

2011 Property Task Group Report

2011 Property Task Group - Summary of Recommendations

Based on site visits and a review of all council-owned properties, the task group has recommended that the camp properties be divided into three tiers that guide the action taken with respect to the camp properties:

Tier I Camps will be maintained and improved based on existing maintenance and capital improvement processes. (dependent upon available financial resources) Most girls in the council should have access to “Tier I” camp experience within one hour of her community. The council Tier I camps are:

- ✓ Camp Libbey
- ✓ Camp Whip Poor Will
- ✓ Camp Stonybrook

Tier II Camps will be monitored and improved as needed over the next 3-5 years for changes in camp use and other risk areas, especially encroachment. (dependent upon available financial resources)

The council Tier II camps are:

- ✓ Camp Butterworth
- ✓ Rolling Hills
- ✓ Camp Woodhaven
- ✓ Little House (in Greeneville)

Tier III Camps will be sold or investigated for other options for ownership, management, or use of camp based on surrounding conditions or restrictions on use/sale of property. Tier III camps are:

- ✓ Camp Ladigrau
- ✓ Camp Myeerah (conservation easement)
- ✓ Camp Greene (deed restrictions)

I. Task Group Purpose

The task group was charged with completing an analysis of all council properties based on the *Property Criteria for Decision-Making* adopted by the council board of directors. The task group was to provide a complete report to the council board of directors, including a summary of the property analysis, and recommendations for property short and long range plans, including property development and property disposition.

II. Task Group Members

Dave Kylander, Task Group Chair; Board Member
Ann Cople, Day Camp Director/ Service Team Member
Dawn Gruber, Service Unit Manager
Victoria K. Huseman, Council Trainer
Carl Kissling, Girl Scout Camp Volunteer/ Audubon Society Member
Lydia McMillen, Council Volunteer/ National Delegate
Cathy Spaeth, Service Unit Manager / National Delegate
Charlie Tyler, Service Team Member
Beth Wykoff, Council Trainer / National Delegate

III. The Primary Challenge and Findings

With the merger of four councils to create Girl Scouts of Western Ohio, came 10 camp properties, each one with unique and treasured features, and a valued camping tradition. This increased camp capacity brings flexibility and diverse program options, but it also brings increased liability and annual property operating and capital budgets exceeding 1.2 million dollars.

Overall Findings on Camp Usage versus Camp Availability

A thorough assessment of the available camp space versus council camp usage indicated that this council has significantly more camp space than is used. When the national Girl Scoutⁱ and non-Girl Scout trends reflecting decreased camp usageⁱⁱ, are also considered, our analysis shows that we have more camp capacity than we need. In 2010, even excluding the two rested camps, the **total usage was about 23.7%ⁱⁱⁱ of total available capacity^{iv}**, with only one camp (Stonybrook) operating at more than 30% capacity and two camps (Myeerah and Rolling Hills) operating at less than 5% of capacity.

IV. Background / Method

- A. The 2010 / 2011 Property Task reviewed the following documents and data:
 1. The Girl Scouts of Western Ohio *Values Statement on Camp Program Sites* and Guiding Principles and Property Criteria for Decision-Making adopted by the council Board of Directors in June 2010.^v (Addendum B)
 2. 2009 and 2010 Camp Usage statistics
 3. 2010 and 2011 Camp Budgets
 4. Camp legal designations and restrictions, including Land Trusts, conservation designations and donor restrictions.
- B. The task group visited and developed a summary report for every council property including nine camps (includes two rested camps), the Greenville Little House, and the four service centers.
- C. The camps were grouped into three “tiers” based on how well they met the established principles and criteria for decision-making:
 1. **Tier I Camps** are our largest and most resource-rich camps. They are well-maintained and provide sufficient lodge space, diverse “tent” units, year-round program/dining areas, and strong program supports, (e.g. pools, core-staff supported low/high ropes, climbing walls, etc.). They are located (relatively) near population centers and are well-laid out for ease of access and use by Girl Scout troops/groups, service units, and program.
 2. **Tier II Camps** provide most of the features of a Tier I camp, but are generally less well-used based on location and/or availability of well-maintained, year round facilities and program supports.
 3. **Tier III Camps** have significant limitations that restrict use based on location, size, availability of year-round facilities and program supports, and /or environmental/health concerns.

