



November 10, 2010

We wish to extend our thanks to all for the cooperation, support and gracious hospitality extended to Andi Tilmann and Erin Weber-Johnson throughout the feasibility study process recently completed.

A special word of thanks goes out to Kenn Allen, Doris Burton, Kathryn Powers, Maureen Shea, Marilu Sherer, Jim Steed, Mike Townsend and Susan Thompson for coordinating the personal interviews and the mailing of the questionnaires.

During the implementation process, we found friendly, concerned, and open communication regarding the proposed campaign and project plans. A total of 187 units participated in the survey; 32 interviews were conducted, 15 responded to the direct mail questionnaire and 140 responded to the online questionnaires. This represents a total response rate of 40% among the members of the church community that were contacted.

This study is our distillation of the information, opinions, and ideas gathered through the survey. It represents our combined evaluation and appraisal of major factors related to the proposed campaign.

Now important decisions must be made to continue the momentum essential to the success of a campaign. The Episcopal Church Foundation welcomes the opportunity to provide further assistance.

Feasibility Study Table of Contents

Letter of Introduction and Appreciation.....	1
Table of Contents.....	2
Section One: Feasibility Study Methodology	3
I. Introduction	4
II. Feasibility Study.....	4
III. Elements of a Successful Campaign	5
Section Two: Personal Interviews	7
I. Listing of Persons Interviewed	8
II. Personal Interview Responses	9
Section Three: Direct Mail/Online Responses	50
Section Four: Composite Analysis and Summary of Personal and Direct Mail/Online Responses	93
Section Five: Conclusions and Recommendations	108
I. Conclusions	109
II. Recommendations.....	110
Section Six: Appendix	113
I. Tentative Case Statement	

Section One:

Feasibility Study Methodology

I. Introduction

For some time the leadership of St. Mark's Episcopal Church, Washington, DC, has been evaluating the parish's programs, facilities, and resources, and assessing the capital needs of the church. After much study and the involvement of many people, the Vestry authorized the Episcopal Church Foundation to conduct a feasibility study to explore the willingness of the congregation to support financially these identified needs.

The facts, findings, and recommendations of the resulting survey, now completed, provide a sound basis for leadership decisions with regard to the future of a fund drive. A complete description of the goals of the proposed plans may be found in the tentative case statement in the Appendix.

II. The Feasibility Study

As the parish considers a capital campaign, it should reflect on several important questions:

- ◆ What conditions are essential to a successful campaign in the church community?
- ◆ How much money realistically can be raised?
- ◆ Will the church community support a drive that fulfills the goals of the proposed plans?
- ◆ When should the campaign begin, and how long should it last?
- ◆ What volunteer leadership is available to head the campaign?

Determining the answers to these and other questions was the major purpose of the Feasibility Study. Through the Study we have researched, analyzed, and evaluated fundamental factors present, or capable of development, which might influence a capital campaign.

The study was conducted in three phases: research, personal interviews, and direct mail.

Phase I

An examination of the proposed needs, development of a "Tentative Case Statement," determination of optimum campaign goals and timing, and review/selection of personal interview prospects were completed during sessions with the parish leadership.

Phase II

A sampling of parish members was selected for personal interviews. A total of 32 interviews were ultimately conducted by Andi Tilmann and Erin Weber-Johnson of the Episcopal Church Foundation. A listing of the persons interviewed may be found in Section Two: Personal Interviews.

Phase III

A mail survey was sent to 40 households. Included in the mailing was a letter requesting participation in the survey, the questionnaire, the tentative case statement and a self-addressed return envelope.

An online survey was sent to 401 households. Included in survey was a letter requesting participation, the questionnaire, and the tentative case statement.

STATISTICAL NOTE:

- ◆ A total of 40 direct mail questionnaires were mailed to the parish community.
- ◆ Of those, 15 were returned: a mail response rate of 38%.
- ◆ A total of 401 questionnaires were e-mailed to the parish community.
- ◆ Of those, 140 were returned: an online response rate of 35%.
- ◆ Including the 32 who were interviewed, 473 units were exposed to the study. Of those, a total of 187 units or 40% participated.
- ◆ Based on experience, this response rate is a very good representative involvement from the parish community, lending credibility to the study findings.
- ◆ Of the total that participated, 42% attend worship services one or more time(s) per week, and another 35% attend worship services two to three time(s) per month.
- ◆ Regarding the financial-giving practices of those who responded, the majority, 94%, are regular contributors with a written annual pledge.

III. Elements of a Successful Campaign

There are certain elements which must exist in connection with every successful fundraising campaign.

1. Recognition and acceptance of the “tentative needs” as expressed.
2. The case for widespread appeal.
3. Availability of strong financial leadership.
4. The capability of existing leadership to recruit additional support.
5. Past and current support levels for other church-wide capital campaigns.
6. The congregation’s awareness of the proposed plans.
7. The economic optimism of the parish community.
8. Possible conflict with other past, present, and projected community, parish or diocesan campaigns.
9. Overall response to goal attainability.
10. Indicated interest in contributing to, and projected levels of support for the proposed campaign.
11. Projected timing of the campaign.

These elements are carefully reviewed in this report. The Conclusions and Recommendations Section at the end of this report addresses these elements of success as we consider the readiness of St. Mark’s Episcopal Church to proceed with a major capital campaign.

NOTE: Minor editing has occurred in the comments to ensure grammatical accuracy and preserve the anonymity of the feasibility study respondents. Also, the spellings of some names could not be verified against the parish directory.

Section Two:

Personal Interviews

Listing of Persons Interviewed

Anonymous (2)
Bart Barnes
Eileen Blumenthal
Dick Bradshaw & Pam Lacey
Mary & Bert Cooper
Susan Cunningham & Philip Eliot
Stephanie Deutsch
Pete Eveleth
Bob & Linda Ewald
Betty & Wes Foster
Janice & Neal Gregory
Rob Hall
Brock & Penny Hansen
Jack & Tucker Harris
Fritz & Suella Henn
Josie Jordan
Duke & Laurel Kennedy
Jeff Kincheloe
Lynn & Ed Kneedler
Keith Krueger
George Meng
Crane & Jane Miller
Walt Moody
Greg Niblett
Kathryn Powers
Louise Walsh & Charlie Rupp
Paul & Lynda Smith-Bugge
Linda Staheli
John Terry
Caitie Whelan
Dave & Gretchen Willson

Results from 32 Personal Interviews

Note: Not all respondents answered all questions.

- 1. Prior to this survey, were you aware that the parish was considering a capital campaign?**

 32 Yes 0 No

- 2. Prior to this survey, were you aware of the needs as expressed in the accompanying proposed plans?**

 27 Aware 1 Not Aware 4 Aware of some of the needs

- 3. Generally speaking, do you favor the parish conducting a capital campaign as outlined in the proposed plans?**

 15 Yes 4 No 13 Yes, but with some concerns

Comments:

The only thing I am really interested in is a bell in the bell tower, rung with a rope.

I am tepid about this.

Yes I approve of Option B; I like that putting the underpinnings in to support it making it open to us expending in the future when we can pay for it.

I am in favor of getting as much as we can from decrepit old Baxter House, and moving on.

I think some of it is absolutely essential. Obviously we are aware there are some real problems – things need to be fixed, cleaned and safe – and that would cost a lot.

We are concerned about the mural in the Parish Hall. We do not want that destroyed – it is a valuable historical document in a sense. It tells the story of how St. Mark's is still on the corner where it is. We have felt some judgment about being stuffy for liking the mural. We treasure the history and the tradition.

We would want to keep the name Baxter if we get rid of Baxter House. He saved the church. We wouldn't have it if it weren't for him. That needs to be remembered. Paul understands that.

Raising a lot of money is always difficult.

We are very happy nobody is trying to do anything with the sanctuary just fixing the lights and AC and sound – that is fine and good. There is nothing to improve there but it does take maintenance.

I did not identify with our mission as articulated on the case statement – “Christian” is not there anywhere, and I do not identify with the part of the mission – we have been working on it for a long time, but I do not feel it is productive – we are a church. We gather to worship and consider what it means to be Christian.

I think you are out of your mind trying to raise money now; I don’t think it will happen.

How the church is used is more important to me than a super-modern facility. We have been here a long time and have seen a lot of change. The last capital campaign was very beneficial to the church. The proposed changes probably would be beneficial too, but I don’t think the money is there to do it.

We think that the maintenance of the church does need to be done. That may be all we can do but that does need to be done.

It’s a big undertaking and I think we’re up to it, but it will take a real community effort and sacrifice.

Question: a reference to a “5% Community engagement” – what is that about?

I believe no matter what happens we have to find a way to get rid of Baxter House as it is a hole in the boat. It has never served our needs. This should be an opportunity to get rid of that.

I’m concerned about the money. It is a fact that this is a good idea, but it is not the best time to go after money. That is the only issue to me. I love the idea of all three floors in the Parish Hall. It would serve us well for another generation.

I have a positive attitude toward the notion of expansion and how that should occur. There are a number of possibilities. I would like to keep everything on campus, not scattered around town. I would prefer underground to over-ground. I think we should renovate Baxter House by burning it down. I would hate to see the second floor on the Parish Hall. It would be closed in like the undercroft, not the open airy space it is now and that would be less attractive.

I am opposed to hiring a Christian Ed Director, although I see we have significant challenges with a multi- level program and doing lots of things, and teacher training for any of our education is woefully spotty.

We feel strongly that Baxter House should go.

I feel very strongly that a significant overhaul of the kitchen should be done.

Not clear on sustainable systems or the community fund.

Do these costs incorporate an interest computation? I recommend that you include that in the final cost and goals; interest can be very significant.

Not paying attention to deferred maintenance and upkeep is a very dangerous thing. We just put a new boiler in 20 years ago; it is disconcerting that it is at the end of its useful life.

I hear people focusing more on maintenance than say the choir room, etc. People really value this property and know there is a need. They have been affected at some point. We have grown up since the last campaign, and people are aware.

I did not know anything was wrong with the organ, but I believe it.

No money into Baxter House!!! It is not a viable option. Getting rid of it means we have to do something here. We have to replace the square footage and that is at least the second floor.

I don't see the younger set stepping up to lead in this process.

It's been a dream of mine that we could expand since 1964, but same as then, we never can seem to afford it.

I have been very impressed with the work that the committee has done. The way they have presented it to the parish has all been VERY well done.

It is a time of recession and with a lot of people in retirement, it is a great idea, but what we can do is limited.

I am struck by the ambitiousness of this. Wow – it is a lot of money!

I missed any sense of homage to maintaining the architectural character of the space. No words have been said about preserving the character. I would like to hear that we will take care to preserve that. The language about “flexible space” made me think of hotel ballrooms; functional but not attractive.

The cost estimates are too low, both for construction and real world costs of paying the builder while we collect funds. That alone can be very expensive.

The floor plans are awfully vague. Given the floor plans, I am not sure they can get everything they want in the space. It looks like 10 pounds of space in a five pound space.

The statement is very beautifully written. It weaves together who we are and what we need very well.

I've been coming here for a long time. The demographic when I came was 20-40 age range, with one unemployed spouse. Few were in their 60's and above. Many lived on the Hill, and were sort of "pioneers". There was a lot of cooperation among members for things like childcare. There was a lot of group formation. In the 1980's we did a capital campaign because the roof needed repair. We had 200 members and started a second service and hired an associate rector. There was no choice but to do that capital campaign.

Then there was an effort to buy the organ. One was available used, at a good price, and enough people gave to get it. Then, we did the 1990 major renovation capital campaign to build the undercroft. That project changed a lot about St. Mark's. We were starting to move as a community into a stage of more affluence and "getting a nicer house". It was a top-notch job.

As a result of that campaign, we grew to our highest membership. But, since then, we have refused to opt to move to the "corporate church" level. This community values the closeness of the church, so they fear the risk of going corporate. Now there are a very significant number of people over 60 years of age in this community. It is very important that you listen very carefully to that group. The people in the 40-60 age range are NOT invested in this project idea. It is really important that everybody be on board with the goal of growing if we do this campaign. The significant givers to the last campaign will not give at the same level to this one. I am certainly not as invested in this one. I perceive that other people in their 60's feel the same. Many people do not live on Capital Hill, and that is where a fair amount of the money is that is available.

My big problem with this campaign is that people who are 30-40 years old are not prepared to invest significantly in this program. The \$100,000 income people will maybe give \$10,000, not \$50,000. We will not generate the givers I see on the chart here. Also, there is a culture around here of pulling out the stops when you need to pull out the stops, when there is really no choice.

This campaign is not exciting; mechanical systems are not exciting. There is not enough storage space and there hasn't been for 50 years. In regards to adequate office space, that is really Baxter House. That space just as it is, is absolutely luxurious compared to what we had then. What we had then produced an extremely vibrant community. I disagree that we "must" do security, same with accessibility.

If there is not a ground swell of 40-60 year-olds, this will not work. The 60 and over age group are not excited about it. The attitudes of many my age are the same. We are retiring and more careful with our funds. We also have a significant number of people who retire and then leave, just as we are.

I am also troubled when I look around and see that all the volunteer work is also being done by the 60 and over age group. People in the 40-60 age range have two employed spouses, both working at tough jobs with children.

With technology, our ability to communicate has increased so dramatically that we are doing two or three things at one time, but really you are being interrupted by things multiple times and by the end of a typical day now, I am beat. Too much happens in a day now. That is the daily life of 40-60 year olds. Then they come home and care for kids. The cost of education is phenomenal now. So a \$200,000 income is not a big income right now. They don't have big amounts to give away, even if they are really invested in a community. I do not see the investment in this community to get a campaign of this magnitude done.

It feels a bit like a stampede. The Dreamcatching was a wonderful thing, but I have not seen that a lot of work has been done to reconcile people's dreams to reality, in the sense that people were asking for things we already have.

I want whatever is done to improve the tiny sacristy we have. Number one on our list is to make sure that the new HVAC systems work in that space.

We know things are falling apart and need to be fixed, but we don't want us or the church to go too far out on a limb financial.

I like the way the options are laid out, and I think that we should go with one of the more minimal options, and that certainly would include selling Baxter House. One concern is that we both noticed is that the Dance Studio seems to be sacrosanct. Is there an endowment or trust that prevents us from using that space for offices? Does the dance studio need to be at St Mark's location? Could we support it at another location and use the space? We know all about the dance studio and its place, but that space is really just right for office space as it is right by the front door. It would be a much lower cost than putting in a second floor on Parish Hall, and Baxter House can clearly never serve our needs.

