bit further away. It's not a commuter congregation. I mean, you have some folks in Chestnut Hill, some folks in Oak Lane, although they might be related to someone who lives nearby. Maybe east Mount Airy, but it's still a neighborhood church, so in that sense, having a physical space here is important to the congregation's history and identity.

Summit Presbyterian

Are you in a court room? You ask the same questions every way. Dig a little deeper. Just by virtue of the composition of the congregation has caused it to change. We've had people who have relocated because of what's going on in
the neighborhood. We’ve had those who have passed. We have a woman 105 years old just recently passed. I would say... They contribute, too.

*Union Baptist*

That, I think, is part of the size of the church, being a non-denominational, independent church, but it also has a lot to do with where we live. South Philly is just like that. I say, within the churches down there, that we have a lot of incest. So many people hop around. They go here, this one, that one, that one. You see that. They come here for six months, then they’ll pop over there for six months, then they’ll come back again. ‘Oh, I tried over there.’ You see a lot of that going on. A lot of the churches are not growing because of new people coming to salvation. It’s a lot of people migrating from one place to another. Sad, but it’s true.

*First Christian Assembly*

Now anybody who has working around since knows that there are more women in church and more women support church financially. You definitely don’t want their bathrooms smelling like pigeons. I’ll give that to the guys but you’re not going to do that to the women.

*Metropolitan Baptist*

It’s funny because the archbishop made a surprise visit here last year, he does that. He just sort of pops in on a Sunday, without warning to say mass. He said that he was amazed that we get a nice mix in all of our masses, as far as both age, ethnic background, color, but also how they all seem to get along with each other. They are all friendly with each other, especially when we have the social hours downstairs. You have college professors sitting with elderly black women who used to be housekeepers. They are all chatting and talking and laughing with each other. I think there is a nice camaraderie among people.

*Our Lady of Lourdes*

It’s different from the church that we keep, we got as the member, we call you member to make donation. For Buddhist temple, voluntarily you can come and go. As I told you that Cambodia now is a Buddhist country. Most Cambodian are this. Even they are not a member, when we have Cambodian New Year, Cambodian National Holiday, a Buddhist holiday, they come to the temple. We cannot say that they are a member, not the member but we can say that they a Buddhist congregation, a Buddhist follower.

*Preah Buddhist Temple*

Congregations, especially older congregations, don’t like to be told they gotta do something different from the pastor. But, when they hear it from somebody else that agrees with the pastor, that’s the difference. That’s almost like supporting the clergy part of well, he’s right. And that gets over “I don’t like it.”
Shiloh Baptist

It's just hard for me. I've only been here a year. I'm hoping it's trending up. I don't think what we are experiencing here is very different from what other Roman Catholic congregations are experiencing in other areas. Even along the Northeast Corridor of the United States, I really do think we're in a huge transitional period trying to redefine how to be a parish. We've been so ... In Philadelphia, if you don't have a school ... I don't know how many people have said to me, "Oh, your parish closed." I said "No, the school closed." Our parish is still open but they all do it because they all associate with the school so much rather than the parish.

Saint John the Baptist

On paper financially both congregations have been struggling for a long, long time. I don't like the term poor congregation and I've heard this out, but I really poured into when I heard it. How can you say that you are poor if you are proclaiming a message into the world that there isn't in the world today? We are not poor, but we are financially challenged.

St. Michael's Lutheran, Kensington

I think the challenge of being an immigrant in the United States is something that the majority of our people are dealing with and so it's hard for them to understand a lot of the things that we do and why we do them. A key piece for us is trying to educate people just things like the registration, registering in the parish, trying to get people to be active who might feel like I'm undocumented. I don't want to ... People's lives are chaotic. They're working a lot. They're working long hours. They don't have time for a lot of things like participating in the church things because I would say the Vietnamese work 6 days a week, the ones that are working. All of them work 6 days a week, so Sunday is the only day where you can have a meeting, where you can do things. For most of our other Spanish immigrants, they're working 5 to 6 days, sometimes 7 days a week. That's just a challenge. Getting people involved with so many they're being torn in so many different ways, mostly economically, but also with their families. They're sending money back home to support parents and that kind of thing. There are a lot of things that are important to them. I'm sure; I have no doubt, that we would have much more participation if it weren't for these economic realities and their immigrant reality. I'm sure they would love to help out more, but just not financially and time wise it's very difficult for them.

Visitation BVM

Yeah, we're becoming more diverse ethnically. The English speaking component is definitely growing. Our young people speak English primarily. I think our, as people get more established in a country, the social component, the economic is improving as well. We see more people who transition from ... into middle class economically.

Lifeway Baptist
And it goes back to the reason why we won't sell. People may not come here on a Sunday morning, but in their mind, we’re their church and they can come and get married and get buried here. If people do come and visit, when I do the appeal for why you would want to belong to a church, this is why you would want to belong to a church. For weddings, and for funerals, and people just think that the church should be standing whether or not they come and donate or anything, but United is going to be here and if my daughter gets married, it’s going to be at the local church. Or if somebody dies, we can go up to United and have the funeral there. So we get a lot being the local church but it’s what we are and it’s what we do.

*United Missionary Baptist*

A little bit, yeah. I mean it’s kind of hard to join per se. You got to come in and see, it can't be based upon what you see on the outside. It's like the Lord told Samuel, go to Jesse's house, I want you to save Israel, but don’t look at the outward appearance, look at the heart. That’s what God says. If you look on the outside, it's kind of rough, when you come in you’re like, wow you know what. I've had friends who have come in and said; wow there's a lot of love here in your church. So we’re characterized by a lot of love.

*19th Street Baptist*

I don't know because there's so much resistance to it, because of the median age of the congregation. Technology and social media is not their forte, not to say that it hasn't been used, but it hasn't been used as much, until I got here. If they don't buy into the social media trends, I think they're going to kind of get swept away. Not to say that everything has to evolve into everything is on social media, but at least recognize that you have to be a part of it if you're going to reach those that are outside of Campbell. There's a resistance there.

