

FEASIBILITY STUDY
for
LUTHERAN CHURCH OF HOPE

Prepared by
KIRBY-SMITH ASSOCIATES

JUNE 6, 2010

Table of Contents

Item	Page
A. Introduction.....	4
B. Purpose Statement.....	5
C. Analysis	5
Congregational Meeting	5
Surveys and Interviews.....	6
D. Observations	17
E. Conclusions	18
F. Recommendations	19
G. Summary	21
H. Thank you	22

Appendices

*Feasibility Study for
The Lutheran Church of Hope
Broomfield, Colorado*

A. Introduction

In 2009, the LCH completed a Strategic Plan, prior to calling a new pastor. The 19-page plan articulated a Mission, Vision, and Values Statement, and then set multiple goals and strategies. For our immediate purposes, Goal Six focused on property: “Improve the real property of LCH essential to meeting the needs of our congregation, missions, and ministry.” The Plan was approved by the congregation on May 17, 2009.

To that end, a Building Committee was formed “to develop a master plan” to determine needs and “viable solution alternatives,” and to oversee implementation of the approved solutions. To follow on that work, the Strategic Plan also recommended the establishment of a “Facility Finance activity to raise the capital needed.”

In December 2009, Fransen Pittman General Contractors completed a Conceptual Design Estimate and provided LCH with drawings of the proposed changes, which soon were posted in the narthex and on the church’s website for all members to see. The plan emerged after a series of discussions with church members about what needed to be done. The plan proposed a new and enlarged Fellowship Hall, a renovation of the Sanctuary with music room additions, a second story for a music room, and multiple Sunday School rooms for adults and for children and youth, a chapel, a library renovation, and a pre-school addition.

About this time, a new pastor, Rev. Scott McAnally was called and installed, and shortly after, on February 2, 2010, Kirby-Smith Associates was invited to present a plan for both a Feasibility Study and a Capital Funds Campaign. On February 15, the Church Council approved membership lists for the Capital Finance Team (the Facility Finance activity in paragraph 2 above), the Building Team, and the Strategic Planning Team. On February 21, a special Congregational Meeting approved the Fransen Pittman drawings for what was now called the “Master Campus Plan,” and the hiring of Kirby-Smith Associates for a Feasibility Study.

That study began in early March with preliminary meetings that yielded a campaign vision, “Renewing Hope,” and a decision to hold a second Congregational Meeting on April 11, 2010 to present the Chairs of the key committees and the KSA Services representative to explain the process of a Feasibility Study. At this time, the cost estimates of the “Master Campus Plan” were presented to the congregation. On April 12, the pastor and council president sent a letter and then surveys were sent to all members, 32 of whom were selected to be interviewed. Surveys were sent to approximately 187 families, and several more were sent to youth members. Ninety-eight (98) surveys were returned, all but one from families. Thirty-one (31) members were interviewed. The total family response rate was a very high 68%, suggesting, at a high level of probability, the accuracy of the findings for the full congregation. The interviews took place April 21 – 24, 2010.

B. Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Feasibility Study was as follows:

1. Measure the congregation's awareness of the proposal to expand the church facility.
2. Measure the congregation's support for the proposed project.
3. Measure the potential financial support for a project through a potential Capital Funds Campaign.
4. Gather relevant input regarding the proposal.
5. Present recommendations to church leadership, along with a subsequent report to the congregation, regarding implementation of the proposal.

The study was conducted in an objective and factual manner by a Vice President of KSA Services. All attempts were made to be true to the needs and intentions of LCH. All comments, concerns, and opinions expressed during interviews, surveys, and conversations were recorded, classified, tabulated, and presented in this report.

The ultimate objective was to measure, as accurately as possible, support for the proposed facility expansion. This report is presented in a statistical and narrative format. All information collected is for the exclusive use of LCH and its leadership. Any questions, comments, or inquiries referencing this study should be addressed to KSA Services.

C. Analysis

Congregational Meeting

One meeting was held between church services on April 11. Presentations by key leaders offered the congregation the background to the Master Campus Plan, a vision of LCH's future, and the beginnings of a discussion on financing.