Our space utilization needs are obviously not compatible. Why has the Dance Studio not been considered or proposed as a viable space that we do have? Why has that not be out there for public discussion? There were members of our small group who know about architectural things and felt that the options were low-balled, with not enough contingency so the numbers did not have credibility in our small group. The dance folks and choir are the only people who use the dance studio, and many have not even been up to look at it, so it is minimally used by the congregation, it is a huge space and already there, and the location is central. An elevator could even be extended to serve it.

Our top priorities are to upgrade the systems, in sustainable ways, and to get staff together so they can function better for us all.

I think the projects need to be done. It is really a question of timing, debt and what the congregation can do.

We pledge a lot compared to our income and we feel that is our contribution to St. Mark's. The church needs money all the time, not just for big efforts.

We are concerned that if we do anything, we should do Option C, even though it is most expensive. We just don't know whether the parish can support that.

I am very dubious about a campaign of this scope at this time. I am very in favor of the things we MUST do to keep the building repaired. I do not have enough faith in where St. Mark's is going and its future in the next 10 years. Attendance is falling, and we don't seem to be growing. Raise funds to do the absolutely necessary repairs, specific decisions about which could be phased and which could wait a few years.

We are not in favor of more program space because I don't see us growing to need it.

I had a practical question on Option B. The estimated costs do not seem to include selling Baxter House. So, we could apply \$1M to that if we sell Baxter House, right? Has there been any assessment of Baxter House's value as it is?

If we go forward talking about this thing it is IMPERATIVE that we get as many people as possible to walk through Baxter House and do a tour to see it. Many people have never even been in Baxter House, so have no clue of the many issues and inconveniences there. We think we should sell it whatever we do.

I don't think we can pull this off. Too many things are piling up that are getting in the way. Like the current economic situation. Things seem to be getting worse, not better. The number one issue seems to be government spending, which means lay-offs. If we have a second dip like the first dip, there will be a panic button. We need to figure out where people are on an individual basis. I don't see panic at St. Mark's right now.

We have aging members of the parish on retirement income, and young families dealing with the current economic problems.

I was at a small group meeting and got a lot of information there and also I was at the sermon seminar about the options. So I am up to speed on things.

Realistically, we need a capital campaign because as I understand Baxter House is going to cost us close to \$1 million to keep and it is not work that can be put off again (we have already done that). My concern is whether the church has the resources and the energy to pull it off, but that is what this survey is for.

For the 3 options, how much more detail is available, like what the new undercroft would look like, or the second floor on the Parish hall?

I am generally in favor of it, at least what it takes to keep things from further degrading.

Although I am not a fan of selling Baxter House, I see it is short-term financial need, but long-term it is short-sighted. Space is so precious on the Hill, and you really shouldn't give up a property foothold here. It was a mistake we didn't buy the house next door, and I hope we don't find selling Baxter House to be a mistake. Real estate will continue to go up on the Hill; we should try to hold on to it, even if that means renovating it. It could be useful if renovated.

I'm very much in favor of the campaign; we need to do one. I also like the 3-tiered extension of the Parish Hall, but am equally in favor of refreshing the main church (deferred maintenance, but also things to make the place look fresh and decent).

We are still in a great recession. Let's put this off by two years for success. We have been here a long time and have experienced other capital campaigns.

To me there are elements of Option A and Option B that could be kept and kicked out. Sequentially, I would add onto and refresh the church and existing undercroft. It needs spiffing. It all looks tired. Then, extend the church building below and above the Parish Hall. I would put Baxter House to the side, and just sit on it. Move the offices to the new structure and then figure out what to do with Baxter House. I understand using Baxter House for cash, but I am not afraid of a loan. Baxter House could be collateral, and I think we should try to do it without losing Baxter House.

I am struggling with a few things. First, effort to hear Dreams – we put it all out and now there is a campaign to renovate the space that is not related to the Dreams – but many of the dreams are not about space. It seems backwards to ask about creating space without a vision for how we will use the space and the connection of our dreams depending on them. Maybe I have been out of the loop. I need good arguments about why we need so many better spaces than we have. I am struggling with the need to keep the maintenance on the building, the whole question about Baxter House (sell or renovate and legal access to it) and the need being real to upgrade our facility. It would help me a lot if the campaign was more directed toward where we see our community dreams and visions being realized and the need feeding those, than to talk about a campaign. I could look at my house and see things that could happen that make more sense, but I don't have an open checkbook. I need a really compelling reason to spend on upgrades.

We are looking forward to the Children's Chapel.

I am very aware of the upgrades but it is appalling that our congregation is not raising enough money.

I think some things are missing. The plan does not have fire sprinklers for the nave. The leading cause of church fires is arson. Our security is lax. A homeless person could accidentally cause a fire by smoking. There are also upkeep issues with the bathrooms upstairs, the vestibule off A Street is dark and dingy and needs lighting, and glass doors to replace the wooden inner doors. Lighting in the nave should be followed up on in addition to exterior lighting.

All capital campaigns at St. Mark's have always turned out well.

I question the size and the amount of money. If we are talking deferred maintenance, it is already too late.

4. Please indicate the level of priority you would attach to each of the projects outlined in the proposed plans by checking the appropriate line under each heading. At present, they are listed in no particular order.

**Select only one option per line and feel free to make comments.*

	PRIORITY				
	High	Medium	Low	Opposed	Lack Information
<u>Option A:</u>					
<i>(No new construction)</i>					
a. Deferred Maintenance on Church Buildings & Organ	<u>27</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
b. Baxter House Renovations	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>Option B:</u>					
<i>(All Option A maintenance work, no Baxter House Renovations)</i>					
c. Parish Hall Second Floor & Renovation	<u>20</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>
d. Current Undercroft Renovation	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>10</u>
e. Install Sustainable Systems	<u>21</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>Option C:</u>					
<i>(Includes all Option B work)</i>					
f. Parish Hall Undercroft Expansion	<u>12</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>

Comments:

The second floor and undercroft are not realistic, unless money drops like manna from heaven.

What does “sustainable systems” mean? I am annoyed by terms that defy definition. Tell me what you mean and I’ll give you an answer.

Undercroft renovations only if it is done right – but don’t change the shower!!

Option C is too expensive for now.

It seems that in the long run, it would be better to finish the undercroft space under the Parish Hall while you are at it.

If we are keeping Baxter House, it has to be made functional.

A second floor on the Parish Hall would cut off the top of the mural and we would not have a beautiful beamed ceiling anymore; that is a big down-side. Why has no one mentioned doing an undercroft without adding a floor to the Parish Hall?

The time may come when we need the second floor, but I just hate the loss in the aesthetics.

I do think the staff needs to be moved back into the church. It does not make sense as it is in another building. We should have put the Sunday school in Baxter House and used the undercroft for offices. It is very confusing for people, and kept locked which is not welcoming.

As soon as you create new space people start saying you need more space!

Don't know about the organ. Get rid of Baxter House.

Renovating Baxter House is money thrown away, unfortunately.

I think the second floor would be the most beneficial thing beyond maintenance, but I don't think it will happen right now. The only thing we will contribute to is maintenance until times get better.

We can't afford to be "green" right now. Just maintain what we need to. Green is great; do as green as possible for the money you have.

We need to dispose of Baxter House, even though the rector won't have such nice spaces in the new space. But the rest of it is very not nice.

What does the word sustainable mean exactly? That is the most overused and under-defined word in the country right now.

There is a 5-year plan done which lays out handling the deferred maintenance over time using budget funds, but many things have happened to make the budget unable to handle it.

I question whether we need to spend \$50,000 on the organ at this time. It is not a high priority.

We need to divide the deferred maintenance into things that must be done now and things that can wait on the budget plan. I would like a nuanced list of the maintenance items over time.

We need reliability in the systems more than anything else. We have a very low maintenance budget for things to go wrong which is why it is in the condition it is in.

Renovating current undercroft is a "nice to have" and could be put off, especially if we do the new construction.

Deferring may be better than going into debt; debt is the most concerning to me.

Flexibility of space is the main advantage so that people on Capital Hill may rent this space and it could provide income if it was flexible enough, but that competes with the need for consistent, secure and familiar children's space. Making our space available to other groups would need a community conversation. We need it for our children, but it is empty and needs to be heated and cooled during the week.

We are most supportive of Option B. We would really love to do C, but if we don't have the cash, we can't. It depends on how much we would have to finance. Maybe we could do some sort of "rough-in" of systems while we are digging in the undercroft, so we would be that much closer when we do need to finish it.

One consideration with offices upstairs is how do we greet people for welcome and security? We need to see how the architect will work that in. Maybe a receptionist, or continue "Answering Angels" at a small desk?

I am not a big fan of movable walls. We would need a really good space plan to renovate the undercroft. I would oppose anything that messed with the Adams Room.

I am concerned with what is happening to the mural. I like the mural. It is part of our history. It reflects Capital Hill at the time it was painted.

I need to know what they plan to do to make the undercroft space "more flexible". I would not want anything to happen to the Adams room; Jim Adams is a very special person in our book.

"Sustainable systems" is undefined. Are they talking grass roof and solar panels or a windmill?

I am in favor of selling Baxter House. It is important for the people who work there. I am tempted to take a deep breath and go for Option C, but

Renovating the current undercroft sounds like a good idea, and flexible space sounds great but it isn't a high priority.

I don't know what's wrong with the organ but if they say it needs it, then do it.

Baxter House renovation is a waste of time and money.

I'm for Option C; if we're going to make a big mess, let's just get it all done.

I don't know what they mean about current undercroft flexible spaces.

We don't do a good job of raising funds for operations. Deferred maintenance means we don't have the money to do it. If we increase the size of the plant, we will have even more things to do maintenance on.

In regards to Baxter House, we can't renovate something we are going to get rid of, so this is hard to answer. We want to sell it.

The second floor of the Parish Hall will be an awfully complex activity to make accessible, and not to destroy the dance studio. There are a lot of architectural questions the drawings don't seem to address.

Flexible space in the undercroft is okay if it is done attractively.

The systems is high priority, but replacing them with "green" systems is medium. They are very expensive versus the payoff.

The new undercroft would be really exciting, but can we afford it?

We already have a flexible wall in current undercroft. We do need more space for our children, but the rooms are too small already to make smaller with more walls. We will have issues for some Sunday school classes on Sunday mornings only. The dance studio can be used for the staff, and those offices could also be used for a couple meetings on Sunday mornings.

How much is a likely appraisal on Baxter House? Get some appraisals and give us a number to consider! We need a number; the congregation needs to know that.

The organ is low priority, but all other maintenance is high. It is best to have a private donation to support an organ. I actually oppose the organ as part of a capital campaign. This campaign must focus on deferred maintenance and selling Baxter House.

This isn't really the time for anyone to put in campaign dollars as most people are still reeling economically. It is not a good time for a campaign. Also, our rector will be leaving in a few years so perhaps we should wait until a new rector arrives and some economic recovery is in place. Our senior warden is leaving, so the campaign will have to be managed by a new senior warden. Do maintenance and sell Baxter House, create office space, and put all else on the back burner.

I am not hearing from elders that they have a lot of money set aside. They love the church, but don't have much to give. It will be hard for them to stretch. We also have not reached our annual pledge goal and are losing pledging units. I am concerned about succeeding with a capital campaign.

We need to understand the use of our building. What fees are collected for the church for the use of our systems by programs that use it? Are they being used to need systems? Are we getting rent? We don't know these things! We don't feel our current spaces are being used sufficiently.

Option B is really the best of these. Pull that apart and work with the details; put some prices on the pieces and explore the dance studio.

What do you mean by sustainable? We don't know what that means. What would it cost? What are we talking about? We don't know what the options are within these options. Another one is upgrading the kitchen; what does that mean? It is not broken down enough.

Building is a higher priority than the organ, although as a family we would also put the organ high.

The Parish hall expansion needs doing (when we need space), but I am not convinced now is that time. If we can't raise the money now, we will make it work with what space we have, maybe even be creative about how we share with other churches. At some point we may grow more and really need the space then.

The sustainability goals support flexible spaces that are used all the time, then small inflexible spaces we heat that impact the environment highly for use once a week. If we are at the end of the life of the systems, we should replace them with as sustainable ones as we can, for the long term savings and sustainability. HVAC efficiency and distribution would be high on my list.

Use the space you have to the absolute max first, before adding space.

I like Option B.

Any campaign needs to cover the ongoing maintenance of the buildings so they don't deteriorate as the last ones have due to lack of funds.

I would like to see space projections about why we need that new space. Like the current parish Hall; are we really using that efficiently?

We want Option C. This is the only chance we're going to get as a parish to do this. The future does not look like we will have the resources for any big projects. We are losing a lot of people in our demographic. So, it is Plan C or forget it!

Well, we have to do something, like deferred maintenance, but that would not be the leap forward that we need.

Baxter House is a hopeless situation. It is throwing good money after bad.

If we keep Baxter House and make it a livable place, then I'll give to do maintenance, but we'll need to do the other stuff if we lose Baxter House. I need to know more about the needs of the organ and the costs.

Option B would require selling Baxter House and that makes the second floor more attractive to me. We could raise most of the \$1.5 M. Plus, I understand there are issues with Baxter House beyond the repairs.

There is nothing wrong with the current undercroft, and I haven't seen plans for what they would do differently down there.

Replace things as environmentally friendly as possible, but not with green technology.

I don't know what they mean by flexible spaces; is it moveable walls? Are they sturdy and sound proof? If it works it would be great, but I need information on how it would work. What would that cost of the \$2.5M?

The HVAC units use a ton of electricity for what they do; they are way behind current models. That would help our annual budget. That is the sort of thing a campaign is for, more than maintenance.

I need a comparison. It would cost X to fix the furnace, and X to buy a new one. Then analyze what you repair and what you replace and make the intelligent informed decision.

I am not clear what, if we do the second floor which is priority for the staff alone – what do we get up there? Dedicated choir space? Another Adams-sized room? How much of that can be handled on the second floor? I lack information on the undercroft use of new space.

Why have we not looked at building an undercroft below the courtyard which seems simpler and cheaper?

If we do the underpinning for the second floor, it doesn't make sense to not continue to make new undercroft space and even expand that beneath the courtyard while you are at it. I assume digging and solar collectors on the roof do not affect historic preservation issues?