*Campbell AME*

I know it's normal. It's the women who ... You know there was one preacher said if he goes to a church and it's all men, his first and last sermon would be farewell brethren. It's the women that raise the money. It's the women that gets the programs going. The men sit back and supervise. It’s the women that keeps the church going. I find that in every congregation regardless of the denomination, it's the women that raise the money. It's the women that gets all the programs. Women always got ideas. It'd be typical.

*Sanctuary Church of the Open Door*

This is not an active congregation. Basically, the purpose is to come pray. We don't do social service. We don't do outreach, really. The mindset or the mission is more about being available and open to anybody who is looking to connect with the Jewish tradition. You don't need to be a member to be accepted. That's the Chabad motto.

*B’nai Abraham*
The way that's happening is getting people to love their church and they're doing it, not for me, they're doing because they really want to do it and they want to do it for God. That has been a real blessing. There's people that say yeah, I'll do this. They just want to get an easy sale on the church. That doesn't work. The work that we've gotten done, people have really wanted to do it, and most of it has been done at no cost as far as labor is concerned.

*B’nai Abraham*

Oh, I see what you’re saying. Yeah, they do try to stay within the budget, but if they had to buy ... Like the boiler, or something that they buy outside of the budget, then we ... The trustees and the administrative council could make that decision. However, because of it being such a large expense, we do involve the congregation, but the congregation’s not involved in the decision-making.

*Devereux Methodist*

This is a poverty-stricken neighborhood. If this is a poverty-stricken neighborhood and we are reaching out to neighborhood, we are reaching out to poverty-stricken people. Now, you put that up against maintaining two buildings financially, but you're dealing with what? Poverty-stricken people. You have to pray and depend on those people who most likely don't live in this neighborhood but attended this church because they are attracted to the ministry here. Those are the people who financially speaking, help maintain the building. Our debts our paid. We don't owe anybody any money like that. I'm not saying the people in the neighborhood don't give, I'm not saying that.

*Garden of Prayer*

The change has happened within the last year so we have a new ECW head, new Daughters of the King leadership and new members of the vestry, all within the year. I think that that has to do with some of the building momentum that's going on within the congregation. I get the sense that people are beginning to see that Holy Apostles is vibrant and that they're at a special position to sort of be on the ground floor of the restart. I think that that new renewal in taking part in a leadership position has come as result of new excitement on Sunday morning worship. I don't want to say it's me but I say that some of it's got to be me.

*Holy Apostles and the Mediator*

Most of our church will tend to be young professionals, young families with a lot of students, med students, grad students, doctoral residents, PhD students, and then we’ve also had a growing number of older families, especially at the Mainline, we’ve had older families who have teenagers and that kind of thing. We have a spattering of senior citizens, but not a lot. I could name most of them, which is probably not a lot.

*Liberti*
Neighborhood Context

The neighborhood context code was meant to capture the ways in which the physical and social environments affect the congregation as well as the effects of neighborhood change happening around congregations. These neighborhood dynamics include issues of gentrification, systemic and institutional racism, investments made by the City, and the ways in which the neighborhood is (or is not) reflected in the makeup of the congregation (i.e. are financial contributions low because the congregation is situated in a low-income area or is the membership changing / decreasing due to gentrification). This code could be broadened (and perhaps renamed) to include the context of the community/city. Within some interviews we heard about very particular constraints for congregations in historic buildings that were entwined with city policy – some of this was parking related (including PPA ticketing) and some was focused on the city’s building enforcement and permits.

Possible sub-codes: parking; permits (including preservation regulations); gentrification.

Neighborhood Context Quotes

Usually the history of an urban congregation in decline is that they had once been white, wealthy and now find themselves isolated into a minority community or intercity community that has not very much money and has its own needs but the church doesn’t know how to reach out and engage ‘the other’. We’re a different paradigm. We were a different paradigm. Here is a minority parish with not a lot of money findings itself in the midst of a quickly gentrifying economically moving quickly upper middle class situation and so it’s a new paradigm of integrating from the reverse. How do you do that when you don’t have the fancy music program and you don’t have all of the bells and whistles in an un-church society?

Church of the Crucifixion

You can get much nicer offices, I’m sure, in other places, right? I mean, we have our charms and it’s a nice kind of community. I should say almost everyone who rents here lives in the neighborhood. We’ve really learned that people don’t commute to rent at Summit Church.

Summit Presbyterian

Well, there are obviously issues of race and then there are issues of spirituality and the need for it. There are misconceptions and misunderstandings about in passing encounters that I think if we were in the same room, we would be able to remove some of the challenges that are perceived, which would facilitate us moving towards
resolving real challenges and real issues. We want to remove the trash so we can see what really needs to be dealt with and then partner as much as we possibly can to get that done. Otherwise, you defeat... You’re fighting... You’re walking through mud when you could be swimming through water.

Union Baptist

Not enough street parking. People coming in late because they drive around looking for a space. Getting frustrated. Not coming out on Tuesday night because Tuesday’s worse here than Sunday. Sunday’s a little bit easier to park. You get people getting up and going out and moving around. Tuesday night, people are home. They're not moving. Plus, we compete with the community center across the street, plus the high school down the street. Of course, even though they have a parking lot, they have things that they overflow their parking lot. We fight for spaces, so it impacts people’s ability to come to church. Then because of it, the ones in South Philly who do drive here, when they circle around and do finally find a space, then when they go home, they got to drive around looking for a space. They’re like, ‘Do I really want to drive two hours to go to church for an hour?’ You know what I mean? It’s hard. It makes a big impact.

First Christian Assembly

I think that the neighborhood is changing for those institutions to better serve their population. We have more student housing now than we've ever had in this area. Remember Drexel, their largest incoming freshman class was about four years ago, and it's been steady growing since then. The community is changing rapidly toward a university snapshot, if you will.