The representative from KSA Services was asked to say something of his background and experience and explain the Feasibility Study process. The following points were made.

1. Who is Kirby-Smith Associates?
2. How will we serve your church?
3. How will the Feasibility Study be conducted?
4. What happens after the Feasibility Study?

Questions followed immediately and the KSA Services' representative stayed to worship with the congregation, answering additional questions after the service.

Surveys and Interviews

Methodology: Questions 1, 2, and 10 were treated as “family” questions – one answer equaling one “family.” However, one interview yielded two independent answers to Question 10, equaling two gifts. All other questions addressed to families (those who marked A or B to Question 2) were counted as two answers. Due to rounding, percentages will not always be 100%.

Question 1
How long have you been a member of LCH?

	Interviews		Surveys		Overall	
0 – 5 Years	3	10%	14	14%	17	13%
6 – 10 Years	2	7%	8	9%	10	8%
11 Years or Longer	25	83%	75	77%	100	79%

The high percentage of faithful, long-term members speaks well of a church that many would admit has had its ups and downs over the years. “This is my family,” one member said. Although the LCH leadership might have wished for a better response among newer members, 21% is still a solid percentage on which to build.

Question 2
Family Status

	Interviews		Surveys		Overall	
School-Age Children	7	23%	18	18%	25	20%
Adult Children or None	18	60%	52	54%	70	55%
Sole Member	5	17%	27	28%	32	25%

LCH exhibits a good mix of families with young children, families with adult children, and single members.

Question 3
What is your overall view of LCH?

	Interviews		Surveys		Overall	
Superior	7	13%	17	9%	24	11%
Very Good	38	72%	99	62%	137	64%
Average	8	15%	42	26%	50	23%
Poor	0	0%	2	1%	2	1%
No Opinion	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%

An overwhelming majority of 76% consider LCH to be a *Very Good* to *Excellent* church. Some of those who rated LCH as *Average* were taking into consideration the long history of the church. One interviewee who rated the church *Average*, said he had “lots of hope right now,” suggesting that Pastor Scott was “so far above” what he’d experienced in the past.

It is common for those members with a long history in the church, and LCH has a high percentage of such members, to be both more guarded about and more critical of their church. They’ve seen it all — both the highs and the lows, and thus are likely to have more ideas about what needs to be done to improve the church. This makes the 76% *Very Good* to *Superior* rating, and the 1% *Poor* rating stand out ever further.

The members clearly think highly of their church, and this makes it likely that they will come together in their support for “Renewing Hope.”

Question 4
How involved are you at LCH?

	Interviews		Surveys		Overall	
Very Involved	24	45%	9	7%	33	17%
Involved	16	29%	33	25%	49	25%
Somewhat Involved	26	26%	66	50%	92	47%
Not Involved	0	0%	21	16%	21	11%
Want to Be Involved	0	0%	2	2%	2	1%

Not surprisingly, interviewees were far more involved in the church (74% *Involved* or *Very Involved*) than were those surveyed by mail. But even among the latter, the vast majority were *Involved* to some extent — a full 89%. This compares to an average benchmark of 60% in churches across the country, suggesting that participation at LCH is well above average.

This level of participation suggests a church whose members hold to a sense of responsibility, as well as an obligation to serve the Lord and the mission of the church. These factors will give weight to opinions offered regarding the proposal to add space and expand ministry.

LCH is a church that offers substantial opportunity for congregational involvement, and substantial percentages of members find some niche for their talents.

Question 5
How knowledgeable are you of the Master Campus Plan?

	Interviews		Surveys		Overall	
Great Deal	20	36%	14	9%	34	18%
Some	29	53%	86	63%	115	60%
Little	4	7%	16	12%	20	10%
Very Little	2	4%	16	12%	18	9%
None	0	0%	4	4%	4	2%

An extraordinary percentage of members (78%) had *Some* or a *Great Deal* of knowledge about the Master Campus Plan. The overall numbers are testament to the success of the church’s communication plan, a position widely held by the interviewees, one of whom, a long-time member, said it was the “best I’ve seen for any previous project.”