I didn't realize there was deferred maintenance needed on the organ that was so significant and I have been quite involved.

We should sell Baxter House, not renovate based on the presentations. The space there is not enough, and is not accessible. I hate to give up property, but when I listen to all the difficulties I am willing to give it up.

If we are going to do a campaign and do all that work to raise all that money then we need to get more space, not just fix things.

The current undercroft space is good enough that if we had to cut costs, I would leave that space as it is and do the other work.

I like the idea of doing the work to prepare for more undercroft space and doing the actual finished space in a later campaign - unless we have the money – then I say go for it!

I realize the challenges with Baxter House, but I also think it is a nice space for things we do in the church.

Flexible space in the undercroft is a great thing.

Replacing systems with stuff that will last and is efficient and will not add a lot of extra operating expense is high priority, but radical green things like solar panels is not a priority.

I am not completely convinced we can't use the space we have smarter, so expansion is a low priority.

I do not know anything about the organ. I trust it needs help if those who know say it does. My priority is refreshing the whole church.

I would not renovate Baxter House in this stage. It can sit empty once the offices move out. Build the 3-tier level.

There is no design that will be flexible enough without expanding the undercroft that will accomplish anything. Renovating the current will not do anything.

Anything we do has to be "green" – both climate change and for long-term economy – they will age better and reduce the use of energy. Windows, building materials, systems, all should be green. We have a values proposition before us here. That is a high priority.

I am not sure how possible the amount is for Option C. Option B only gives administrative so Option C is clearly the most compelling.

Is it possible to do Option B and then not preclude Option C?

Cheaper options need to be researched for sustainable systems.

Baxter House renovations are a waste.

My thinking is that deferred maintenance is dangerous. We are running on luck with Baxter House.

Financially, Option C is proactive and is my preference. If we are going part way, why not go the whole way?

Strongly opposed to Baxter House renovations, especially for the estimated cost and zoning problems.

I like Option C, but doubt we can afford it.

Option B is my preferred option. Is the square footage the same as Baxter House? Adult meeting space is hard to find.

Parish Hall second floor depends on space usage.

I need more information on the current undercroft renovation.

Option C is the best, if you sell Baxter House.

Will there be zoning issue with Option C?

Option A sounds more like renovation than maintenance.

I am in favor of selling Baxter House, not redoing it. We need the proceeds for this campaign.

I am not sure how much we need the undercroft renovation.

Option C only if we can raise the money.

5. Would you favor the sale of Baxter House if the proceeds were applied to the capital campaign, thus reducing the amount of money needing to be raised?

29 Yes 3 No

Comments:

Yes, let's get as much as we can out of it.

Yes, but if we don't do the second floor on the parish hall, we cannot sell it.

I cannot imagine a scenario where we could do any of this work without income from Baxter House.

If there is a legitimate reason to get more space, we need to do it with the Parish Hall and that means selling. We cannot get permits to renovate.

It should go. It is good money after bad to fix it. It is an insult to the staff that works there.

A figure on this would help motivate the congregation. It would be easier to run a capital campaign building on a solid lead amount like this.

My only question is 50 years from now if we need to expand, where do we go? Should we hold on to it in case we need it later? I trust the people making the recommendations have been thoughtful and careful in considering this decision.

I would go either way with Baxter House, but if we can sell it for a million, and Options A and B cost the same, then I would do Option B.

It would give people a boost in two ways. One, it seems easier, like “we can do this, and two, if we sell it we HAVE to do the other work or the clergy and staff will be in the parking lot.

I am okay with whatever needs to happen, but if we lose Baxter House we will have to recreate that space elsewhere, and that would be fine, if we can. If we don’t build new space, we have to keep Baxter House. So, I am okay with selling it for Option B or C.

I generally think Baxter House is a total pain. I would sell it at a decent price. But then we would need space for all the staff.

Assuming the price is right.

It depends on new space usage. I need more information. The choir seriously needs space for robes and an alternative place to practice.

6. Are there additional needs that seem important to you which are not covered by the proposed plans?

Comments:

Being flexible sounds good. The choir always wants a separate space, of course, and Option B does not seem to do that.

Just the bell.

Saving access to the mural.

Space is always available for the things we want to do.

The spaces cannot be used because of all the stuff that is sitting and stored everywhere, so we can’t really get income from the spaces we have. It is hard to keep different functions divided, like the players or dancers and church programs. But, it is far better that than having the place too quiet.

Housing the staff in this building is very high priority.

Maintaining the dance studio is a concern for me. It is one of the more thriving programs, even though it doesn’t directly relate to the church; it is awkward. Rosetta is one reason it is thriving, but she won’t be doing this forever. I would still like to be sure that it is maintained.

Parish Hall is just a mess – we do need a presentable Parish Hall. I don’t have strong feeling about the mural though.

The kitchen should be considered maintenance; it is a hardship to work in there. If we do any community projects that need a kitchen it will really need to be improved. A big part of that is overseeing when it is used. There must be supervision, and without it, it is not left as it was found.

I don't think it tells us how many more rooms we are going to get and where they will be and what they will be used for. This plan is essentially collapsing Baxter House and putting it over the Parish Hall, but that leaves no new space for Sunday school which is very important. Almost backs us into Option C. Essentially for 100 sq ft we pay \$3 million? That's a lot!

I question the space utilization. I am a proponent of getting ride of the mural in the Parish Hall and utilizing the space in a much more efficient way – it is an utter waste of space. The room would be much more usable for St. Mark's and outside groups. The mural is ugly and old and it is time for it to go. Why can't we digitally preserve it? It is holding valuable space hostage.

We feel strongly that the first floor space, especially space behind the mural and sitting in Parish Hall, should not be given over to storage.

What are the plans for the dance studio if we renovate the Parish Hall? The dance studio brings a whole different segment of the community into our church (maybe not a reason to keep it). It is part of our community outreach and we have a legacy of dance and the arts that pulled us out of the dregs as a church. There is a sentimental attachment for some people, including me. This needs to be addressed in the plan. I think we should keep it somehow.

I have a strong need to have accessibility issues addressed. Grab bars are needed in all the bathrooms, along with raising the toilets to 18".

I would love for the choir to get new space, but I hate that Option C is the only way that might happen in these plans.

The Players; this proposal takes away space from them but does not address what would be done. It creates dedicated space for the choir, but does not show how they will deal with The Players. That to me is upsetting.

The parking is a problem not addressed.

I don't see anything directly addressing the new fire code and sprinklers. Could we fire protect the nave?

I have a priority to save the mural in the parish hall; it is a very important piece of the history of St. Mark's.

A campaign might have included a van for seniors and trips.

I would like more details, but this captures the gist of it.

The space behind the mural could be used to create classroom space. We need to do everything we can to strengthen Christian Education; that is the backbone of the congregation and the future. The Players could store their things somewhere off-site. We need our space now. We have needs and we need to reclaim those spaces now.

I was interested in the organ as a separate item. What is up with the organ? Can it be deferred? I am not against it, just surprised to see it.

A perennial problem for decades has been a reasonable, safe place to hang coats. We need a coat check room.

We no longer have a rectory since we sold it years ago. One concern is that housing is so expensive in Capitol Hill, when we need another rector it will be very expensive for that person to live close to the church. We already had an associate who simply could not take the job for that reason.

It's really important to me that the Parish Hall and kitchen get some renovation so it can be more of an asset for the church as use for private functions, and having a better social space.

I don't think so. They may mix and match differently later, but we need a comprehensive campaign for a 3-tier extension and greener systems, and keep Baxter House as a valuable footprint.

The whole report on Community Outreach – what does this construction have to do with how we are going to make the world a better place? I know we need to do basic maintenance, but what is compelling enough to do a major capital campaign, and that gets us to our dreams? I think the buildings are fine. Maybe we need new paint and rugs, but we don't need anything gold-plated. The staff space is definitely not nice, but these are hard times. I would need a lot more information to be convinced we need to spend \$2.5 million.

It would be nice to have an outdoor playset.

Exceptional, warm space for staff is critical. Equality is necessary for all, even our staff so as not to be hypocritical.

Meeting space is hard to find.

7. Do you know of other current or projected capital campaigns in the community that might impact the success of this proposed effort?

Bishop Walker School

Capitol Hill Foundation

The Hill Center at the old Navy Hospital (5)

Library on Pennsylvania Avenue

Montessori School

Prep School

Public and private schools

8. How would you describe the present economic climate in your community?

 1 Excellent 11 Good 14 Fair 0 Poor

9. Is the present economic climate improving, remaining the same, or declining?

 6 Improving 17 Remaining the Same 5 Declining

10. Does a proposed solicitation period for pledges in the winter of 2011 seem appropriate to you? (*Members of the congregation would be asked to consider a gift to the capital drive in addition to their annual stewardship pledge.*)

 16 Yes 6 No 8 No strong feeling

Wait until this coming spring.

There is a bit of concern about if Paul will be with us through this. I understand that he is, but it would be a difficult moment for him to leave. People know his house is on the market. If it is a go, a good strong show of his leadership and support would be important.

There are a lot of seniors with St. Mark's in their will and that money is coming in the near future. That is my issue with the timing.

Paul is retiring soon, looking for something else, moving on. It gives me heart burn to start something like this with that chatter going on. I think the success will be affected by the signals he sends out.

The earlier - the better.

It should not conflict with our regular canvass and may be a good to start with the calendar year.

It would be good to have a capital campaign after stewardship is done. I think we need an every-member canvas for our annual stewardship – everyone gets a face-to-face. I worry that the leadership is not bringing in new people to replace the ones we are losing. Stewardship must be strengthened big time.

The sooner the better. We are hitting up against a large affluent co-hort that will be dying or moving away in retirement. The timing is right.

It will be hard for people to commit that soon because they are just not sure right now. If the study shows there is support, then we should just go ahead and not wait.

It all depends more on whether we continue to limp along economically. Then, we should too.

If it's a go, we should go. A concern that came up strongly has to do with how long Paul will be with us, 1) some people are concerned about getting started if he is thinking about retiring, and 2) will he choose to retire in the middle of it. If the results come back positive – I say GO!

As long as it happens soon enough that the price quotes don't start to expand. I would like to know about the plan for if things are more expensive at the end then they are now.

I am definitely in favor of a campaign. I trust the timing to those who know more. Also, it depends on the passion of the people behind it and they are here right now.

Next fall is best.

I was surprised by the three-year solicitation period; it should be four or five years.

It is too soon. Don't do it right now. Real estate is not improving. It is not a good time.

Yes, with a caveat that there needs to be lines drawn and more education. It needs to be well run to defer donor fatigue. I am concerned that appropriate training is allowed for peer-to-peer asks.

It will impact those “in the middle” who can't do both.

There needs to be a clear beginning and end. We need a finite goal.

11. Do you think a goal of \$2,500,000 (as outlined in the proposed plans) can be raised in gifts and pledges?

 8 Yes 11 No 12 Don't Know

If no, how much do you think can be raised?

\$2 million

It looks impossible, but whatever we have to do we have always done. There is one very wealthy and generous family.

The older generation has supported St. Mark's and they are incredibly loyal but they are starting to need their pennies for themselves and their families. The younger (55 and down) I just don't know about, but they have children to educate. This is a middle class church. Two or three rich people, and that's it. But there are people with more secure pensions here than most places in the country. I imagine there are a lot of people who have legacy gifts for St. Mark's. If they gave now, that would be the best hope of a campaign working. We are willing to do that now.

Essentially Option A and B cost the same, when you figure \$1M for Baxter House, so it is a no-brainer to not even consider Option A. That needs to be made more clear.

There are a few families who could do the whole thing, but it is not a church with deep pockets.

We are not as energized in the parish as we used to be. I sense a little less energy than 20 years ago when we did the last campaign. There has been a big shift in how much time people are willing to commit to the church and if their money follows their heart, there is a question about if the enthusiasm is as high as it needs to be to do this. This has been a concern of mine since this started.

There are a lot of new people with energy, but that demographic is very tapped out and very, very busy.

People have a lot of money, but also a lot of expenses. People are house poor and have kids, even kids in private schools so I am not sure how much there is for St. Mark's. This is a very well-off neighborhood.

I think people will give money; I'm just not sure how much.

We raised \$1.5 million in 1990. It feels like the community was more generous back then, and there was urgency for that, an imperative that ignited the campaign. The need for space was more dire then.

I would be surprised if Baxter House brings in \$800,000. I have no idea how much the congregation can do; it is really up to a couple heavy-hitters. We have been through two campaigns already, for very clear needs and in a good economy. I am not sure the need is as clear in this case, besides Baxter House and maintenance. We do need space for our staff if we lose Baxter House, so that is a clear need. \$1,000,000 is the outside limit for a campaign from the congregation.

Targeted giving would be more effective, like trying to accomplish a wish-list. People feel good seeing that sort of thing happen.

I am concerned that people will be disappointed if their dreams from the Dreamcatching do not come true. I would like to see bells peeling in the bell tower, but that is a dream. If I had said that and it didn't happen, I would be disappointed. Also, in regards to the outreach portion, we don't know what they mean by that. What is being proposed? We have not been communicated with about the outreach intentions. You need to be very specific about that. Going to Africa? Capitol Hill Group Ministry? Samaritan House?

We used to have a lot more space used by diverse groups, like the Gospel Cabaret. Our creativity about using our spacing and charging for it has been diminished.

It is a stretch. The money is there, but I am not sure it will be people's number one giving priority. I don't think it is probable.

Making a case for what the next 30 years will be like may help people see this differently. Maybe talk to people about giving now instead of when they die, so we can have workable spaces. The case is not compelling enough in this economy. Maybe it would be at other times, but it needs more in these times.

Probably not, but do it anyway and take a mortgage. There is money out there but prying it out of people is another thing. Like us, we have money put aside for our future, and we are not willing to give that to St. Mark's. Just looking at lifestyles though, there are second homes, expensive new kitchens, ski vacations, a lot of extra money that is just not going to the church.

That is basically 2.5 times our annual budget. For Option B we only need \$1.5M, and that would be easy over 3 years.

If we are raising it over three years, when would construction start? In the last campaign experience, there was a failure to adequately account for the carrying cost of a construction loan while the money was coming in, and we came up short and ended up with a mortgage. It was easy to pay off later, but that needs to be carefully considered this time. We need to figure all expenses over the three years.