Metropolitan Baptist

I would say mainly the demographics. Right now, the neighborhood around the church, and I would have to say it is 95% white. The values of the properties have a lot of homeowners, especially long-term homeowners, scared because of the tax assessment that’s going to take effect next year. And that’s concerned a lot of our older members who own properties; they’re worried about what they’re going to have to pay in taxes. That’s the major change, that’s the fear that a lot of them are concerned about. Some of them are able to wade in to get some of the reductions. But still some of the people cannot afford to pay some of the reductions because of the values.

Shiloh Baptist

Pastor M: People think just because we're white, there is a lot of poor white people. Probably more poor white people than there are poor black people or poor Hispanic and ...

Yes, this Kensington is considered one of the poorest neighborhoods in Philadelphia and it's like-

Pastor J: One of the ten poorest neighborhoods to the country.
Pastor M: ... ten poorest neighborhoods in the country. Same with people being on welfare, they think it's black people on welfare, it's not. The majority is white people on welfare. It's a false image of what poor is in Philadelphia.

*St. Michael’s Lutheran, Kensington*

Most people are from the neighborhood, so most of the composition would be fairly not well off. We obviously have different people, like I said, who live in the northeast or something and have professional jobs and stuff, but the majority of the people would be what the government would consider poor.

*Visitation BVM*

We needed to get permit for that, so we went to the Historical Commission in Philadelphia and we presented that proposal. At first, they were not happy with it, but when we showed them some of the photographs of how it's going to look and explained that the cost is prohibitive for our congregation to pay $80,000 for a repair of the slate roof, so finally they agreed. They understood that it is better to compromise on the material than basically lose building to multiple leaks and so forth.

*Lifeway Baptist*

Last 5 to 10 years, because 10 years ago I guess drugs, people were getting more help. The social services were coming. It was the recuperating from the effects of the drugs. You now have the children of those who were on drugs. So you now have teenagers and some adults of left with like no skills, no job, and no desires for jobs. Then a lot of the older people did pass on. So, and then those children had the homes. So, you did see where houses weren't kept up. Like they used to be kept up. A lot of lack of pride in our culture.

*United Missionary Baptist*

I mean, we have to look not so much at today but we have to look down the road, so 15/20 years down the road, right. So we got Center City moving south, so we have to say, 15 years from now we want to be a jewel of the community, an asset to the community, a place where when people's lives fall apart they can come over to the green church, get some hope, what do you need to change?

*19th Street Baptist*

They bought up Walnut Street near there and put fraternity houses and stuff all around and they're always building. They're always building something--between Drexel. Drexel owns Market Street and University of Penn owns Spruce. What happens, every time they take over something that means our taxes go up. Our taxes go up because they're tax exempt. As a matter of fact, they called us down to City Hall, one day, all the churches, to see whether we were doing anything, selling anything... I said, "We don't have any ... We have a little bookstore, a little candy
store in there, but no taxes come from that." They called us down to City Hall to find out what we were doing, and so they changed their minds and decided not to tax us.

Sanctuary Church of the Open Door

The neighborhood, after the Second World War ... Before the Second World War, really, started to disappear. I was born after the war. If you look at the migration, we were already living in West Oak Lane.

B’nai Abraham

I guess one more thing I can share is that with our congregation being predominantly Hispanic and the community no longer being... The census shows that there’s a high Hispanic population, but it’s not here. When they redo the census, it’ll show a much different number. Our challenge is really connecting with this new community that’s coming in. I know upgrading the building is going to be a big thing for the community—to make that connection. Then the reality is no matter how prepared I am, doctorate and all this stuff, the fact that I’m not white is going to affect a certain amount of people coming and that’s sad, but it’s the reality.

Urban Worship Center

I think the shift that you see, and I think we're going to see it in all Philadelphia churches, when Philadelphia had the jobs here, the people who worked here had more money. Now, we're living off the people who are on their pensions from the jobs that they had here in the city. The younger members don’t ... That's why they tend to be low-income, or no-income, is because there’s not the jobs in the city. That's a major shift that we can really see coming down the road as the people who are giving regularly are giving off of retirement from work in the city.

Devereux Methodist

25 years? There has been transition of people. Some of the neighborhood businesses that were here years ago have gone, even though there are new businesses, they're down the street in Strawberry Mansion Square. There are new businesses inside there. It's changed. Even the school, there has been a school called Stockley School in this neighborhood, which is now a church actually, Prince of Peace Baptist Church. Yeah, there are many changes.

Garden of Prayer

No, I wouldn't say subtle but there is a sense of racism that sort of pervades this area to where that a lot of the money, resources and attention. Garbage men won't come down here when they should be because they're scared of, because they don't feel safe. That's just one thing. Imagine living in a place to where that you've got heap of shit everywhere and your area smells bad and it looks bad. You've got people that are destroying their bodies and they don't really care about their outward. Either people are desperate or they're just pissed off and want nothing to do with organized religion at all.
Holy Apostles and the Mediator

I mean, the obvious answer I have to give and I do believe and that it’s really God’s grace, but I know there is other congregations that don’t have a similar situation. I would say that our success largely has to do with our mission and our mission being relevant to the cultural context that we’re in. That’s the first thing. The fact that we have an outward focus. We’re not about us is very important to the types of people that come in the doors.

Liberti

Resilience and Vulnerability

Resilience and vulnerability were pre-determined codes incorporated into the code book as a way to explore the ways in which these broad concepts were reflected in various ways throughout the interviews. Neither code is meant to offer a conclusive definition of either vulnerability or resilience. These are meant to highlight the complex and nuanced ways congregations can exhibit both resilience and vulnerability simultaneously, as well as the relationships between the factors pushing HSPs and their congregations toward states of resilience and vulnerability. These concepts apply to the both the buildings and the congregations inhabiting them.