Question 6
What is your opinion of the Master Campus Plan?

	Interviews		Surveys		Overall	
Excellent	17	31%	37	23%	54	25%
Good	28	52%	68	42%	96	44%
Fair	4	8%	17	10%	21	10%
Poor	0	0%	9	6%	9	4%
No View	5	9%	31	19%	36	17%

Interviewees were overwhelmingly favorable to the plan — 83% rating it *Good* or *Excellent*. Roughly one-fifth of those surveyed had *No View*, but a substantial majority, 69%, regarded the plan as either *Good* or *Excellent*. One member praised it as “visionary,” another because it “allows us to expand in phases.” But there were cautionary notes as well. Some members did not favor moving forward until it was clear that the site’s ground water problems were solved, others, who were also concerned about ground water, thought it a mistake to add a second story, questioning whether the foundation was adequate. At least two members

expressed a concern about the absence of any address to landscaping, this concern linked to the pre-school playground that one member believed was too prominently located giving the church the appearance of a pre-school.

Reservations aside, the congregation as a whole thinks very highly of the Master Campus Plan, and this bodes well for the future implementation of some or the entire plan. In addition, the 17% who currently have *No Opinion* are very likely to be brought along in support as they gain more knowledge of the plan.

Question 7

Do you agree with the church leadership recommendation that a 3-year Capital Funds Campaign with a goal of \$3.7 million, in addition to annual giving, be considered to fund this project?

	Interviews		Surveys		Overall	
Totally Agree	8	15%	12	7%	30	9%
Agree	22	42%	57	36%	79	37%
Reservations	17	32%	62	39%	79	37%
Do Not Agree	6	11%	10	6%	16	8%
No View	0	0%	19	12%	19	9%

Of the interviewees, a majority *Agreed* with the goal, though only 15% were in *Total Agreement*. Substantial numbers of members had *Reservations* — 40% or more either had reservations or did not agree. The issue was clearly the price tag, with many members mentioning both the state of the economy and the size of the church. A few did not think that the additions would increase membership, but others countered that argument with a belief that the plan is necessary “for us to grow and to meet our church’s mission.” Several voiced confidence in Pastor Scott’s ability to increase membership.

Question 8

How confident are you that the church can reach the \$3.7 million goal in 3 years?

	Interviews		Surveys		Overall	
Very Confident	0	0%	5	4%	5	2%
Confident	12	22%	45	28%	57	27%
Not Confident	33	60%	70	44%	103	48%
Very Not Confident	9	16%	15	9%	24	11%
Do Not Know	1	2%	24	15%	25	12%

The results are clear. Only a minority is *Confident* that the goal can be reached. Seventy-six percent (76%) of those interviewed were either *Not Confident* or *Very Not Confident*, a higher percentage than those surveyed. Overall, 59% of members expressed a lack of confidence in achieving the goal.

The most frequently mentioned reasons for this lack of confidence were 1) the size of the price tag, 2) the state of the economy, and 3) the relatively small size of the church.

Question 9

How supportive would you be of a \$3.7 million campaign for the Master Campus Plan?

	Interviews		Surveys		Overall	
Very Supportive	15	29%	13	9%	28	13%
Supportive	29	56%	89	56%	118	56%
Not Supportive	2	4%	12	8%	14	7%
Very Not Supportive	2	4%	8	3%	10	4%
Do Not Know	4	8%	38	24%	42	20%

Confident or not, a substantial majority (85% of interviewees, 69% in total) intend to support the campaign, and 20% of members do not yet know whether they will support the campaign. Usually more information, and better communication, will move the “do not knows” into the support columns.

While a decision to move forward with a Capital Funds Campaign depends on approval of moving ahead with any portion of the proposed project, it is encouraging to see such a high level of support, and especially so among those church leaders who were interviewed. This level is certain to rise as more information is made available should a project be approved. The number of undecided participants also draws attention to the importance of clear and constant communication.