I looked at the chart, and my reaction was YIKES! It was the mid-range that made me go "yikes" – we don't have that many \$25-50K gifts.

I'm dubious. I think we will need a loan. I think to raise \$1.5 million, and incur debt of \$1.5 million, providing we can get the annual budget to support service on the debt. The church that raised the money for the undercroft was a much different church than the church today, not quite as tightly-knit and not quite the same dedication and commitment in the newer wave of members. Now people are not as willing to sacrifice as much for what they receive from the church. It is just not the same church. Not that it is not vital, just vital in a different way. There is not a whole crowd of people who almost see the church as a second job like there was before.

That's a lot of money! I don't know where that would come from. Maybe selling Baxter House and raising another million from the community would be possible.

If well executed, perhaps even more! Thus far, St. Mark's has done well.

It depends on the major gifts. I have been astounded by what high-end givers give to the annual drive – it is too low.

I don't know if people are convinced of the need. You need to do more selling of the facts.

I am not sure, but we have raised what we have needed in the past.

12. If convinced of the need, would you be willing to contribute to this proposed campaign? (All gifts, regardless of size, are needed and are important to the success of the proposed campaign.)

 30 Yes 0 No 2 Not sure at this time

13. If "yes," please estimate your possible total range of giving. Gifts potentially could be paid over a several-year period. *This is not a pledge or in any way binding.*

<u> 2 </u> \$500 or less	<u> 0 </u> \$500 to \$1,000
<u> 2 </u> \$1,000 to \$3,000	<u> 6 </u> \$3,000 to \$5,000
<u> 4 </u> \$5,000 to \$10,000	<u> 7 </u> \$10,000 to \$25,000
<u> 3 </u> \$25,000 to \$50,000	<u> 2 </u> \$50,000 to \$100,000
<u> 0 </u> \$100,000 to \$250,000	<u> 0 </u> \$250,000 to \$500,000
<u> 0 </u> \$500,000 and above	

14. If the proposed total goal of \$2,500,000 cannot be fully funded by a capital campaign, how would you feel if the parish were to assume prudent long-term debt to ensure completion of these proposed plans?

 18 Acceptable 8 Undesirable, but acceptable 5 Unacceptable

I would want to know a lot more about what we are doing and what the terms of the debt were.

Try our best to get what we can up-front and use a similar percent of cost as last time.

Well, we've done it before and the National Capital Bank would help us again. We paid it off early.

It's a great time to get a mortgage and that's what you do. It would be fine.

Put the whole thing off except for maintenance until the recession is over. We can't service debt when the stewardship is suffering.

Acceptable, no problem.

Our future pledge base cannot support servicing debt; that pot will not work out. The idea of big debt REALLY worries me. Plus, the next generation will end up resenting a 30-year mortgage. \$500,000 at low interest at the most.

Acceptable but it should not be more than 30%.

Well, if you're going to have debt, this is a great time, but we need to carefully calculate what it will take in the budget to carry the debt interest.

I would incur debt just to be rid of Baxter House. We really have to do something about that now.

We need to be careful how we message and communicate this. It is really important that those who cannot give money still feel included and important and they may have opportunities for "sweat equity."

We would have to do it, but that would mean building it into an already strained budget. I have full faith in the leadership committee that this would be done responsibly.

This is a good time to borrow.

They did it before and we were paying on it for years and years, but then we got sick of it and we paid it off.

I think we have to; this estimate is too conservative. We will need to.

It puts the burden of financing it on the future people who will be using it, but it also puts a strain on the current budget to be considered. So many of these things need to be done, if that is what we have to do.

Interest rates are so good right now that it may not be a bad thing. We need stronger pledge units to service a debt. Our new rector is our best chance for new members. The trust in the lay leadership is strong, though.

I'd like to really see the costs, and also the options for not doing it. I don't think we are aggressive enough about the way we use our space, like The Players, and the Sunday school not being willing to share space. That is not realistic for an inner urban environment; we better get used to sharing space now.

We have not been efficient on the operating budget side, so what affect will debt and maintenance have on the budget? I am not confident we can cover that in the future. This is not perceived as a wildly well-run operating budget. I would really be more inclined to give to capital and see it better managed.

We are having a hard time meeting our budget as it is, so servicing debt would be too hard on the budget. We will already need to finance a bridge loan to get started while people pay over the three-year pledges.

Rates are at an all-time low. We have to do something. It is immoral to have our clergy sitting in that dump. It is not preferable, but we don't want a big mortgage weighing down the budget.

I would need to be educated about the finances of it. What would it mean for our operating budget? I am not opposed but I would want to be cautious. The planned giving information could be important information for the future. I would err on the side of small debt.

If it is a low amount; not more than 20% of \$2.5 million should be financed.

The last time we paid it off quickly.

Expertise will be necessary.

It would have to be a very prudent loan.

People feel better without it.

It depends on logistics.

15. In addition to making a gift to the proposed campaign, some parishioners may wish to explore planned or legacy gifts. Check the blank next to the item(s) of interest. Materials will be sent to you from the Episcopal Church Foundation.

 0 Make a gift to your parish through a bequest in your will.

 0 Create a charitable gift annuity (minimum gift of \$5,000).

Benefits of a charitable gift annuity could include:

- receive guaranteed income for life (i.e. current rates of approximately 5.3% annually at age 65, approximately 6.3% annually at age 75)
- receive an income tax deduction now for the gift portion
- receive some tax-free income from the investment for life
- possibly reduce applicable estate and inheritance taxes
- enjoy the satisfaction that at the death of the final beneficiary, the principal would go to that part of the Episcopal Church you so designate

- 0 Donate appreciated real property such as a house, vacation home, farm or business property.
- 2 Send me the *Ministry of Gift Planning* brochure which explains Planned Giving options.
- 3 Add me to the Episcopal Church Foundation e-newsletter.

15a. 13 St. Mark's Episcopal Church is already in my will or estate plans.

16. If asked, would you be willing to work on a committee in support of the proposed capital campaign?

17 Yes 8 No 10 Not sure at this time

17. Among individuals you know, who would make an ideal CHAIR for this proposed capital campaign?

Kenn Allen	4
Doris Burton	6
Edgar Corr	2
David Deutsch	
Stephanie Deutsch	
William Doolittle	
Pete Eveleth	
Lina Ewald	
Susan Flanders	2
Betty Foster	5
Christine Greger	
Janis Gregory	5
Rob Hall	6
Brock Hansen	
Penny Hansen	2
Tucker Harris	3
Bill Jordan	2
Josie Jordan	2
William Kennedy	
Laurel Kennedy	
Margaret Krenshaw	2
Rod Lawrence	
Elizabeth Mahood	
George Meng	2

Crane Miller	2
Julie Murphy	
Greg Niblett	5
Matthew Ossolinski	
Rita Ossolinski	
William Rau	
Jane Rutherford	2
Rick Rutherford	
John Sedgewick	
Peter Sherer	
Jane Sherman	
Elizabeth Townsend	
Michael Townsend	15
Charlie Walsh	
Louise Walsh	4
Catie Waland	
David Willson	2

Visioning members

Previous Jr. and Sr. Wardens

18. Hypothetically, if you were a chair, whom would you select to serve with you?

Terry Adlhock	
Elizabeth Agle	
Paul Albergo	
Leslie Allen	
Kenn Allen	2
Adell Amos	
Christi Anthony	2
Elizabeth Athey	2
Lou Bayard	
Mark Bildner	
Eileen Blumenthal	
Jackie Boddie	
Charles Brodhead	
Doris Burton	4
Jack Burton	
Tracy Councill	
Susan Cunningham	2
David Deutsch	
Stephanie Deutsch	
Nancy Donaldson	

Charles Donnelly	
Kitty Donnelly	
Martha Donnelly	
Pete Eveleth	4
Betty Foster	
Christine Greger	
Janis Gregory	2
Rob Hall	
Penny Hansen	
Tucker Harris	
Anne Headley	
Kristen Hartke	
Jo Ellen Hayden	
Jeffrey Hunter	
Linda Huntington	
Bill Jordan	
Josie Jordan	
Laurel Kennedy	
Ed Kneedler	
Lynn Kneedler	
Keith Krueger	2
Katherine Levinger	2
Will Long	
Bertha Martin	
George Meng	3
Jo Ellen Meng	
Crane Miller	
Don Mosher	2
Julie Murphy	2
Greg Niblett	4
David Obromavitz	
Matthew Ossolinski	
Rita Ossolinski	
Amber Palmer	2
The Rutherfords	
Marilu Sherer	
Peter Sherer	2
Bruce Sherman	
Lisa Soir-Ozgin	
Linda Staheli	
Doris Strange	
Michelle Strange	
Michael Townsend	3
Louise Walsh	2
Rick Weber	

David Willson
 Gretchen Willson
 Phyllis Jane Young

2

This must be multi-generational and multi-group.

You have to get some young people. (2)

The young adults (20-somethings). Many are very committed and grew up in the church.

A mixture of the generations – the most important thing is getting people who will actually do the work, and not just say yes.

Past Treasurers.

19. In your opinion, what major positive factors does the parish have in its favor for the proposed campaign?

Comments:

Past performance – I've been here 40 years and when my wife was ill a lot of people were very supportive. I feel a debt of gratitude.

Part of me thinks this campaign is a loony idea, but I would support it in gratitude to St Mark's.

This Dreamcatcher exercise was “we want to have a campaign – let's see what we could spend the money on” – that is backwards to me.

There are a lot of people leaving money to St Mark's, or thinking about wanting to.

The way the community involvement was worked on was great; just that they had gone out and gathered some ideas about that. I like the idea of mentoring the graduating foster kids. I like that people were talking about some unmet needs that were possibilities.

The openness of the place; new people are always coming in. New people stand up EVERY week. I don't know how many are coming back, but a lot of people come in.

The church is well known in the community for its openness and friendliness; very sociable and very social. It is great for new people coming to town.

There are lots of young families and always a few babies at each baptism.

There are people still there who were our friends over 50 years ago. More than 5 couples! And they are still active in the church and attending!

We have survived through clergy changes and interims.

A lot of people feel very strongly and value a faith community which means different things for different people; it is not purely social.

The community and a place to explore. You can be as active or not active as is comfortable for you to engage.

We appreciate many things about St. Mark's. It is my church community. I really value it. I value the education and the community I have here. I appreciate the life that goes on within it.

The amazing spirit of community here!

There is a sense of universal acceptance and unconditional love here.

There is sort of a general can-do optimism.

It is a vibrant community and there are lots of families with young kids here.

The quality of the space makes a huge difference.

The need is obvious. It's a magnificent building that has had a wonderful ride for 50 years. I would like it to remain a significant force.

It would be a good way for Paul to go out, and an attractive factor for finding a new rector.

The nave and the church are exquisite. It is an incredibly beautiful historic and unusual space. If this helps us welcome people and use it better, that is a great reason to support it.

Our deepest friendship circle is around St. Mark's. We have many circles of really good friends here. This is our church/spiritual home.

I am very invested in our community outreach and it is critical to me that we give it more than lip service. I want us to be really, really serious about it. We have an opportunity right now to open the doors even wider.

This could be energizing for the flagging commitment; being asked to give money is actually a good thing.

The strength of the community itself is a positive.

The education program; almost everybody goes through it at some point and, thus, influences the way we think and our values. It is a common experience that instills a set of values that come from being part of this community. That is a real strength.

We have individual and group commitment. If someone needs something, we'll find some way to help, one way or another.

The leadership and all the work they have done so far, and the presentation they made, makes me feel a huge confidence that they won't be hoodwinking us.

I'll be here a very long time. I bought my niche in the columbarium, so I am invested in seeing to it that we are here long into the future.

I feel that people here really think I am worth something.

I see a lot of unfamiliar young faces here which is a good sign. It means we are growing

My husband is in the columbarium, and I will be too. It's conveniently located. I like singing in the choir. I like the Sunday school program.

We do funerals and celebrations well. People here are very good at that. This is a very social place and people put their all into those things. Maundy Thursday is top-notch.

The sense of community! People will give from their investment in this community. That is the strongest thing.

The people, as opposed to the building!

St. Mark's is my community. I don't know what else I can say. I don't have a work or neighborhood community, and that is necessary for your mental health to have. It's a community of people who are different in many respects, but whoever it is we are interesting to be with.

Many people point to the growing children's population and young parents.

Our seniors have great wisdom and have given so much.

Our elders and lay leadership are our strongest aspect. They are great.

The Honduras program is a plus.

There is a lot of momentum in the parish right now. There is good new blood. Even people who have moved away are still involved. We have a strong rector. People are generally happy with the church. We have some people with some resources, and also a good population of young folks. I would be interested to hear if people feel like they are giving a lot now.

The building is an inspiration for some people.

In general, people love St. Mark's. It is a big part of their spiritual lives, and their social lives. It is very important to them. That can connect to the pocket book.

The current ethos is very lay-leadership driven. All the heavy lifting is done by the laity of this parish, so that creates a lot of ownership. They are eager and aware of problems to fix. There is a feeling that this is OUR church, and if anything needs doing, we have to do it ourselves.

People really open their wallets for short term needs; they will pay for special, specific things, but not to keep the lights on.

There is a strong sense of community. I like a lot of the people here. I like that young families seem to be caring about expanding ministry to young children.

I think the work on the campaign process has been well-done.

We talk a lot. People are not scared to wrestle with stuff, so people do not subvert. That is critical in something like this. People care about the community, so there is the potential for people to get enthusiastic.

We have been very involved for over 20 years. It's a place where you can belong and find answers to questions. It is a good institution and it needs to be able to go on and thrive. We are better spouses, better parents, and better people for having stumbled onto this church 20 years ago.

I like the way people sort of cycle in and out of participation. St. Mark's is a place where you can do that.

St. Mark's helps people figure out their spiritual journey and be more authentic, kinder, and honest people when they hang out here for a while.

It's a pretty affluent community and there is a pretty good case for the mechanical stuff. We haven't done a capital campaign in a while, and it is a good thing for a church to do.

It is a very open community and people find a lot of welcome here.

The work that's been done so far has been really good at letting people know that there really is stuff that needs to be done. Doing nothing is not in anyone's best interest, or the interest of our buildings.

It's a beautiful church.

What I love most is the heritage and the promise of the future based on that heritage. The history is why this church is still strong today.