Vulnerability can manifest in a mismatch between will and ability to care for and maintain an historic building, or instances of significant internal conflict among the congregants and leaders. Resilience could be manifest in strong, adaptive leadership; in decisions to share use and rent space in the HSP complex; or in decisions to move and sell the HSP to a new congregation.

Congregations are not necessarily singularly resilient or vulnerable – rather they often exhibit measures of each and can be characterized as falling along a spectrum of more/less resilience or vulnerability based on a complex relationship between many factors.

Resilience Quotes

I have learned historic speak because it’s never actually been systematically worked out, we are one of the first parish houses owned by a black Episcopal congregation. We are pretty sure it’s the first but because we haven’t done the formal research I have learned we have to say “one of them”. The history of the parish house is interesting and varied. It housed one of the … We are pretty sure it was the first black YMCA in Philadelphia. It had one of the first kindergartens. There are others. WEB DuBois was a member here while he lived in Philadelphia writing "The Philadelphia Negro". There is quite a bit about Crucifixion in that volume.

Church of the Crucifixion
I think it speaks to the strength of the congregation is that when that repair the tower went so far beyond the estimate people were concerned. But I think there was a high level of trust in the leadership. There was consternation but it didn’t cause a real rupture or anything like that.

*Summit Presbyterian*

There are, in the immediate area--say within one block--there were 4 churches. A total of 5 including Union. Union is the only one still here. Union is the only one that is still functional. I believe that we are here for a purpose.

*Union Baptist*

When I came in 2004, every week I walked every inch of this building only because I didn't want someone else to tell me what was wrong. I wanted to know, I wanted to be able to see.

*Metropolitan Baptist*

We have grown, you had asked this earlier, when the diocese did make some decisions one of the things they looked at when they clustered the parishes... One of the criteria that they looked at was what they called vibrancy. Was in the number of baptisms you do as opposed to funerals. The number of weddings. I will say, of the nine in our group, we did more baptisms than the others eight combined. We average about 50 baptisms a year. There is still a lot of life in that sense. Funeral-wise we only average about 10 or 12 a year. We don't have as many people dying as we do coming in.

*Our Lady of Lourdes*

Because the temple is our identity, our center for religious, for culture, for everything.

*Preah Buddhist Temple*

We are now one of the major meeting spaces for South Philadelphia because we’re handicap accessible. And it is so convenient and people can walk to it. That’s what we hear all the time.

*Shiloh Baptist*

I shared with you we have 23 water bills. I think the approach would really be to try and be good stewards of what we have. The real treasures of our community are not these buildings, though they have played a significant role in the lives of the parishioners, but the real treasure are the people themselves. I read in an article in the Inquirer today the pastor of First African Baptist congregation the church is really the people. That’s true but we’ve invested so much into these buildings, that’s it’s hard to separate from that, so again any marketing or sale of property community to serve the of all our greater needs, the pastoral and spiritual needs of the community.

*Saint John the Baptist*
Yes. Yes, I do. We view this as an asset. As much as it can be falling down or ... I was really grateful in the past, the men, because it was men that were in charge of the council at the time, they really felt maintaining the building was important. As you see other churches in the area where they are literally falling down, this one is fairly in very good shape. Most people are just surprised how good it is.
*St. Michael’s Lutheran, Kensington*

We’re very blessed because we have a lot of people who are very handy, so most of the Vietnamese, they own nail salons and do hardwood floors. That’s their businesses, so they’re very good with fixing things. We have a plumber, so they put in ... We had one bathroom in the lower church and they remodeled the whole thing. We now have 3, which is a huge benefit. They did all that.
*Visitation BVM*

In our church, deacons are responsible for meeting physical needs of the congregation. One of the areas where we have a dedicated deacon is building maintenance. That person is responsible for maintaining the building. He uses a combination of volunteer help from the congregation and hired professionals for a specific trade. That’s how it’s done.
*Lifeway Baptist*

Once you use it, it’s not like a gas bill. You only buy what you use you know we share with the church at the beginning of the year like this is the budget and this is how many services we have and this what we are trying to do for the neighborhood so this is what we need in order to keep the building running.
*United Missionary Baptist*

When you look at the committee you have Marion Thomas, she’s an architect. We have a friend of our church, Thomas Bacon, he is the main engineer at the Navy Yard. So that’s commercial property maintenance. And he said he was on loan, he’s helped us. He’s at our meetings, so Thomas Bacon. Reverend McFadden is a builder... Then we have Professor Aaron Wunsch, Professor Frank Matero and then Partners, so if anything happens we can say "Do you know anybody? Help us!", Reverend Goode. So because the goal is to build the team collaboration, is to build the team. So everything we need is there somewhere. I may not be able to put my finger on it immediately but it’s there, we can find somebody to do it.
*19th Street Baptist*

A lot of it is needs-based. Of course, every AME church has certain ministries that we have to have based on our discipline. We have to have a missionary group. We have to have a young people’s group. We have to have a lay
organization. How those organizations operate in the individual local church, it depends on the community and the
culture of that ... It depends on the culture of that community.

*Campbell AME*

I don't have any professional training, but having been in it for a couple, I think I know pretty much. I count on these
guys to tell me what needs to be done. Some of them have expertise in that area.

*Sanctuary Church of the Open Door*

If that would happen, it probably would have happened decades ago. The fact that the congregation has pulled
through some of those difficult times in the Jewish community in Center City, we're now on the way up, not on the
way down, so it's not ... They may have had that conversation, where people see doom and as a last resort, we have
to sell the building--and many synagogues went through that in this neighborhood. There were many synagogues
that ended up selling their buildings because there was just no other option. For our congregation, we consider the
fact that it's survived those years as a miracle. Now, it's not a question of whether we're going down that road.
We've passed that stage of having that fear.

*B'nai Abraham*

They have everything. When we had to borrow the money to buy the building, we wouldn't have been able to
borrow money from a bank. Our denomination has its own loan fund. It eliminated a lot of red tape. We were able
to close on $160 grand in less than 30 days. That helped a great deal. Assemblies of God is the largest Protestant
denomination in the world. Depending on the year, the largest in the United States. One year it's the Southern
Baptist, the other year it's us. We have so many programs available, curriculum, networks. It's just depending on
what we need.