Question 10
**In what range would your financial gift be
over the 3 years of the campaign?**

Interview

	Number	%	Low	Medium	High
\$25,000 and Above	2	6%	\$ 25,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 75,000
\$15,000 – \$24,999	3	10%	\$ 45,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 75,000
\$ 5,000 – \$14,999	7	23%	\$ 35,000	\$ 70,000	\$105,000
\$ 1,000 – \$ 5,000	14	45%	\$ 14,000	\$ 42,000	\$ 70,000
Other	5	16%	\$ 6,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 20,000
No	0	0%	–	–	–
Undecided	0	0%	–	–	–
Total	29	100%	\$150,000	\$247,500	\$345,000

Survey

	Number	%	Low	Medium	High
\$25,000 and over	1	1%	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000
\$15,000 – \$24,999	1	1%	\$ 15,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 25,000
\$ 5,000 – \$14,999	10	10%	\$ 50,000	\$100,000	\$150,000
\$ 1,000 – \$ 5,000	50	53%	\$ 50,000	\$150,000	\$250,000
Other	19	20%	\$ 9,800	\$ 23,450	\$ 37,100
No	2	2%	–	–	–
Undecided	12	13%	–	–	–
Total	95	100%	\$149,800	\$318,450	\$487,100

Totals	128		\$299,800	\$565,950	\$832,100
--------	-----	--	-----------	-----------	-----------

Ranges from *Low* to *High* are provided in each category. There were 112 members who responded positively with a total giving range between \$299,800 and \$832,100. Twelve (12) members left the question unanswered. It is reasonable to assume that most of those will give something. Three (3) members indicated that they would give more than \$25,000. How much more was not clear, but the three ranges should all be somewhat higher.

The experience of KSA Services suggests that the *Middle Range* total will often be closest to the amount actually committed during a Capital Funds Campaign effort. In this study, that total is roughly \$565,950, which represents slightly less than twice the annual church offertory. Typically, churches can raise 1 – 3 times their offertory in a 3-year campaign time period, depending on the number of major gifts available. Minus any major gifts, the expectation would be more in the range of 1 – 2 times the annual budget. The result of the study shows potential giving to a project to be within this range. In view of current economic conditions, this is an encouraging sign.

In order to formulate a potential range of giving that could be expected in an actual Capital Funds Campaign, several factors will be applied:

1. Current economic conditions may affect people giving at levels a bit lower than the Middle Range estimate that is normally expected.
2. Some of those who gave no response to the question (10% of participants) may choose to make commitments should a project be approved.
3. A significant number of the households who did not participate in the study may make financial commitments if a Capital Funds Campaign is completed.
4. Those who have a capability to do so may decide to give major gifts, or increase their gifts during the campaign process.

With these factors in mind, a conservative goal of \$500,000 seems quite feasible. A stretch or faith goal of \$800,000 would be a possibility. If marketing efforts are successful and some major or memorial gifts materialize that total could rise. It could rise as well as membership increases.

Question 11

Would you be willing to solicit fellow members for a gift?

	Interviews		Surveys		Overall	
Yes	8	15%	3	1%	11	5%
Perhaps	4	7%	18	11%	22	10%
If Needed	3	5%	11	7%	14	6%
Not Sure	11	20%	40	25%	51	24%
No	29	53%	90	56%	119	55%

The good news here is that one-fifth of the congregation is open to soliciting members, and only 55% said *No* definitively.

In addition, 32 of those individuals interviewed indicated that they were already working on committees engaged in the building campaign or would be willing to assist in hosting receptions.