I like our progressive value system, living the questions. Also, it is my primary community. The love of the church and wanting to make sure it survives into the future.

The sense of community and the support of our children; it helped me to raise healthy productive citizens. I am very happy with our youth director and the new focus on children.

This is an organization that is extremely volunteer invested.

There are more people engaged here than just about anywhere else I know of.

We have a unique, progressive voice.

This is an exciting entity and a good corporate can-do spirit.

This is a caring community. We are open to new ideas (as long as they are not too conservative).

Baxter House is a huge asset. With subtracting it from costs, this is very possible.

This is such an unabashedly inclusive and welcoming place. This generating of space and presence could inspire generosity in others.

This is where we want to grow old and die!

There are emotional commitments.

There is a good core of committed people.

This is a community where people know and care about each other.

This is my home.

We have been attracting more kids and families.

Kenn is providing good leadership.

A capital campaign allows people to get involved who weren't previously involved. In the past, it has brought new competence. There is something good about coming together around a central project.

The church is a part of everyone's life.

This community would like to see the church succeed.

There is a strong sense of community and definite growth in the congregation. There were 13 new couples in baptism class and lots of new young families.

There is a lot of enthusiasm for programs.

Participating in this is investing in our community – the Hill.

We have a lot of young kids and families.

20. What problems, if any, do you foresee for this project?

Comments:

The economy! (3)

My problems are that I don't think it can happen. Maybe it can. And I have some other priorities for my money, too.

The amount that's been suggested for community projects should be flushed out more. What project would it go to? How would I "apply" for help with a ministry? Who would I approach about that? I am interested in a Haiti project, and so are others. Maybe a smaller percentage?

Just the noise and dirt and upheaval when it is being done. Mercifully, we have a flexible nave, so we can function through that although we don't have pews.

It's just A LOT of money.

Annual giving has been flat to negative for the last few years. The culture of giving is much more attuned to special needs than regular faithful giving. Annual giving is always hard but it is easy and people are generous when they perceive a need.

Money would solve it all. The plans are appropriate and would be nice for the church to have and would be a benefit. I don't see anything I don't like or don't want.

We are going through a generational shift here. There is a bit of an undercurrent of "we have been leading for so long it is time for others to step forward and lead". The new crowd is not perceived as carrying their weight and that may affect the elder giving. The 40-somethings seem to have a lot of time and money commitments.

The generation supporting is moving on.

Finding the money!

Attendance seems high, but I'm not sure the time and financial commitment match that. When we were a smaller church, with different leadership, there was more passion and broad participation and investment of time, talent and money.

A lot of the new energy people have very busy lives.

We have a supremely able senior warden, but he goes out of the office soon and I don't know who is next in line.

My heart is willing, but my accounts are weak.

What is the plan for when we are in construction? When do we bring in the port-a-potties?

The groups that use this space range from the "we do not participate in a campaign" to those that raise money on Capital Hill on a regular basis and would be willing to help.

I am having a hard time getting a fix on if I feel a lot of enthusiasm for this.

I don't know how much money you're going to get. People spend their money on things I wouldn't spend money on.

I am hoping this campaign is a great growth opportunity for stewardship; raising enthusiasm and awareness should help.

Our beloved rector has been open in a healthy way about retiring soon. We have a healthy parish that can weather this. I know Paul is very committed to this campaign, but we need to be sensitive to that issue and the impact it could have.

Not just raising the money, but how do we educate people about what is the right amount? People have radically diverse perspectives about money here. I will give what I think is right, but it does disturb me that others are not carrying their fair share.

The congregation is really unaware of what the vestry is up to, what they are voting on, or what they are considering. There is just no connection.

We lost "The Gospel According to St. Mark" monthly newsletter. It has wound down. Is it dead? We have a lot of communication issues. A canvas might be a good time to resurrect The Gospel. Not too many people really read online communications.

Because of the distance, people don't spend as much time at this church as they would a neighborhood church.

This is not an easy place to do major work with historical constraints and old building issues. I see pretty good contingencies, but I would make them higher.

There is a shift in the rectorship coming.

We love having everything first-class, but we don't want to pay for it. People want things nice, but then give a low amount.

The excitement we started out with is gone. We have not been able to maintain our reputation as a progressive, innovative, and creative church. That is what attracted me to St. Mark's. I do not see the same church as in the earlier days. The results of old things we've done are still there, but there is no new thinking, only more holding onto the past. That is why my children don't go. They are open to being part of a church community, but they are not being fed enough in the worship services.

There are a lot of individuals with their own thoughts; they say we are not grassroots at St. Mark's – we are all trees! Getting to consensus is a lengthy process, but we do keep going until we get to it.

The economy and what is happening with Paul are the two main ones.

During the last campaign, it was a time of lots of energy. I feel less energy now, plus the normal trepidation about money. The work being done with this survey will be really helpful in seeing what we really have.

People do not have as strong a commitment to St. Mark's as in other churches; maybe we are too busy. We don't seem to have the same congregation from week to week.

There are a lot of different ideas for what needs to be done and what should be done. It will be hard, once you get beyond deferred maintenance, to get consensus about what people want to do. It might be a difficult time.

We don't have the right leadership for this.

People are unsettled about making new commitments. Major donors have been negatively impacted by the recession and are starting to recover, but retirement is a huge concern.

Families have college expenses to consider.

There is competition for economic constraints.

There is a sense of nervousness and pessimism.

My sense over the past six-to-eight years is that we haven't had much growth in pledging members. We have a large number of new parishioners who have kids and less money.

So much of the pressure to expand comes from parents who can't give.

There may be neighborhood concerns about construction.

Will there be parking problems?

We will be double-dipping with stewardship and a campaign.

This will need to be orchestrated so that there are targeted individuals who are cultivated and trained. People need to frame the question in compelling ways.

This will require a real community effort.

Getting the money!

How will we work through and work together through construction? There will have to be cooperation for sharing space. People gave tons of complaints for the Shower Project.

Paul's potential retirement impacts all components of this.

There is a strong possibility of not reaching our target and the annual stewardship is evidence.

There may be problems with organizing and finding volunteer support. We need people who have experience with this to help. We need good people to run it.

Consensus with the vision; the congregation will debate something forever. Very few people will not air their opinions.

We don't know about Paul's future and how long he will be staying. His potential retirement leaves people anxious.

21. What added ideas or suggestions do you have which might be helpful to the leadership in making this important decision?

Comments:

Be realistic. Be ready for it to be the right thing to not do a campaign at this time, even if that is not the most exciting decision. That advice applies to Paul and the lay leadership.

I believe that it is confidence inspiring to hear from the rector how long he plans to be here. He is selling his house. Some commitment from him would be confidence-inspiring.

Just keep staying in constant communication with people as it has been. Keep people clearly informed about the inconveniences – like The Players, etc.

We have lots of small children that need to be accommodated. We have several multi-generational families, because they felt welcomed as children there. Be sure they have nice spaces and are not stuck in a grubby corner

This has been a really good process. People have been asked for their input all along the way.

Some people feel this is overindulging at a time of economic weakness and that we should just bring it up-to-code and do repairs and that's it. They do know what it is like to live through bad times.

One thing we really need to think about is maintenance. I don't feel we have always had the right maintenance; our building looks sloppy sometimes and that shouldn't be. If we have beautiful, new renovated space we have to do better. For weddings we need to clearly articulate the pricing and expectations. I am fond of our maintenance people, but do not feel we always get what we need from them. And there is a flaking ceiling in one room that just stays flakey. There doesn't seem to be an easy way to get things done. Little things like that should be attended to. The junior warden should not have to be telling maintenance people to change a light bulb.

Look to the seniors and the increased ease of doing this in the future.

St. Mark's can get bogged down in process. This has been moving at a good clip, but I would hate to see this go off the rails due to "process addicts". We have done enough; this has been a great process. Don't let "perfect" become the enemy here. We need buy-in but not processing to death. Keep this fresh and new and exciting.

On the 5% Community fund thing, let's pick one or two things and have a real impact we can be proud of and put our name on. We have a tendency to make our personal causes St. Mark's causes.

Baxter House is crumbling; it's not secure or comfortable, plus we need the staff in this main building. Something has to happen with Baxter House. If we can do Option C, that would be the best, but at least let's do Option B. Something has to happen soon, and that should be the best thing we can design.

Doing this would really help us when we are calling a new rector.

A lot of attention needs to be paid to an esthetic bonding of the buildings to make a single consistent edifice. Do not pin an ugly tail on a pretty donkey; that is really important.

I think Paul should make a commitment to staying through any building project, and be WHOLLY invested. If he were to leave in the middle it would be deflating and de-energizing

Communication is number one. People need to feel welcomed, no matter what. Involve the young people. Have kids think about how they could contribute to create a culture of giving.

Some continuity of Jane Rutherford's community work is inviting other stakeholders to participate with their thoughts and energies and support, as a way to pull them in.

Pray!

One concern I have is with Paul Abernathy and if he is going to be sticking around since he is talking about retirement. I trust that he wouldn't make a move before we start this campaign. Changing horses mid-race is hard. We have strong laity here, but we have always been rector-centered. I'd like some assurances from him that he would stick with us a few years to get us through this.

I am excited about the way this place functions as a community center and can help. That makes me more invested.

You have to talk to people about their estate plans.

Comparing to the last campaign, we need to make the case that we HAVE to do this, rather than it would be nice to do this.

The reference to the 5% to outreach came up at the last minute last time. That bait-and-switch was divisive. That part needs to be very clear and out there if it is included. It is part of the cost of being in a community, and I won't fight it if it needs to be there for a large group that feels strongly about it. However, I am not in favor of it being in here, myself. If it is, you must be very clear, and upfront and specific.

Listen carefully to the needs and opinions of the elders.

I like the creativity that has been brought to this so far. Continue to think creatively about our role in the community and how we can share and pool resources both financial and space. Continue to explore that. Should we do joint fundraising with other spiritual communities or perhaps swap meeting space with synagogues that use their space on different days?

Among the ethos of St. Mark's is that you have to take any complaints directly to the person.

Just one – communication is SO important. When I went to that small group meeting I gained an enormous amount of understanding and perspective on all the important questions, but there were only 18 of us in the room. There are long-time members who were away for the summer for whom this was like lighting out of a cloud. They had no idea about this. Their reaction was “Are you kidding me? A capital campaign now???!?” Communicate, communicate, communicate about the relevant, important information as much as you can.

They are doing a great job getting us to the point where we can look at the data and make decisions.

The leadership needs to keep a conservative mindset about this work and not get too excited about people's interest in doing it and bite off more than we can chew with a lot of debt in the future, or projects we can't finish. Be happy with doing just what needs to be done. That may be better than making the Parish Hall no longer a big open space since you can't really go back from that if people don't like it. Maybe we just need to make the current space work better.

In marketing you need to leave no stone unturned. It must be a passionate, committed, and comprehensive effort. People give for all different reasons. Do everything – do email, mail, personal visits, phone calls – a very comprehensive effort to reach each person, who respond to different stimuli and methods. Leave no one “left to contact” at the end. Someone needs to take this tiger by the tail and not let go of it for this to succeed. We are talking about a major, huge effort like we haven’t done here in a long time. For example, it is October, and I have not even been approached by the canvass.

What is the vision for the kind of church we are going to be in 10 years? The same? More progressive? I would like to support homeless mothers and their children, for example. There is a lot we can do that doesn’t cost a lot. I could be convinced to give money, but I need a much better sense of how it relates to all those dreams.

We need to see some sort of highlights and figures for money. What would you save by improvements?

Highlight the outreach capital investment in the community. It is about capital gains for other organizations. Keep outreach in.

The mural is just plain ugly!

Capital campaigns are easier than annual campaigns. This will take a lot of one-on-one. Twenty years ago we had a beautiful dinner. We should highlight the space.

Wait a year to allow parents time to become givers.

We need better bicycle racks for people who may want to ride their bikes rather than drive during construction.

Talk to a professional chef about leasing the kitchen space either for rent or food, or lease the kitchen to other non-profits. Consider community outsourcing of fresh produce.

In regards to the awful mural in the Parish Hall, take a photo, project it, and then replace it!

We need to take care of the trash right out back of the kitchen. We need a compost area. Take care of the weeds and create a garden.

A gentle ethic could be embedded into the culture as to what it means to be part of St. Mark’s. You are part of the legacy and responsibility, not all the time, but frequently.

There is such potential here. The committee has done an excellent job thus far. Now we are in a trickier stage which requires expertise. We need someone who knows corporate fundraising and will do it differently than non-profit fundraisers.

You have to take the feasibility study report seriously. If something is on the line, we need more than a majority vote. We don't need internal struggle. The process has been open and inclusive but there is an under current that this feasibility report is proforma and that concerns won't be fully weighed.

There is value to costing out particular projects. Breakdown the large numbers into smaller components.

The notion of legacy is important to people. Our obligation is to maintain the building.

This looks like a very carefully laid-out plan.

When this gets started, the following things need to be made clear – a definite goal, exactly what it will be used for, and no reserve funds.

There needs to be a lot of give and take. A discussion is necessary about economic security among individuals. Who is afraid, and how can we support you. What can be done to alleviate anxiety and fear?

Narrow the ranges from \$10,000 to \$25,000 in the feasibility study. The range is too wide to get accurate estimates.

Section Three:

Direct Mail/Online Responses

Results from 155 Direct Mail/Online Responses

Note: Not all respondents answered all questions.

1. Prior to this survey, were you aware that the parish was considering a capital campaign?

148 Yes 7 No

2. Prior to this survey, were you aware of the needs as expressed in the accompanying proposed plans?

107 Aware 14 Not Aware 34 Aware of some of the needs

3. Generally speaking, do you favor the parish conducting a capital campaign as outlined in the proposed plans?

79 Yes 17 No 55 Yes, but with some concerns

Comments:

In the current economic climate, I question the likelihood of success.

Is this the right time, given the economy and since the congregation is not growing?

Its carbon footprint is far too great for the building to be feasible for the future of environmental concern.

I think a capital campaign is long overdue.

Baxter House has got to go; it is a disaster!

My concerns are: a) the timing for an ambitious capital campaign before the economy strengthens a bit more; b) how/why the community outreach is such a large integral part of the plan! c) nothing is said about phasing Options B and C given the disruptions involved to space and activities; and d) I don't recall hearing the organ was in bad shape. Is there an organ angel for this? Disconnect both outreach and organ from options to focus on necessary renovations and building priorities.