*Urban Worship Center*

You know we pay into a fund, right? We pay Conference apportionment; every church is assessed. However, they do
provide loans, grants, you can right to the larger denominations through the General Conference as well as Annual
Conference for programming support. Your apportionments pay for your insurance. They pay for your property
insurance. They pay for your pastor's package. The congregation doesn't have to pay ... It's not like every
congregation has to go out and find health insurance for their pastor. It's done through Conference, so that's a lot of
support.

*Devereux Methodist*

The struggle was rebuilding the congregation and also getting help to rebuild the congregation. I had to make some
phone calls. I had to call in some favors. Some was family, some were friends to help build the congregation. Now,
some Sundays, we may have 75 people here. Then some Sundays, you may look up and there is only 25 people here.
The attendance is inconsistent. Why? If I knew, I would write a book about it.

_**Garden of Prayer**_

As far as Sunday school and things that we would need it for Sunday morning, it's very underutilized. I think part of that is the decline of the congregation, the lack of children on Sunday morning. It's making us to change the way that we measure success for the congregation.

_**Holy Apostles and the Mediator**_

We've been worshiping for six years and raised six times our annual budget for the purchase and renovation of this building, which is mind boggling. It's surprising to us, so yeah.

_**Liberti**_

**Vulnerability Quotes**

Certainly not terribly self-sustaining. We went from 13 people on a Sunday to almost 40 on a Sunday. Between 2 services, which was great. You lose 10 people and that was due to death, moving away to California, children left and it sort of knocks your footing and I'm not sure that we've really recovered from that.

_**Church of the Crucifixion**_

Usually we have surpluses, but this year we are expecting to end in a little bit of a deficit and that is mostly because our rental. We were really short of tenants.

_**Summit Presbyterian**_

So, what I have been trying to do is first find out exactly what the cause of that fall off is outside of the normal changing in the neighborhood. There's always some internal things that are going on. Without getting into that too much, my primary focus has not been that we embrace everything about the church. It's the immediate that we stop the bleeding and then we could start over from there.

_**Union Baptist**_

I never talk about money. I don’t ever, I mean, I’ll teach on what the Bible says about tithing and I can't remember the last time I did that, but we do not stress money. We do take an offering, but we don't say, ‘Hey, get your money out; get your pocket book ready.’ We don’t do that. In fact, we go way the other way. People aren’t really forced to give at all... And many can't give. A lot of people who come here are clients of the Access Center or guests of the
Access Center. I'm not going to beg for money from somebody who I know can't even make their rent or their heat. No. God doesn’t need their money. He provides.

_First Christian Assembly_

Oh man, wouldn’t that be nice. No we do not, usually just to be honest with you, usually you won’t find endowments or savings with predominantly African American churches because people don’t leave money like that, and they just don’t do it.

_Metropolitan Baptist_

The temple survives by donation. As long our people make donations then it's okay. We don't have any problem yet since, have this temple.

_Preah Buddhist Temple_

Well, that is the major change. With the increase in housing, in the multi-unit housing, and the development, and that’s it. There have been some upgrades in the schools, but that’s it, the development and the parking and it’s caused a major problem.

_Shiloh Baptist_

The parish in the merger process, parish where other communities are merged into, it inherits the debt and the assets among those communities. The Roman Catholic Church ... if any there parishes that merged with St. John’s had a debt it’s now the debt of the entire parish. We did inherit significant debt. We had debt, we inherited more debt. We also inherited a capital needs trust fund, that was held by one of the parishes. We have about a million dollars in a trust fund.

_Saint John the Baptist_

Then that's a big tune of a lot of pastors these days are talking about having to be bi-vocation. This is my second career also. I had been an office manager and doing administration. Yeah. I'm the secretary now. Planning things or doing the bulletin, doing the flyers and what not the ministry forced me. Slowly pushing it off to other people helping them to ... To empower them because again I'm trying to put myself out of business and take over more and more of it. It's always happening with our food pantry. We have someone who is doing all the flyers and planning and she also does for the flea market and the Christmas bazaar. I don't have to prepare any of that stuff. So it's fantastic.

_St. Michael’s Lutheran, Kensington_
Financial situation, paying the bills. I think also with the building itself. I mentioned about the windows and trying to come up with a way to deal with some of the just regular maintenance things that have to be dealt with, which are not cheap.

*Visitation BVM*

We are little bit limited. Number one, we have activities in those building on Sundays, and then every night. Every night there is something going on here. If we wanted to share—we have other small churches approach us to rent space on Sunday. Unfortunately, they all want to do their services at the same time we use it. Our parking situation and our restroom situation does not allow that because we are already limited with our parking and limited with our restrooms. Bringing another group would be prohibitive.

*Lifeway Baptist*

It’s a passion and knowing her skill set I think she is just a perfect match and to some degree it’s our family business even I’m the pastor … you know it’s a family business. So outside of, you know my father being the longest pastor, this is our family business and if that is your skill set then that’s where you need to rise and where she’s definitely going to tell you she’s not the preacher or the pastor but you know this is my contribution.

*United Missionary Baptist*

For here, yes, that would be the mortgage. Yes, independent realtors purchased the mortgage, and it was purchased as a result of bad loan debt scenario, again I wasn't here. And the church has, well first of all, as I said, they didn't pay dollar for dollar for it. We know that. And we're trying to settle that, trying to get money, because again it's over 30% of the budget.