Question 12

**The Master Campus Plan has identified five leading goals.
Please rank them in order with 1 being your highest priority.**

New Space for Early Childhood Education (Preschool/Sunday School)	Interviews		Surveys		Overall	
1	5	9%	5	5%	10	6%
2	7	13%	15	15%	22	15%
3	5	9%	16	16%	21	14%
4	19	36%	32	33%	51	34%
5	17	32%	30	31%	47	31%

A Renovated Chapel (the original Sanctuary) for smaller worship services and formal occasions.	Interviews		Surveys		Overall	
1	3	6%	7	6%	10	6%
2	6	12%	11	11%	17	12%
3	2	4%	10	10%	12	7%
4	16	31%	31	30%	47	30%
5	24	47%	45	43%	69	45%

A New Fellowship Hall	Interviews		Surveys		Overall	
1	24	49%	34	33%	58	38%
2	8	16%	28	27%	36	23%
3	14	29%	18	17%	32	21%
4	2	4%	20	19%	22	14%
5	1	2%	9	4%	10	4%

Sunday School Rooms for All Ages, including youth rooms and adult education space.	Interviews		Surveys		Overall	
1	13	25%	24	22%	37	23%
2	20	38%	36	33%	56	35%
3	15	29%	34	31%	49	30%
4	2	4%	11	10%	13	8%
5	2	4%	4	4%	6	4%

Updating of the Sanctuary, including chancel renovation, improved and enlarged music area with additional storage, and enlarged sacristy and vestry for worship furnishing storage and use.	Interviews		Surveys		Overall	
1	6	11%	37	35%	43	27%
2	12	24%	15	14%	27	17%
3	16	31%	24	23%	40	25%
4	9	18%	18	18%	27	17%
5	8	16%	12	10%	20	14%

Sixty-one percent (61%) said a new Fellowship Hall was either a first or second priority, only 4% rated it last. Fifty-eight percent (58%) made Sunday School rooms a first or second priority, and again only 4% rated it last. Forty-four percent (44%) listed the Sanctuary as first or second, 14 % rated it last. Twenty-one percent (21%) said the Early Childhood Rooms were a first or second priority, with 31% rating it last, and the Chapel received 20% of the first and second votes, with 45% rating it last. The congregation's priorities seem quite clear.

One word of caution, however, many members seemed to see the Early Childhood Center only in its current status as a separately chartered outreach mission serving a secular purpose, rather than as a space that would serve also as a critical welcoming space for parents with toddlers on a Sunday morning. It's well known that such spaces are essential for churches that seek to grow by attracting parents with very young children. More effective communication of that point might well alter the congregation's sense of priority.

Question 13 (Interviews)

**Would you be willing to assist the campaign
by serving on committees, hosting a reception, etc.?**

See Question 11 above.

Question 14 (Interviews)

**Are there individuals, companies, foundations, organizations
that could provide financial assistance to the campaign?**

Several mentioned the Broomfield Community Foundation, but a member of its board indicated that the BCF does not give to building projects. Others suggested that the city of Broomfield has some responsibility for the groundwater problem. Others mentioned the Boy Scouts, who use the church, Thrivent, possible matching gifts from companies, the Rainbow Tree Preschool, the Hmong congregation who also use the church, the Rotary Club, and the Balswan Children's Center. One member suggested that Home Depot or Lowe's could contribute building materials and supplies. The church should make a list of contractor needs and ask for donations – much like a “bridal registry.”

Question 12 (Surveys)

Question 18 (Interviews)

Comments

Here is a sampling of typical comments repeated, in some fashion, by more than one member.

1. “We need a ‘more inviting’ church, with ‘street appeal.’”
2. “The project may be too big considering the state of the economy.”
3. “We need a ‘wow’ factor to lure additional members.”
4. “The plan is ‘pretty amazing,’ and ‘necessary to the church going forward.’”
5. “We need to move forward, improve the facility to accommodate more programming to again be competitive.”
6. “I am very excited about this but have this fear that the congregation may not see it through.”

7. “Church is not good at soliciting time and skill offerings.”
8. “A dream plan for the future.”
9. “Not happy with the plan, ‘all requirements can be met with a much more practical design.’”
10. “Is the water issue included?” “The parking lot needs to be fixed before anything else is started.”
11. “Better to demolish Fellowship Hall and the original building — ‘drainage problem will not go away,’ too much money on a “bad plan.””
12. “The playground is ‘badly located.’ ‘LCH does not look like a church – but a pre-school.’”
13. “A little ambitious, but now is the time.”
14. “I think it can be done. We have a lot of in-house expertise that can cut costs considerably.”
15. “We should have paid off the mortgage.”
16. “After 28 years, ‘I don’t think I’ve ever felt such excitement at LCH as I feel now. I’m sure Pastor Scott is the reason.’ We have ‘a new confidence in ourselves...and it shows in our willingness to make a commitment to this new project, and therefore new life for LCH.’”
17. “The process must be transparent ‘so far, quite well met.’ ‘Prayer and hope must accompany this work. We must not let our ministries lag behind our building plans.’”