This is a bad time, both in terms of a weak economy and in the life of the parish, to start a major fund raising campaign.

I understand that Baxter House is a problem. I also understand that space is a problem and has been for some years. However, I do not believe the community can sustain a capital campaign at this time.

I am concerned with raising the necessary capital and assuming long-term debt.

It seems like a difficult time financially to go through with this.

Do we have the means to do both a campaign and maintain our current programs, given that we struggle with canvassing? I am not sure how much more I want to give.

This is a particularly inappropriate time to have a capital campaign. The economy is in a bad way and poverty is everywhere. St. Mark's should be putting its efforts into raising money to help the needy.

As I understand it, there is a critical need for repair and maintenance of the church's facilities that for practical reasons should not be postponed. The issue you frame is not whether to seek funds (postponed maintenance only gets more expensive) for the repairs, but how extensive the repairs should be, whether the church should go beyond repair to renovation and improvement, and whether the needed amount of money can actually be raised. My questions are, if there is no capital campaign, can those repairs be put off; if so, what would be the consequences of putting them off; if they cannot be put off, how much of the funding strategy depends on member contributions and what are the other parts of the strategy?

I'm concerned about the ability to meet fundraising targets in this economy.

In all the options, the dollar amount is quite high and will be a significant challenge.

My concern is for my own family's ability to contribute financially, though we agree with the needs.

It seems irresponsible to renovate Baxter House for office space. It is identified as an educational building, and I believe we are at risk in terms of DC building codes by using it as an office.

St. Mark's is uniquely positioned, both physically and spiritually, as a church and congregation. It should continue to work to upgrade both.

I don't think Option C should assume the sale of the Baxter House. I would like to see a way to keep the property and only consider selling in a time of dire crisis.

I would support only the option of selling Baxter House and putting the profits into designing office space in the Parish Hall.

We don't believe adequate information is presented to make an informed decision and the options appear to have significant built-in bias towards an outcome that includes a significant decision on losing a major asset (Baxter House). In addition, the economic conditions are not good for a capital campaign.

It doesn't bring us any closer to having our own retreat center.

We are in favor of a modest capital campaign.

I have yet to find responses on the St. Mark's website to the numerous questions raised about the campaign.

We have difficulty meeting our annual budget needs to support staff with appropriate cost-of-living increases, etc. I worry about our ability to keep our staff/annual budget while conducting such a large capital campaign.

I am concerned that the parish is not growing, that the parish will not support the more expensive options, and that adding community engagement onto the proposals is unwise if the funds must be borrowed. Do we know that altering the facade of the parish hall will be approved by the Fine Arts Commission?

Perhaps there should have been a survey to determine how members are currently managing their financial lives in this recession that does not appear to have an end in sight.

The economy is still a bit rocky and people may hesitate to dig deep and give more than they're giving now. I know that would be true for me.

Assuming that Baxter House is sold, with the proceeds applied to the estimated campaign goal, e.g., if we have net sales proceeds of \$850,000, then the estimated campaign amount is reduced by \$850,000.

I would prefer deciding first whether to sell Baxter House, since the proceeds from the sale would greatly reduce the amount needed for the campaign.

The current economy has put a strain on almost anyone's income, even the "wealthy". People are being asked to support family members and to contribute to charities more than ever.

The size of the projects and the amount contemplated is far beyond any previous capital campaign at St. Mark's. Given that we are among the top 25% of pledges, I am concerned about where the funds will come from.

My ability to contribute at the present time is limited. It seems that the case for significant renovation work at St. Mark's has been made, however.

With the economy so uncertain, I have strong concerns that we are dreaming about the willingness/ability for the parish to support this effort at the levels "dreamed"! I do strongly support a campaign for maintenance that would speak to deferred maintenance needs. But, BASIC is the word I would stress. With so many folk worried about the economic future, and so many homeless and hungry, anymore than this would be a strong sign to me that the parish is too self centered/absorbed!

All the options sound very ambitious, maybe even overly so. My thought would be to do the deferred maintenance first and save the dream renovations for the future. The idea of selling Baxter House seems like a good one.

I am hopeful that we can get more information before committing completely, including demographic information and who, really, might be the contributors.

I hope that we consider the relation between the annual pledge campaign and a capital campaign and what it means if we cannot achieve our goal in the former case. We need to contemplate giving (actually giving this time and not as 20 years ago when the target was not realized) a larger percentage (10% or more) of our pledged dollars to mission and ministry outside of ourselves.

I would like to learn the final decision of what renovation/expansion plan is decided upon. If Baxter House is too costly to renovate, would the sale of it help finance the renovation of St. Mark's and Parish Hall? Would the renovation provide the space needed in the foreseeable future (20 years)?

I am not sure exactly. Building maintenance should be part of the operating budget and if the reserves are used responsibly, they should cover the maintenance issues.

We need to do it, and if we're going to do it we should seek to raise enough to do all that we need to do.

In my opinion, I understand the need for the capital campaign for general maintenance, but in this economy it doesn't seem appropriate to ask for large donations.

It is within reason to include compensation of staff, who will have to work more hours to insure follow-up and follow-through, which is not reflected in any of the outlined proposals.

I don't want to sell Baxter House. I need to see more options. I don't like the 5% for outreach.

Due to the economic climate, I do not believe a capital campaign is justified at this time.

I am not for redoing the kitchen. We don't have the money, especially in these uncertain times. I feel the need, but think that it's irresponsible to take on such an enormous commitment at this time. I feel we, as a family, cannot contribute and we, as a parish, are not on stable enough financial footing.

We need space and especially a welcoming place for our staff to work.

My concerns are about my personal ability to contribute, but I recognize the fact that the campaign is needed.

I'm concerned about the success of a capital campaign given these uncertain economic times.

I completely understand the need for a capital campaign, but my apprehension comes from the fact that I am currently unemployed so I don't want to say "Yes, of course!" when I have no idea if or how much I could contribute.

I am not inclined to favor a \$2-3 million capital campaign when there are so many needs outside of St. Mark's, particularly during these times.

I favor a capital campaign with goals that outline a new set of ideas. I'm not sure regular and delayed maintenance warrant one. This should serve as a reminder to us to budget for maintenance on a yearly basis.

I am in favor only of bringing the existing building up-to-code.

I am concerned because I can spare only a little.

This canvass may indicate parishioners anxiety over current needs.

I am opposed to doing more than the minimum to preserve the property we have. If more is done, I can see digging under the Parish Hall, but I think it would be a crime to change this historic architecture.

4. Please indicate the level of priority you would attach to each of the projects outlined in the proposed plans by checking the appropriate line under each heading. At present, they are listed in no particular order.

**Select only one option per line and feel free to make comments.*

	PRIORITY				
	High	Medium	Low	Opposed	Lack Information
<u>Option A:</u>					
<i>(No new construction)</i>					
a. Deferred Maintenance on Church Buildings & Organ	<u>60</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>7</u>
b. Baxter House Renovations	<u>23</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>Option B:</u>					
<i>(All Option A maintenance work, no Baxter House Renovations)</i>					
c. Parish Hall Second Floor & Renovation	<u>48</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>9</u>
d. Current Undercroft Renovation	<u>29</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>9</u>
e. Install Sustainable Systems	<u>49</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>Option C:</u>					
<i>(Includes all Option B work)</i>					
f. Parish Hall Undercroft Expansion	<u>45</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>9</u>

Comments:

The church population is aging, so there is a need for improvements of acoustics to assist those with hearing difficulties.

Talk to someone with knowledge about building codes in and near historic structures.

It must be made clear what plans would be made over the next three years to accommodate the many activities, classes, etc. if Baxter House were to be sold to raise money for construction of second floor and undercroft of Parish Hall.

The choices are confusing and unclear.

I don't fully understand the way you are asking for three Option B choices. I checked all three as high, because I favor Option B.

We understand that Baxter House is a problem and also understand that space is a problem - and has been for some years. However, we do not believe the community can sustain a capital campaign at this time.

Baxter House needs to be sold and the staff moved.

We're having trouble with the way this question is worded since it does not segregate each individual project as you go through the options. We are most in favor of doing Option C (which seems to include everything in Options A and B). If we end up needing to sell Baxter House to get this done, then we should sell it. If it turns out that we can do everything and not sell Baxter House, then that would be a good thing too.

It would be crazy to spend money to renovate Baxter House (especially 400-500K!). It's in bad shape but so is our house and we make do. Deferred maintenance on the church itself and organ should be done, but as to Baxter House we should either keep things as is (with no renovations except as necessary for safety/code) or sell it and move the offices to a second floor of the Parish Hall. The proposal was unclear on what the net cost of this would be (what we would likely get for Baxter House) but we would be against it if it would require a large capital campaign. We are also concerned that putting a second floor in Parish Hall would make the ceiling too low and we'd end up with a group space even less appealing than the current Parish Hall.

I am concerned that the St Mark's community will: 1) focus too much on building and space needs of the parish as opposed to outreach to the community, diocese, world, etc.; 2) commit to a building project that exceeds what parishioners actually pay to the capital campaign, making it necessary to finance the balance of the costs through a mortgage; and 3) estimate that the St. Mark's community cannot afford more than \$1.5 million without financing from a bank.

Adding a second floor in the parish hall should be abandoned. It will turn the present space into one more dull, lifeless, multi-purpose room. The present open-to-the-roof design must be kept!

I can't rate the importance of carrying out deferred maintenance of buildings without seeing an inspection report. Your summary suggests it's critical now.

I expect Baxter House is an early 1900's building whose renovation and continuing maintenance would be extremely expensive. Selling it and using the proceeds for something more structurally suited to your needs may be a better strategy.

I'm not 100% sure which building is Baxter House.

It is important to us that the design be developed in a thoughtful, inclusive and expansive way. At this point, we do not see a real design ready for implementation, just an over-arching concept.

I prefer Option C with the sale of Baxter house but would take Option B if needed.

I am in favor of the most expansive renovation. St. Mark's can raise the money, the improvements are needed, and we need to go ahead.

Just as we talk about 100-year floods or 500-year disasters, we also have 50 or 100-year opportunities. We must be bold.

A lot more information needs to be developed on Baxter House. What is its value "as is" in a bad real estate market? What would its value be if renovated? What options are foregone by selling it?

I think we should go all out, even if it means taking on a mortgage. I'll support whatever the community decides, of course.

Parish Hall Undercroft Expansion - if the projected needs of the church are better met by also including the Parish Hall Undercroft Expansion in the proposed work, it would seem to me that now is the time to do it as the "renovation" machine of disruption to the church programs, fundraising, etc. will already be in place. Doing the work now might better, and more economically, carry the church forward meeting its needs for program support now and in the future. A lot of thoughtful work has been done for what would help the church sustain and improve its internal and community outreach programs - analyzing how the current facilities place limitations on those efforts and dreams. Why not work for maximum change, knowing that less-expensive fall-back options exist if the capital campaign is unable to meet the funding needs? These proposals do not appear to me to be extravagant, just thoughtful and solid-for-the-future proposals for change and improvements.

I don't have enough information to know what is a critical need. Sell Baxter House and finance part of this project if we don't need it.

There are too many unanswered questions about this project. Little effort has been made to resolve parish concerns and generate enthusiasm. What happens if insufficient money is raised to fund whatever renovations are decided upon? Do we take on the burden of a mortgage? I don't favor putting aside a portion of whatever money is raised for unspecified outreach purposes.

I think the parish should take the opportunity to do what will best serve the parish needs for at least the next 15-20 years and go for it. Doing a partial job seems like not worth the effort of a major capital campaign, even though it may be a daunting financial proposition. All the items outlined in Option C are really needed and would ultimately be beneficial.

The undercroft is functional and I do not favor spending a lot of money when we get no new space. I like the idea of using the space behind the mural in the parish hall and actually having a functioning stage there. I'm not sure that is in any of the proposals, but we would get a lot of use from the stage and, perhaps, could auction off the mural or parts of the mural as a fundraiser. I also like the idea of the second story above the Parish Hall.

I think that Option A is inadequate and that Option C is over-reaching. I support state-of-the-art systems but am less concerned about whether or not they qualify as "sustainable."

The need for Option A deferred maintenance is clear. Option B renovation with sale of Baxter House results in no increase in usable space but costs \$2M. By not selling Baxter House usable space would increase with Option B. Option C cost seems prohibitive.

The only matter about which I feel strongly is that we should not spend more money on Baxter House. It is and always will be sub-optimal space. By the same token, if we sell it once the residential market is on the mend, it represents potentially 40% of what we'll need to enlarge/enhance the Parish Hall and do the other necessary work. Finally, I wouldn't favor embarking upon a campaign unless we have lined up the "bell cows", the four or five very large gifts without which we can't be successful.

If the campaign goal can be sustained for Option C, without a "real" stretch, then Option C would rise to a medium level. Given the economic circumstances today however, I believe that Option B should be focused on. I firmly believe that funds should not be set aside for outreach. All funds generated by a capital campaign should be applied to infrastructure – then we have ongoing resources to offer for outreach. Otherwise, you need to dramatically change to the definition of capital improvements. Such a shift in definition becomes a deep hole of one-time use of funds, with no long lasting impact.

This is very confusing and I am not sure that I understood. I think you should do all the work that you need to do.

I strongly favor Option C; go for the whole nut now. If we wait even a year the costs will just go up and up.

I appreciate the work done by the committees but I find it hard to get a full sense of the differences in the projects compared to the costs.

It seems that a very successful fund-raising effort, allowing the church to do as much Parish Hall and undercroft work as possible in one single project, would be most desirable. I see a cart/horse problem; clearly financial targets need to be set. Is it possible to ascertain major prospective gifts before the project target is set?

In general, if Baxter House is too costly to repair/renovate, I would favor doing the least possible to it and would prefer proceeding with renovation/expansion of Parish Hall together with a second floor. Do whatever is necessary to the undercroft to sustain the second floor addition safely.

I recommend selling Baxter House based on the zoning and other issues surrounding it.

Based on population and trends and our focus on the youth, the edifice supports it all.

I believe we should do ALL we can.