*19th Street Baptist*

I don't go by their vote. I never ask for a vote. I guess because I'm the founder of the church and they have that confidence in me. I'm not a Jim Jones, now, don't get me wrong. I'm not a Jim Jones. They have a lot of confidence in me because I haven't led them wrong, yet. I actually talk to the board. *Sanctuary Church of the Open Door*

Kalen: How significant is the deficit?
David: It's really hard to say, because accounting-wise, the financials will show a deficit of either $12,000, year to date, or 17. I'm not too sure what the number is. The cash flow is also a different story.
Kalen: For how many years has the congregation had an operating deficit?
David: As long as I can remember. Actually, what really sustained the shul was the flood because after they were able to get the shul back to normal, there was enough money to keep it going. That's the pot that's been getting smaller and smaller.
B’nai Abraham

It’s that elder led issue. We really got to hand over more reigns and have systems and processes in place to follow, which, ours are all informal or not documented. That’s what it’s going to take to change. To document processes, formalize them, and get people in the position to take care of it. Getting the right people is the hardest part.

Urban Worship Center

The restraints? Well, one of the things is that the congregation doesn’t have much input as far as their clergy is concerned. We are appointed every year, so they can look up one day and I’ll say, "Sorry, y’all. I got to go." That can be very devastating to the congregation.

Devereux Methodist

In the sanctuary, if you look on the floor, there are certain places where the floor is weak from water damage. If you look on the wall, you can see rust spots where the leak. If you look up on the ceiling, you can see parts where the wood has rotted. That’s in the sanctuary. Here, your partner will probably tell you, if you took it to the third floor, there is a section of one of the rooms where the ceiling is wobbly in the sense from water damage.

Garden of Prayer

We’re rich in building and rich in spirit and rich in enthusiasm and rich in motivation but struggle financially.

Holy Apostles and the Mediator

[inaudible 01:00:52] a high degree because of where we are and the kind of person who comes to our church, we have an abnormally high level of transients and so we have a lot of members who they don’t leave because they’re mad at us. They leave because they’re going to do their doctoral work somewhere else or their job is taking them. We have somewhere between 2 and 300 members.

Liberti
VI. MAPPING
A. INTRODUCTION

The following portfolio of maps documents, explores, and analyzes the HSP inventory and relates the inventory to its urban contexts. The maps have been organized in two parts. Part A maps represent the locations of the inventory (n=839) and the location of the interview/architectural survey sites (n=22), and parses the inventory along several categorical lines drawing on field survey variables (date of initial construction, preservation listing status, current use, current condition). Part B maps explore connections between the distribution of HSPs and a sampling of Philadelphia-wide demographic and socio-economic contexts.

Other general notes about the map portfolio:

- For many of the Part A maps, two versions are presented: one based on major streets as the orientation device; the other on Philadelphia City Planning Commission Planning Districts; the data is otherwise identical across these pairs;
- The contextual maps included here are suggestive, not exhaustive; many more analytical combinations of data are possible; likewise, analysis at larger scales is possible;
- All of the maps have been constructed in ArcGIS; therefore, there is a great deal of flexibility for editing, modifying, and re-designing them according to the needs of the final report (all data and GIS framework files are being submitted as part of the project data deliverables).

MAP NOTES

A. Planning Districts of Philadelphia

Map of Planning Districts developed for Philadelphia2035 Citywide Vision, June 2011. Planning district boundaries have been used as overlay in Maps 2, 4, 5, 8, 10, 12, 15, 17, 18, 21, 22 to add neighborhood context to individual map themes. Source: Philadelphia City Planning commission (via OpenDataPhilly)

B. Arterial Streets of Philadelphia

Map of Arterial Streets were used as an overlay in Maps 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 19 to add a locational context to the map themes and the inventory.

Maps of HSP Locations and Field & Architectural Survey Findings

1. Site Locations of Surveyed Historic Sacred Places (HSPs) – by Streets

Source: Philadelphia’s HSP Field Survey, 2015-2016

2. Site Locations of Surveyed Historic Sacred Places (HSPs) – by Planning District
3. **Locations of Architectural Survey – by Streets**  

4. **Locations of Architectural Survey – by Planning District**  

5. **Density of HSPs by Planning District**  
Source: Philadelphia’s HSP Field Survey, 2015-2016

6. **Vacant and recently demolished and HSPs**  
Map of HSP sites that are vacant and those which were demolished between 2011 and 2015; observed during the course of inventory update and field survey. Additional demolitions, conducted prior to 2011, are documented in the Demolitions subset but not mapped here, as this list is incomplete and needs additional research.

7. **Eras of Initial Building Construction – by Streets**  
Source: Archival research  
Map of the eras of construction of individual HSPs, represented with an overlay of arterial streets. This map has been populated and symbolized as per the AGE_CODE variable in the inventory. Refer to Appendix F: Research Design, Data Dictionary for more explanation on Age_Code.

8. **Eras of Initial Building Construction – by Planning District**  
Source: Archival research  
Map of the eras of construction of individual HSP, represented with an overlay of PCPC planning districts. This map has been populated and symbolized as per AGE_CODE variable in the inventory. Appendix F: Research Design, Data Dictionary for more explanation on Age_Code.

9. **Listing Status in Historic Registers – by Streets**  
Source: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission; Philadelphia Historical Commission  
Map of the designation status of all properties in the HSP inventory, represented with an overlay of arterial streets. Includes properties listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places (PRHP), the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), both Philadelphia and National Registers, and properties without any designation. This map has been populated and symbolized as per the DESI_CODE variable in the inventory.

10. **Listing Status in Historic Registers – by Planning District**  
Source: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission; Philadelphia Historical Commission
Map of the designation status of all properties in the HSP inventory, represented with an overlay of PCPC planning districts. Includes properties listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places (PRHP), the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), both Philadelphia and National Registers, and properties without any designation. This map has been populated and symbolized as per the DESI_CODE variable in the inventory.

11. **Primary Use of Surveyed HSPs – by Streets**  
Source: Philadelphia’s HSP Field Survey, 2015-2016  
Map of the primary use of surveyed HSPs, distinguishing between religious use (in blue) and other use (in red), with an overlay of arterial streets. “Other” includes all properties for which the primary use does not support stable congregational activity; this includes HSPs that have been adaptively reused, vacant properties, mixed-use sites, worship sites, other uses, and HSPs with an unknown primary use. This map has been populated and symbolized as per the USE_CODE variable in the inventory.