D. Observations

Definition: Observations are based on comments, suggestions, impressions, and various written materials reviewed, along with an interpretation based on our previous experience. The following observations were noted during this study:

1. LCH is a church with strong lay leadership, deeply talented in many of the areas necessary for building campaign success.
2. LCH is a church highly regarded by its members and its members are deeply involved in the life of the church.
3. The vast majority of members are broadly aware of the Master Campus Plan and overwhelmingly supportive of it.
4. There is a high level of excitement about the master plan and LCH's future, much of it positively linked to the energy and enthusiasm of Pastor Scott, but linked as well to a well-thought-out and well-communicated plan.
5. There is also an undercurrent of anxiety, linked to the frequent changes in pastoral leadership in the past, to the state of the economy, to the mortgage still held for the new Sanctuary, and to the recurring problems of ground water.
6. Several members mentioned that the church has many retirees living on fixed incomes. Others made comments that suggested that their own contributions were solely linked to their current incomes. Stewardship, and especially stewardship education, suffers in churches that have had high turnover in pastors, and it seems clear that too few members understand that Capital Funds Campaigns succeed only when church members understand that major gifts must come not from income, but from accumulated wealth.

E. Conclusions

Definition: Conclusions are based on direct interpretation of surveys and personal interviews. After analysis, study, and prayer, the following conclusions have been reached:

1. It is a testament to the strength of LCH's hope for the future that so many members (85%) will support a Capital Funds Campaign, even knowing that they do not now have the resources to build to the vision (76% are not confident they can raise the full amount).
2. At the present time, and given LCH's yearly offertory of \$238,000 in 2008 (a number well below LCH's 5-year average and clearly linked to a pastoral vacancy) and the estimated range of \$299,800 to \$832,100 found in this study, LCH should be able to raise between \$500,000 and \$600,000 for this campaign.

F. Recommendations

Definition: Recommendations are based on our observations and conclusions. The following recommendations are respectfully submitted:

1. Based on the levels of support indicated in the Feasibility Study, leadership should make plans to move forward with a project. LCH will have the summer to prayerfully consider how best to move forward. A budget and financial plan for the project should be established. A phased plan of construction should be determined in consultation with the architect, bearing in mind the proposed budget.
2. Based on the strong support for a Capital Funds Campaign, along with the ample number of volunteers willing to assist, a campaign should be initiated as soon as possible. Adequate planning for a campaign requires several months of lead time. A campaign begun in the fall months could facilitate a winter commitment date. This schedule would allow funds to be gathered while the plan for construction proceeds. This would provide a positive cash flow as the project nears ground-breaking.
3. A campaign goal of \$500,000 – \$600,000 should be established and an overall financial plan created with a possible stretch goal of \$750,000. LCH will need to decide how it will set priorities and how it will phase the project. Given the gap between the cost of the project and the church's ability to raise the sums, three options suggest themselves. First, leaders could decide to scale back the project. Second, a mortgage for the difference, or some part of the difference, may be considered. Third, leaders may consider doing two consecutive Capital Fund Campaigns.
4. Continuing education in stewardship, offered by both the pastor and lay members, is critical to success. The success of a Capital Funds Campaign rests on the understanding and the willingness of congregational members to prayerfully consider giving, not from their annual income alone, but from their accumulated savings — from their wealth.
5. As LCH moves forward, it needs to build on the strong communication efforts already in place, to communicate more clearly its commitment to addressing the groundwater problems as a necessary first phase. This should go some way toward bringing those members troubled about that issue, and who are reluctant to move forward without a resolution of it, into a position of support for the Master Campus Plan.
6. As plans change, LCH needs to continue to communicate openly and well, offering opportunities to shape the final project to all those members who have specific concerns or recommendations.