I do not favor selling Baxter House. I favor taking care of all deferred maintenance which includes the organ (which should have been included as part of deferred maintenance). The wording of each scenario reflects the long held history of how the choir, dance, music, yoga, etc. have not been considered part of this parish. We need to wake up! These ministries are part of who we are. How can you faithfully consider any kind of capital campaign without considering the extra work and toll it has on your staff? The Episcopal Church Foundation, as advisors, is not being faithful or fiscally responsible in its advisory capacity if it has not taken a look at the parish's budget for staff in relation to the capital campaign.

Do not do this piecemeal. "Build it and they will come". The impression of any part of the physical structure of St. Mark's other than the lovely and historical nave is old, tired, and grey. Repairing the infrastructure is not enough.

I strongly support selling Baxter House so, perhaps, I do oppose renovating it. If we do not sell it we have to renovate it, so I might assign a higher priority to that. I'd love to check high priority for everything in Options B & C, but I wanted to prioritize in case we can't do everything.

I think we should think big. We should build out the space for our current needs and in anticipation of growth.

I support maintenance of the church and Parish Hall.

The way in which these options are stated is very confusing. I'm concerned that you won't get the clarity of information that you need.

I think the deferred maintenance projects are absolutely crucial and installing sustainable systems is similarly essential and will, in the long run, save the parish money.

The staff needs a better workplace in Baxter House!

It's very confusing to have four separate Option B's.

Good work on infrastructure is an investment in the future.

Under no circumstances should we spend additional funds on Baxter House. We believe it would be prohibitively expensive for the building to meet current DC code standards.

Option C is too expensive. It can be done in the future, by future generations.

Top priority is to do all deferred maintenance. Do not do Baxter House. Option C is best.

5. Would you favor the sale of Baxter House if the proceeds were applied to the capital campaign, thus reducing the amount of money needing to be raised?

114 Yes 29 No

Comments:

I am not convinced you cannot make excellent use of a redesigned and upgraded Baxter House. If I were a Baxter, I would be very upset if you showed so little respect to my very generous gift, even though it was long ago.

I would not make sale of Baxter House an immediate step for two reasons: It's a lousy market to sell, and we need the space during construction on the Parish Hall and undercroft.

Obviously provisions will have to be made for staff offices after the sale takes place.

I might favor the sale of Baxter House but would prefer to consider other options for what to do with the proceeds. I am not in favor of a capital campaign at this time.

Yes, unless rental income could be better used than an outright sale.

We have to sell Baxter House. It's a negative for the church as it currently appears and is used.

Only if that would ensure we could get to Option C.

We suggest that we wait for the real estate market to fully recover before selling Baxter House and use it as collateral on a construction loan in the meantime. We assume this is the plan in any case since the staff needs somewhere to live until the space is created in the Parish Hall second floor.

We are in favor of selling Baxter House over renovating it. Our preference would be to have a minimal capital campaign just to pay for deferred maintenance/sustainable systems (and possible Parish Hall/mural space upgrade) and leave Baxter House as is for now.

I don't feel like I have enough information to answer this question. (2)

The sale of Baxter House would be optimal if money were not an issue. Since that is not the case, I fear we cannot afford to develop an alternative to Baxter House.

Baxter House should not be sold!

Absolutely!

As a parent I strongly support the sale of Baxter House and the renovation of the main church building so that all adult and youth activities could be held in the same building.

I really wanted to answer “maybe” here. I would need more information to best understand the office and meetings needs and if they could be met by selling Baxter House and going with Option C.

It doesn't seem like a sound decision.

The sale of Baxter House (thereby eliminating office & class space) should not be used as an excuse to renovate and expand the parish hall and the undercroft.

We will be selling the house in a bad market. We lost a bundle selling the rectory when we did it.

Baxter House is a pit; it is not a workable solution even today for a thriving, lively parish. Were it connected to St. Mark's it might be viable, but with the Sikh House in between it just doesn't work. There is no handicapped accessibility, a lousy kitchen, spaces and poor configuration.

I love Baxter House but if it really is in that bad of shape, we should sell it. I think we will regret that decision in about 15 years though.

It seems to me that there are just too many challenges with Baxter House. It will be a shame to let it go but the cost to upgrade is too great.

Selling Baxter House to support Option B does not increase usable space, so for no new space Option B with selling Baxter House costs \$2M.

If deemed necessary by the vestry, but I would like to see the church retain the property.

We need more space, not less. Real estate in DC isn't going to get cheaper.

In a perfect world, I would remodel and keep Baxter House but that would require completely gutting the house and I just don't think we have the ability to do that and the necessary upgrades to the church. So, while I don't necessarily like it, I think the reality of it is that Baxter House has to go.

I am in favor of the sale of Baxter House if proceeds go to a generation of sustainable systems and a trust fund for clergy and the choirmaster.

I do not care really, but I think there are long term values in keeping it.

If possible, we should keep Baxter House. It could be used as extra space, as shelter space, or as space for as yet to be planned projects. Maybe it could be turned over to the music program. It would be a shame to sell it if we absolutely don't have to. Once it is gone, it's GONE.

With the housing market as bad as it is, and the condition of Baxter House because of deferred maintenance, I don't understand why we would even consider this!

I would wonder what space may be available for the functions that Baxter House provides.

There seems to be no realistic scenario in which keeping Baxter House is a good idea.

Yes, provided that adequate space is provided for offices. Could we start the renovation/expansion of Parish Hall and when the offices are finished, then sell Baxter House? Prices should have gone up by then and it would help foot the bill/loan.

Yes, that presumes one of the expanded options would be taken and I am not sure I am in favor of those.

Perhaps, like Jim's old home, the sale was not a complete advantage for St. Mark's - ergo Baxter not now.

Although Baxter House is said to be an asset of \$1.3 million without any renovations, in this market I am not convinced. Baxter House is small compared to other commercial properties on the Hill; is still among residential living; and, more than likely will sell quicker as a residence than a commercial property unlike our neighbors at the corner.

We are not sure of the wisdom of selling Baxter House especially in a not-so-great real estate market. I need more information, since I think the church still wishes it hadn't sold the former parish house on 11th street.

Don't sell the farm to pay the mortgage.

If done, this should be done at the right time to get a good price. Housing markets in DC will probably be up again in a few years.

It makes no sense to keep Baxter House.

Baxter House has served its purpose. It's too cramped and too outdated. Let's sell it and move on!

I don't know how we'd get by without that space. Redoing the parish hall won't do it, in my opinion.

Yes, if the staff had choices and options about a viable working space they were happy with and could help design.

I would favor a sale only after renovations were completed.

It seems that renovating Baxter House will produce an inadequate and relatively still inaccessible space at a great cost.

As old friends of Jo Turner, it hurts to let it go, but she would probably go with the sale.

I would be interested in knowing exactly what proposed changes to Baxter House, and to the Parish Hall, are impacted by zoning and the Fine Arts Commission.

6. Are there additional needs that seem important to you which are not covered by the proposed plans?

Comments:

Parking! (4)

We need building reserves to address maintenance, contingencies, etc.

We need a room specifically for choir rehearsal, robes, music storage, etc.

There is a need for a sustainable budget to include long-term funding for maintenance.

A security system.

Ensure space for the shelter ministry/community outreach oriented options.

I think a space suitable for a chapel should be considered in the plan.

This may be included in the sustainable systems proposal, but the south facing Parish Hall roof is ideal for a large solar panel installation.

Millennium Development Goals of the Episcopal Church

Community Outreach

Outreach efforts with Honduras are already established by St. Mark's.

I'm concerned about the very large amount of money to maintain real estate and the very small percentage that would go to community outreach.

The staff should have adequate office space.

Pave the parking lot! The gravel is very unstable for everyone to walk on, especially the elderly or those with walking problems.

It is important to us that the design be developed in a thoughtful, inclusive and expansive way. At this point, we do not see a real design ready for implementation, just an overarching concept.

Yes- it seems like the homeless ministry could benefit from using Baxter House. Why don't we consider it for that?

I mention the spiritual as well as the physical. It seems as though we are capitalizing in this proposal on the physical. How about adding a spiritual dimension such as endowing a speaker series or educational opportunities of varying sorts for leadership and members alike? Also, are we adding buildings and space that will mainly be used on weekends or are we serious about engaging in a deeper way with the community?

Existing systems should be upgraded with sustainable systems as an option only.

We need our own retreat center.

It was not clear to me how much maintaining a home and support for the dance studio and the St. Mark's Players is a part of the plan, and I believe that both of those programs are very important contributions of the church to the larger community. Are they well accounted for both in the plans and in the possibility for disruption to their programs if a renovation occurs? For a capital campaign, has soliciting non-church members of the community associated with those programs been considered as potential funding sources?

I oppose the building plans because they are not linked to new programs. I would favor planning for new programs and then planning for building to support the programs.

It seems like Option C would address all the needs.

We need to use the stage space behind the mural.

Does the church need to purchase a bus or van to help seniors and children/youth with transportation?

As a practical matter, enlarging the undercroft concurrent with installing the underpinning makes all the sense in the world. But, do we have the financial wherewithal to do that?

What should be removed from the proposed plans - one-time use of funds for outreach. Instead, apply those same funds to improved infrastructure that promotes long-term outreach efforts.

I saw nothing about attention to the sacristy in the plan.

The stage in the parish should be restored for use, whether for theatre, music performances, or church programming such as lectures with slide shows. The mural can be relocated to the undercroft.

More attention to giving outside of ourselves!

I assume that we would use the latest energy technology?

Did not see specific mention of the vesting and altar guild areas but I am assuming upgrading would be part of the foyer enhancement – yes?

I believe Baxter House is an essential building for St. Mark's. I do not believe any additional expansions or renovations other than what is extremely necessary should be done to the Parish Hall.

Handicap accessibility.

Choir members say that only Option C provides adequate choir room space. Could the space behind the mural be for the choir? Maybe limited shared use?

7. Do you know of other current or projected capital campaigns in the community that might impact the success of this proposed effort?

The Hill Center at the old Navy Hospital (8)

CHAW

Capitol Hill Day School (3)

I-village

Local schools (3)

National Cathedral

8. How would you describe the present economic climate in your community?

 5 Excellent 63 Good 72 Fair 11 Poor

9. Is the present economic climate improving, remaining the same, or declining?

 38 Improving 88 Remaining the Same 23 Declining

10. Does a proposed solicitation period for pledges in the winter of 2011 seem appropriate to you? (*Members of the congregation would be asked to consider a gift to the capital drive in addition to their annual stewardship pledge.*)

 60 Yes 25 No 64 No strong feeling

2012 would be better.

11. Do you think a goal of \$2,500,000 (as outlined in the proposed plans) can be raised in gifts and pledges?

41 Yes 33 No 79 Don't Know

If no, how much do you think can be raised?

\$400,000

\$500,000

\$1 million (2)

\$1 million - \$1.5 million (2)

\$1.25 million

\$1.5 million (3)

\$1.5 million - \$1.75 million (2)

\$1.8 million

\$1.8 million - \$2 million

Probably \$1 million, over several years, for deferred maintenance

Maybe up to \$2 million, and cover the rest via sale of Baxter House.

I am concerned that moving ahead at this time will place a greater burden on parish members who have always been generous. For the others, the choices are very tough indeed right now.

Yes, if the top four gifts are secured.

I would need to know more about past experience in carrying out special campaigns, the economic portrait of your giving community, and your strategy for raising funds.

We are going to have to take out a mortgage like we did for the last expansion and pay it off over time.

Since we can't meet annual pledging goals, I wonder where any of us will find more.

It's such a large amount that it seems overwhelming

Given that your top givers are opposed to the full-fledged plans, I say no more than \$1M for specified improvements.

As I will not be contributing and am a regular pledger, I can only assume there will be many like me.

It is mind-boggling!

Yes, if Baxter House is sold.

12. If convinced of the need, would you be willing to contribute to this proposed campaign? (All gifts, regardless of size, are needed and are important to the success of the proposed campaign.)

111 Yes 13 No 30 Not sure at this time

13. If "yes," please estimate your possible total range of giving. Gifts potentially could be paid over a several-year period. *This is not a pledge or in any way binding.*

<u>14</u> \$500 or less	<u>23</u> \$500 to \$1,000
<u>35</u> \$1,000 to \$3,000	<u>21</u> \$3,000 to \$5,000
<u>11</u> \$5,000 to \$10,000	<u>5</u> \$10,000 to \$25,000
<u>1</u> \$25,000 to \$50,000	<u>0</u> \$50,000 to \$100,000
<u>0</u> \$100,000 to \$250,000	<u>0</u> \$250,000 to \$500,000
<u>0</u> \$500,000 and above	

14. If the proposed total goal of \$2,500,000 cannot be fully funded by a capital campaign, how would you feel if the parish were to assume prudent long-term debt to ensure completion of these proposed plans?

51 Acceptable 66 Undesirable, but acceptable 32 Unacceptable

What is our long-term debt right now?

15. In addition to making a gift to the proposed campaign, some parishioners may wish to explore planned or legacy gifts. Check the blank next to the item(s) of interest. Materials will be sent to you from the Episcopal Church Foundation.

- 14 Make a gift to your parish through a bequest in your will.
- 2 Create a charitable gift annuity (minimum gift of \$5,000).
Benefits of a charitable gift annuity could include:
- receive guaranteed income for life (i.e. current rates of approximately 5.3% annually at age 65, approximately 6.3% annually at age 75)
 - receive an income tax deduction now for the gift portion
 - receive some tax-free income from the investment for life
 - possibly reduce applicable estate and inheritance taxes
 - enjoy the satisfaction that at the death of the final beneficiary, the principal would go to that part of the Episcopal Church you so designate
- 0 Donate appreciated real property such as a house, vacation home, farm or business property.
- 5 Send me the *Ministry of Gift Planning* brochure which explains Planned Giving options.
- 2 Add me to the Episcopal Church Foundation e-newsletter.

15a. 17 St. Mark's Episcopal Church is already in my will or estate plans.