12. **Primary Use of Surveyed HSPs – by Planning District**  
Source: Philadelphia’s HSP Field Survey, 2015-2016  
Map of the primary use of surveyed HSPs, distinguishing between religious use (in blue) and other use (in red), with an overlay of PCPC planning districts. “Other” includes all properties for which the primary use does not support stable congregational activity; this includes HSPs that have been adaptively reused, vacant properties, mixed-use sites, worship sites, other uses, and HSPs with an unknown primary use. This map has been populated and symbolized as per the USE_CODE variable in the inventory.

13. **Polity Categories of Surveyed HSPs – by Streets**  
Source: Philadelphia’s HSP Field Survey, 2015-2016  
Map of the religious affiliation of active religious properties, per the DEN_CODE variable in the inventory.

14. **HSPs adaptively reused – by Streets**  
Source: Philadelphia’s HSP Field Survey, 2015-2016  
Map of the HSPs that have been adapted to a mixed or non-religious use, with an overlay of arterial streets. This map has been populated and symbolized as per the AR variable in the inventory.

15. **HSPs adaptively reused – by Planning District**  
Source: Philadelphia’s HSP Field Survey, 2015-2016  
Map of the HSPs that have been adapted to a mixed or non-religious use, with an overlay of PCPC planning districts. This map has been populated and symbolized as per the AR variable in the inventory.

16. **Building Condition Index – by Streets**  
Source: Philadelphia’s HSP Field Survey, 2015-2016
Map of the building condition of all extant HSPs, per the methodology outlined in Section III-C of this report (“Building Conditions Index”), represented with an overlap of arterial streets. The index assumes that some characteristics (e.g. holes in roof) indicate more significant physical vulnerability than others (e.g. drainage detached); individual queries were weighted and assigned point values according to their severity. This map represents the final conditions score for each HSP, weighted according to the number of contributing queries.

17. **Building Condition Index - by Planning District**
Source: Philadelphia’s HSP Field Survey, 2015-2016
Map of the building condition of all extant HSPs, per the methodology outlined in Section III-C of this report (“Building Conditions Index”), represented with an overlap of PCPC planning districts. The index assumes that some characteristics (e.g. holes in roof) indicate more significant physical vulnerability than others (e.g. drainage detached); individual queries were weighted and assigned point values according to their severity. This map represents the final conditions score for each HSP, weighted according to the number of contributing queries.

**Contextual Maps**

18. **Market Value Analyses Around HSPs – by Streets**
Market Value Analyses (MVA) developed by The Reinvestment Fund (TRF) to explore real estate typologies in the City. An overlay of MVA typologies with HSP locations describes the real estate environment around the HSP inventory. Colors used in Maps 18, 19, and 20 are proprietary colors of TRF.

19. **Market Value Analyses Around Vacant and Recently Demolished HSPs**
Map of the cross-section of MVA (see Map 18) with vacant and recently demolished HSPs (see Map 6). Colors are proprietary colors of TRF.

20. **Market Value Analyses and Building Conditions Index**
Map of the cross-section of MVA (see Map 18) with the building conditions of surveyed HSPs (see Maps 16 and 17). Colors are proprietary colors of TRF.

21. **Vacant Lots in proximity to HSPs – by Planning District**
Source: Philadelphia Water Department, via OpenDataPhilly
Map of small and medium-sized vacant lots (of areas measuring less than an acre), aggregated by a quarter-mile buffer around each surveyed HSP. Darker shades of symbology depict higher density of vacant lots within the buffer.

22. **Civic Assets Around HSPs – by Planning District**  
Source: Rebuild Philadelphia Project, Philadelphia Parks and Recreation  
Map of the density of civic assets around HSPs, aggregated by quarter-mile buffer around each surveyed HSP. Civic assets represented in this data set include libraries, playgrounds, recreation centers, pocket parks, parks, older adult centers, ice rinks, environmental centers, etc.

23. **Racial Distribution and HSPs**  
Source: Social Impact of the Arts Project (2014), University of Pennsylvania  
Map of predominant race in every census tract. Races that constitute more than 50% of population in a tract were deemed predominant.

24. **Education Levels and HSPs**  
Source: American Community Survey, via Social Explorer  
Map of the percentage of population (age 25 and older) per tract with a high school education or higher. Non-residential areas were excluded from this map.

25. **Crime Index and HSPs**  
Source: Philadelphia Police Department, via OpenDataPhilly  
Map of crime rates of violent incidents (Part 1 crimes) that occurred between 2010 and the present. The values have been normalized by natural log values and symbolized in quintiles. Darker, bluer colors indicate a higher count of crime incidents. Tracts with a total population of less than 1,000 have not been symbolized due to their skewed ratios. Temporal distinction (such as the year and time of the incident) was not factored into the mapping process. Incidents with UCR codes (rounded off to the nearest hundred) 100, 200, 300, 400, 500, 600, and 700 were used, and recorded point locations were mapped. More information about source data can be found here: [http://metadata.phila.gov/#home/datasetdetails/5543868920583086178c4f8e/representationdetails/570e7621c03327dc14f4b68d/](http://metadata.phila.gov/#home/datasetdetails/5543868920583086178c4f8e/representationdetails/570e7621c03327dc14f4b68d/)

26. **Economic Wellbeing Factor and HSPs**  
Source: Social Impact of the Arts Project (2014), University of Pennsylvania  
Map of economic wellbeing index, calculated by Census tracts. Index developed by Mark Stern and team at Social Impact of the Arts Project, 2014 ([http://impact.sp2.upenn.edu/siap/](http://impact.sp2.upenn.edu/siap/)).