V. Standards for Evaluation of Council Property Portfolio

The task group used the following broad standards for evaluation of our property portfolio as a whole, in order to best meet the values, principles and criteria previously adopted by the council board of directors. When reviewed overall, our camp property portfolio should provide:

- A. Capacity to serve most girls in the council with a “Tier I” camp experience within one hour of her community.
- B. Capacity to support existing summer camp program opportunities. (resident camp, Troop Adventure Camp, day camp, and My Gal / My Guy activities)
- C. Program resources and support to address the changing needs and experiences of volunteers and girls, including the increasingly limited time availability of both girls and volunteers.
- D. Consistent standards for maintenance, cleanliness and “core resources” at all camp properties.

VI. Task Group Recommendations

- A. **Camp decision-making be based on the three tiers established by the task group.** See *Addendum A – Camp Evaluation Summary*, for the summary evaluation of camp properties and specific recommendations.
 1. **Tier I Camps** be maintained and improved based on existing maintenance and capital improvement processes.
 - a) **Camp WhipPoorWill**
Invest in swimming pool to bring to current standards.

- b) **Camp Libbey**
 - (1) Improvements needed in pool and shower house areas.
 - (2) Consider renovation of administrative building to increase program space.
 - c) **Camp Stonybrook**
 - (1) Take out or renovate (for new purpose) unused tennis courts
 - (2) Improve shower / toilet house available to troop campers.
 - (3) Monitor potential to move day camp area to front (north) area of “main camp”
 - (4) Monitor for encroachment risks.
2. **Tier II Camps** be improved and/or monitored over the next 3-5 years for changes in camp use and other risk areas, especially encroachment.
- a) **Little House** – Recent capital investment so no additional investment required at this time.
 - b) **Camp Rolling Hills**
 - (1) Address major drainage issues in tent units
 - (2) Consider investment in rebuilding adirondack units or alternative structure.
 - c) **Camp Butterworth**
 - (1) Improve large, winterized kitchen options
 - (2) Ensure access to latrines in climbing wall and archery barn areas.
 - (3) Improve maintenance standards
 - (4) Monitor safety/risk issues related to proximity of Little Miami Bike Trail.
 - d) **Camp Woodhaven**
 - (1) Invest in camp to develop accessible, hands-on environmental center
3. **Tier III Camps** investigate other options for ownership, management, or use of camp based on surrounding conditions or restrictions on use/sale of property.
- a) **Ladigrau** - Sell Property – Property has lowest use and would require significant investment to bring to camp standards.
 - b) **Greene** (Donor restricted for use as a Girl Scout camp and camp lies in a Land Trust)
 - (1) Investigate options for collaborative agreement to allow some continued Girl Scout usage.
 - (2) Will have to involve donating family in discussion on next steps.
 - c) **Myerah** (Conservation easement restricts options for sale and usage.)
 - (1) Investigate options for collaborative agreement, sale or donation that may allow some continued Girl Scout usage.
 - (2) Consider selling some or all of camp property to the right buyer.

B. Council Service Centers

The task group did not believe that the criteria used to evaluate all council sites was fully applicable to the service centers and so did not include these facilities in their overall summary. The exception was the Toledo Service Center, where there were some significant safety concerns based on location, as well as notations that this building design and layout did not appear to efficiently support regional operations.

ⁱ GSUSA Property Survey Report, February 2010

ⁱⁱ A Shift for Survival, Copeland, Gregory, et.al.; Camp Business, February 2010

ⁱⁱⁱ *Girl Scouts of Western Ohio 2009 Camper Days Statistics*; Capacity is based on “camper day” calculations, which equal the number of potential camper spaces available x the total days on which a troop could camp. (i.e. 2 weekend nights per week and 7 day weeks for spring, winter, and summer breaks)

^{iv} 2010 Girl Scouts of Western Ohio Camper Days Report

^v Girl Scouts of Western Ohio Property 2009/2010 Property Task Group Recommendations