7. Given the low priority set on improving the early childhood space, the pastor and lay leaders need to make the case that such spaces, attractively and functionally laid out, are critical to church growth — to LCH's ability to attract families with very young children.

8. Given the levels of anxiety expressed about the turnover of pastoral leadership in the past, the congregation needs to hear from Pastor Scott about his commitment to the church and to the campaign, a commitment KSA Services understands that he is prepared to make.

G. Summary

Pastor McAnally, Council President Shannon Ambrosio, and the leaders of the key committees are to be commended for their vision and efforts in bringing the need for more space before the congregation for its consideration.

A total of 221 people, representing 187 households, participated in the study. Interviews involved 53 people from 31 households. The total represents 68% of the approximately 187 active households. The goal of 50% participation was surpassed. About 4 of 5 participants have attended the church for 11 years or more, suggesting a strong, stable congregation. This was substantiated by participants' 76% positive view of LCH. Further, 89% of those surveyed considered themselves "involved" in their church, well above the national average.

Seventy-eight percent (78%) of participants expressed their knowledge of the Master Campus Plan, 83% believed it to be a good to excellent plan, and 69% were supportive of a Capital Funds Campaign to fund the plan. However, participants were not confident that the total could be raised — only 29% were confident.

The congregation made its priorities clear. Sixty-one percent (61%) believed that a new fellowship hall was a first or second priority; 58% regarded the Sunday School rooms as either first or second; 44% considered the Sanctuary upgrades as first or second. The Early Childhood Center and the Chapel drew similar support at 21% and 20% respectively.

Some measure of support for a Capital Funds Campaign was indicated by 69% of participants, with 20% indicating that they did not yet know. In Kirby-Smith's experience, most of those answering in this way will come to support the campaign. Giving estimates totaled a low range of \$299,800, a middle range of \$565,950, and a high range of \$832,100. Experience indicates the middle range is often closest to giving actually realized. Considering factors of additional families who may contribute, along with the fact that current economic trends may suppress giving to some extent, a goal of \$500,000 to \$600,000 seems feasible, with a stretch goal of \$750,000. This would represent about twice the church's annual budget, a figure within the margin churches can normally raise.

Given the gap between the cost of the project and the church's ability to raise the sums, three options suggest themselves. First, leaders could decide to scale back the project. Second, a mortgage for the difference or some part of the difference may be considered. Third, leaders may consider doing two consecutive Capital Fund Campaigns.

Based on positive study results, we recommend that LCH move forward to establish a project budget with a phased approach, and initiate a Capital Funds Campaign to begin the fund-raising process. We also advise leaders to develop a clear vision plan for new ministries and programs, including a timetable for implementation. The study revealed that the more people understand proposed ministry, the stronger their support will be. We also advise utilizing the many volunteers who expressed interest. To delay acting upon this process that has been initiated by the Feasibility Study would cause momentum to be lost. Kirby-Smith Associates stands ready to assist you in moving forward.

H. Thank you

It is with great appreciation that we thank you for allowing KSA Services to assist you with this Feasibility Study.

A special note of thanks goes to Pastor Scott McAnally and church Council President, Shannon Ambrosio for their hard work leading to the formation of the Feasibility Study Committee and the overall communication of details to members. Thanks also to the key committee heads and leaders, Deanna Jacobson, Chuck Meyer, Lloyd Moir, Sonya Rath, Penny Schreter, and Paul Yantorno, and to all those who came to meetings, filled out surveys, and came to be interviewed. A special thanks to Marlys Dufour for her office support.

As a decision is made to proceed with a project, Kirby-Smith Associates would be honored to conduct a Capital Funds Campaign for you. We will work with you, exerting the same diligence and care to design and conduct a campaign that will help you achieve your vision for the proposed project.

Again, thank you very much. It has been a distinct pleasure to serve LCH. We will be praying for your success as you consider your next step in this journey of faith.