27. **Social Wellbeing Index and HSPs**
Source: Social Impact of the Arts Project (2014), University of Pennsylvania

Map of social wellbeing index, aggregated to zip codes. NOTES: In 2010 and 2015, four variables (NEIGHBOR, IMPROVE, BELONG, AND TRUST) were averaged and subtracted from 4 to compute SC index. In 2012, two variables (IMPROVE, BELONG) were averaged and subtracted from 4 to compute SC index; SC index (1=lowest, 4=highest).

More information on the source data and methodology is available here:
B. MAPPING ANALYSIS
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01. SITE LOCATIONS OF SURVEYED HISTORIC SACRED PLACES (HSPs)

BASE MAP LAYERS
- Arterial Streets
- City Limits

Surveyed HSPs (839)

Source: Philadelphia HSP Field Survey, 2015-2016
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02. SITE LOCATIONS OF SURVEYED HISTORIC SACRED PLACES (HSPs)

Surveyed HSPs (839)
Source: Philadelphia HSP Field Survey, 2015-2016

BASE MAP LAYERS
- Planning Districts
- City Limits
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06. VACANT AND RECENTLY DEMOLISHED HSPs

Vacant HSPs (39)

HSPs demolished between 2011-2015 (23)
PHILADELPHIA’S HISTORIC SACRED PLACES
10. LISTING STATUS IN HISTORIC REGISTERS

LISTING STATUS
- Philadelphia Register (63)
- National Register (47)
- Both (76)
- No Designation (653)

Source: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, Philadelphia Historical Commission
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11. PRIMARY USE OF SURVEYED HSPs

USE
- RELIGIOUS (698)
- OTHER (141)

Source: Philadelphia HSP Field Survey, 2015-2016
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12. PRIMARY USE OF SURVEYED HSPs

USE
- RELIGIOUS (698)
- OTHER (141)

Source: Philadelphia HSP Field Survey, 2015-2016
PHILADELPHIA'S HISTORIC SACRED PLACES
14. ADAPTIVELY REUSED HSPs

Surveyed HSPs (839)
Adaptively Reused HSPs (82)
Arterial Streets

Source: Philadelphia HSP Field Survey, 2015-2016
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17. BUILDING CONDITIONS INDEX

Building Condition Index (#HSPs per class)

- 0.00 (60)
- 0.01-0.1 (220)
- 0.1-0.2 (244)
- 0.2-0.3 (155)
- 0.3-0.4 (96)
- 0.4-0.5 (37)
- 0.5-0.6 (10)
- 0.6-0.7 (4)
- 0.7-0.8 (2)
- 0.8-0.9 (2)

WORST

BEST

Source: Philadelphia HSP Field Survey, 2015-2016
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18. MARKET VALUE ANALYSES AROUND HSPs

Philadelphia MVA 2015
(TRF Code, #HSPs per class)

- Regional Choice (A1, 45)
- Regional Choice (A2, 83)
- Steady (B, 70)
- Steady (C, 56)
- Transitional (D, 56)
- Transitional (E, 76)
- Stressed (F, 52)
- Stressed (G, 82)
- Distressed (H, 99)
- Distressed (I, 102)
- Insufficient Data (15)
- Non-residential Areas (26)

Source: Market Value Analysis 2015, TRF

○ Surveyed HSPs
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19. MARKET VALUE ANALYSES AROUND VACANT AND RECENTLY DEMOLISHED HSPs

Philadelphia MVA 2015
(TRF Code, #Demolished HSPs, #Vacant HSPs)

- Regional Choice (A1, 0, 2)
- Regional Choice (A2, 4, 6)
- Steady (B, 4, 5)
- Steady (C, 3, 1)
- Transitional (D, 2, 2)
- Transitional (E, 1, 6)
- Stressed (F, 0, 3)
- Stressed (G, 1, 3)
- Distressed (H, 2, 3)
- Distressed (0, 3, 6)
- Insufficient Data (N, 1, 0)
- Non-residential Areas (X, 1, 4)

Source: Market Value Analysis 2015, TRF

- HSPs demolished between 2011-2015 (23)
- Vacant HSPs (39)
PHILADELPHIA’S HISTORIC SACRED PLACES

21. VACANT LOTS AROUND HSPs

#Vacant parcels within 0.25mi radius

0  250  500  750  1000  1000-

Vacant lots (less than an acre)

Source: Philadelphia Water Department (via OpendataPhilly)
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23. RACIAL DISTRIBUTION AND HSPs

Surveyed HSPs (839)

Tracts with HSPs

Predominant Race Class in each tract (#HSPs per class)
- African American/Black (264)
- Black, Hispanic (108)
- Hispanic (9)
- White (145)
- Other diverse (312)
- Insufficient data (1)

Source: Social Impact of Arts Project, (2014) 
University of Pennsylvania
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25. CRIME AROUND HSPs IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS

Surveyed HSPs (839)

Crime Index in each census tract (HSPs per census tract)
- 8.485 - 9.567 (95)
- 9.568 - 9.865 (172)
- 9.866 - 10.133 (166)
- 10.134 - 10.441 (211)
- 10.442 - 17.582 (194)

Source: Philadelphia Police Department (via OpenDataPhilly)
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26. ECONOMIC WELLBEING FACTOR AND HSPs

Surveyed HSPs (839)

Tracts with HSPs

Economic Wellbeing Index

- Lowest (-1.608)
- Average (-0.017)
- Highest (3.457)

Source: Social Impact of Arts Project, (2014)
University of Pennsylvania
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27. SOCIAL WELLBEING INDEX AND HSPs

Surveyed HSPs (839)

Social Wellbeing Index (#HSP's per quintile)

- 0.001 - 1.87 (216)
- 1.88 - 1.99 (279)
- 2.00 - 2.02 (91)
- 2.03 - 2.11 (132)
- 2.12 - 2.40 (121)

Source: Social Impact of Arts Project, (2014)
University of Pennsylvania
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VII. APPENDICES
   A. Master Inventory of Philadelphia’s Historic Sacred Places (2016)