16. If asked, would you be willing to work on a committee in support of the proposed capital campaign?

24 Yes 79 No 45 Not sure at this time

17. Among individuals you know, who would make an ideal CHAIR for this proposed capital campaign?

Paul Abernathy	
Kenn Allen	7
Elizabeth Athey	2
Charles Brodhead	2
Doris Burton	2
Jack Burton	
David Deutsch	2
Stephanie Deutsch	3

Betty Foster	3
Wes Foster	2
Janice Gregory	3
Celia Hahn	
Rob Hall	6
Penny Hansen	2
Kristen Hartke	2
Bill Jordan	2
Josie Jordan	4
Ed Kneedler	
Lynn Kneedler	
Keith Krueger	3
Rod Lawrence	
Donald Lipscomb	
Elizabeth Mahood	
George Meng	9
Cecilia Monahan	
Julie Murphy	
Greg Niblett	13
Matthew Ossolinski	
Kathryn Powers	2
Jane Rutherford	
Marilu Sherer	
Bruce Sherman	4
Lisa Sotir-Ozkan	
Joseph Tarantolo	
Mike Townsend	19
Loretta Veney	2
Louise Walsh	2
David Willson	2
Margaret Wood	

Someone young

Someone who would be seen as a peer to those in the older crowd of St. Marks, but connected enough to those newer members

There is a lot of talent at St. Mark's.

18. Hypothetically, if you were a chair, whom would you select to serve with you?

Scilla Adams	
Paul Albergo	
Kenn Allen	5

Leslie Allen	2
Douglas Ammon	
Adell Amos	2
Stewart Andrews	
Christi Anthony	
Elizabeth Athey	4
Bart Barnes	2
Kevin Billings	
Bill Brooks	
James Brooks	
Eric Burneson	
Heather Burneson	
Doris Burton	5
Jack Burton	3
Joseph Calizo	2
Lee Calizo	
Pete Carlson	
Susan Carlson	
Kathryn Chefetz	
Rich Chefetz	
Martha Conner-Donnelly	
Mary Cooper	
Edgar Corr	3
Nancy Corr	
Tracy Council	2
Leon Cover	
Philip Cunningham	
David Deutsch	
Stephanie Deutsch	3
William Dickinson	
Charles Donnelly	
Kitty Donnelly	
Don Ellison	
Pete Eveleth	2
David Evelyn	
Linda Ewald	
Karen Falk	
Penny Farley	
Susan Flanders	
Betty Foster	6
Raiford Gaffney	
Karen Getman	
Tom Getman	
Janice Gregory	3
Ann Greiner	

Ray Hahn	
Rob Hall	6
Brock Hansen	
Penny Hansen	
Rosemary Harold	
Tucker Harris	
Kristen Hartke	
Nadine Hathaway	2
Peter Hawley	2
Rick Hayes	
Christina Herman	
Janis Hoffman	
Susan Hoffman	
David Johnson	
Bill Jordan	4
Josie Jordan	3
Gene Kendall	
Brian Killingsworth	
Keith Krueger	2
Rod Lawrence	
Mark Lindley	2
Nancy Lindley	
Don Lipscomb	4
Janet Lipscomb	
Frank Lloyd	
Katherine Loevinger	
Will Long	
Elizabeth Mahood	3
Randy Marks	
Tucker McDonald	
George Meng	3
Crane Miller	2
Jane Miller	
Cecilia Monahan	2
Alvin Moseberry	
Winnie Mosher	2
Julie Murphy	3
Greg Niblett	7
Matthew Ossolinski	
Rita Ossolinski	3
Amber Palmer	
Tova Patterson	
Donna Pettit	
Kathryn Powers	3
Burton Reist	

Christine Rumpf	
Lenore Rumpf	2
Charlie Rupp	
Jack Richards	3
Jane Rutherford	4
Rick Rutherford	4
Donna Sabino	2
Jessica Sauer	2
Steve Schindel	
John Sedgewick	
Susan Sedgewick	2
David Shaw	
Marilu Sherer	2
Peter Sherer	3
Bruce Sherman	3
Jane Sherman	2
Julie Shroyer	
Linda Staheli	2
Jim Steed	
Arnold Taylor	
Susan Thompson	2
Elizabeth Townsend	
Michael Townsend	8
Loretta Veney	3
Mary Louise Wagner	
Louise Walsh	
Rick Weber	2
David Wellman	
Thomas Wickenden	2
David Willson	3
Margaret Wood	
Peter Yanish	

Existing steering committee, individuals with creative vision, and individuals with financial acumen

Several long-time members, several younger, and newer members including singles and those married with children

19. In your opinion, what major positive factors does the parish have in its favor for the proposed campaign?

Comments:

This is a committed and thriving community.

We have a small handful of very wealthy parishioners.

There is a strong sense of community in the church.

There are fairly high average levels of income.

There is generosity by members who consider the St. Mark's community a vital part of their lives, a significant number of whom are affluent enough to make sizeable contributions.

The location is good.

Members are committed to St. Mark's and the church community as a whole has always struck me as generous.

We have a magnificent building located in a strategic spot in our nation's capital. We take pride in this and wish to see the building maintained and used appropriately in the life of our city and our country.

Thorough and extensive and well-communicated research and groundwork has been done in advance. There is a desire to make our church more welcoming and more user-friendly.

A strong church community!

The need for more appropriate office space is very real and therefore compelling.

There is a strong commitment to the parish among active members.

It has been a very good, inclusive planning process. There is a clear need for better space configuration, modern systems, and sustainability.

Bringing the building up-to-code, and getting the staff out of Baxter House are priorities.

This is the most vibrant progressive Episcopal Church in the DC metropolitan area. The location and the beauty of the actual church building on Capitol Hill are very positive. The population explosion in young families and new babies are a vital component of our parish.

Most people identify with, and have support for, the St. Mark's community. The need for maintenance work on the nave, parish hall, undercroft, and Baxter House is clear.

The large amount of outreach that the church currently does for the community, from yoga to children's ministry to music, is compelling. The campaign would allow us to not only renovate spaces for the church, but also to develop these spaces for the surrounding community.

There is lots of enthusiasm, and concern for the infrastructure of the church to keep it safe.

Keeping the buildings and grounds in good condition is important and a lot of this has been deferred.

This is a positive move forward in the church.

Previous campaigns have been successful and most parishioners have responded favorably.

I think the congregation would be interested in knowing about the deteriorating systems.

The opportunity to address our vision/mission going forward and to address findings in the discernment process with commitment is a positive.

The demographics of our parish are upper-to-middle income. We also have a growing parish.

We have some very generous parishioners; people often give over and above the "usual" by contributing time and money to fund-raising efforts on behalf of those who are less fortunate (Honduras, Capitol Hill Group Ministry - cooperative efforts to pull together the homeless shelter project for the last decade or so).

There is a love for St. Mark's and concern about preserving it for now and into the future.

Lots of membership and commitment!

We have articulate clergy leadership and a spiritual community unlike others.

It may have some older, wealthier members that would be willing to donate.

I expect the parish will be sold on the idea of selling Baxter House for a large sum which can be applied to the cost needed for Options A and B.

The parish will meet the necessary maintenance requirements.

The need!

There are many young families and we have faith.

The parish is very well regarded in the community and the facilities are, and have been, used by a number of different groups outside of the church community who may be willing to support work to sustain and improve the facilities.

The church does not have an existing mortgage.

There has been a good process of discernment, there are obvious needs, and this is a vibrant community.

Maintenance needs are clear. HVAC systems clearly need replacement. Baxter House facilities are outmoded. Whether the need to bring our buildings more up-to-date as a need for major expansion is another proposition.

This is a thriving parish with lots of activity, loyalty within the community, a good rector and parish leadership.

New members, lots of kids in programs, arts, Christian education, and historic value are all positives.

There has been lots of preparation in advance of doing a campaign.

There is a clear need to take some significant action to maintain and improve our church home.

Making the church more energy efficient and taking advantage of solar energy generation can make deferred maintenance a more appealing "sell".

The enthusiasm of church members for the existing (and new) programs that require an improved space is positive.

Our positives are our history, we are welcoming to all, the church is well run, there is good will among parishioners, our location on Capitol Hill, and the increased capacity to reach out to the community and the city.

It's a great church and we can expand so that more people can attend.

The fact that there is a need, and overall our parishioners are very committed to the health of St. Mark's.

In part, the argument in favor of proceeding is based on the lack of utility of the Baxter House space. It's inefficient, it's not compliant with ADA and cannot be made so easily, and it would soak up a lot of money in the years to come. Whereas consolidating within our current building envelope and adding space to the Parish Hall (and potentially beneath it), I think, should be appealing to many parishioners.

Baxter House - in today's market and with its location, we can liquidate a problem asset for a high value.

We recognize the need for this space and will fund it.

St. Mark's is a well regarded part of the larger community. We have a membership that is strong in many ways and getting better.

Most of the members of this parish are well-off economically. There is no reason why these funds can't be raised. If this parish, in this very affluent community, can't raise money through a capital campaign, then what parish can?

The parish is reaching out to the community and understands the need for renovations to be a greater partner. Also, buildings all over the neighborhood are being renovated, reducing any fear that we are putting too much money into the facilities.

The repairs are needed.

Location! The Baxter House is prime real estate (despite the current economy) and could be sold for a good profit. The church itself is a magnificent piece of historic property and would likely draw in grants as well as pledges from the Capitol Hill community.

There is a fantastic appreciation by the entire community of the importance of preserving our historic church and the need to expand without too much impact on the neighborhood.

Our love of meeting and gathering together puts a focus on the physical space. Our love of tradition and history extends to the property. A large number of people have been involved in the Christian Education program, so they understand the importance of the far corners of the meeting spaces.

Many parishioners are nervous about losing the kind of community that has drawn them here.

I think the parish is finally cognizant of the needs of the building.

St. Mark's has a loyal and long-standing community who can be tapped for the campaign. The economy is not recovering well and the timing of this campaign is a question in my mind. If I am wrong and there is a generous outpouring in the feasibility study I would be happy!

We have committed & active membership.

Unreasonable exuberance!

There is a willingness to work hard.

The parish is recognized as a major positive in the community as a vibrant church that is respectful of neighbors, respectful of historic preservation, and a source of theatre, dance and community service.

Our careful decision-making process is positive.

Our history!

Most people who regularly worship here are aware of the building needs.

There are many longtime members here, and we have not carried out a capital campaign in quite a few years.

Collateral in Baxter House which could be sold after renovation/expansion is finished.

The community is very energetic but also very opinionated; that can be both a benefit and a curse. With the right leadership, the campaign will be successful.

There is a desire to improve the facilities and this is an action-oriented congregation.

St. Mark's is very generous when a need is known. Also, there is some wealth in the parish.

The future growth looks good, with young families with children, and younger parishioners.

St. Mark's is a very open and friendly community.

There is an absolute need for the work to be done.

The vibrancy of the congregation is positive.

We have a wealth of talent and experience in the varied areas of expertise that go into planning, fund raising, and evaluating options. We also have a large reservoir of good will and, I think, good judgment when it comes to realizing that our resources have to be conserved and maximized.

Kenn Allen provides very strong, positive leadership.

When we had capital campaign in the past, we raised the money and pledging went up.

Momentum, the desire to expand space and programming, and improve the condition of the facilities are all positives.

It is something that must be done for the health of our buildings now, to feel comfortable with growth in numbers and for future generations. If we don't do anything now, we will need to later.

The parish is growing, with more families and more kids. It's a dynamic place and the space needs are obvious.

The parish wants to do more and do what it already does better, but is constrained by space.

St. Mark's (as I perceive it at this time) is entering a new phase of possibility. There is a willingness to look beyond the past and into the future.

St. Mark's is a vibrant community that realizes if we don't maintain our buildings emergency repairs will cost even more. Our current staff space is an embarrassment.

We have dedicated parishioners.

St. Mark's has a lot of collective energy and committed souls; many of us lived through a previous capital campaign and have reaped the benefits of that effort. We can do it again!

Baxter House is falling apart and we should get rid of it before it declines further. It will materialize funds for the campaign. The foyer and Parish Hall is an embarrassment and I think the congregation would be motivated to improve that area of the church. There's a fairly large contingent of the church that is older and they may see this campaign as their last hurrah to leave a legacy behind them.

There are committed members, the proposed plans are well considered, there are no frill-type items, and we could potentially solve the Baxter House money pit problem.

We have valuable property and a loyal and growing congregation, as well as an aging population who may consider naming St. Mark's as beneficiary in a will or bequest.

We love our church. There are some people who have lots of money.

This is a committed and generous congregation.

The community has a great deal of energy and I think it is close to being ready to do something like this.

St. Mark's is an important part of peoples' lives.

We have a lovely building to start with that needs updating and upgrading. We have an opportunity to be a real beacon on the Hill.

This is extremely valuable real estate providing services to a large community.

Loyalty, enthusiasm, location, tradition, number of new, younger parishioners, highly-educated parishioners, and the beauty and history of the building.

There has been an influx of young families with children, which is a good thing but has increased the needs for space.

The financial resources are here.

We have a very committed group of seniors.

20. What problems, if any, do you foresee for this project?

Comments:

The economy! (8)

The timing!

There are too few high net worth parishioners.

You will need for more people from 40-year olds to retirement age to step up.

We need more exciting missions to inspire people.

The main problem I see is the disruption in regular activities that would be very stressful to many people. This will happen, no matter which option is chosen.

With the amount of poverty among children and the homeless in the DC area, it is hard for me to justify expansion expenditures.

Too much money and inadequate funds.

The possible loss (through sale) of Baxter House would be a huge loss to the workings of the church and a long-term financial loss.

Retirees (and people approaching retirement) may not be able to give much, and the same is true for families with young children. The state of the economy, although improving slowly, may well incline people to give conservatively.

The problem will be raising additional monies from a community which is largely in stretched circumstances. Currently, we have difficulty meeting our annual budget needs from annual pledges.

My personal concern is that I recently made a large multi-year pledge to another major capital campaign and see no possibility of making a contribution to St. Mark's at this time.

The overall economic environment creates challenges for raising funds. There are complicated relationships with Baxter House -- reluctance to give up good space, but acknowledgment that it is not currently functional, nor could it be renovated to better meet our needs.

Money, mess, noise, air contaminants, permits, neighbors, security, time-table, etc.

The obvious problem is the strained economic situation that many of us face. Beyond that, however, is the sense that St. Mark's is shifting away from that way-of-being that most attracted us when we first joined many years ago. We have recently read about the Episcopal consultants working with St. Augustine in SW, and the efforts they are putting forward to revive a dwindling congregation. What they are doing sounds exactly like what St. Mark's did in the '50s and '60s -- removing the pews and worshiping in the round and establishing a dynamic, challenging, largely lay-lead adult Christian Education program, and creating occasions for parishioners to have small group discussions and to have fun together, enjoy one another and form strong personal bonds. Lately there has been a tendency at St. Mark's to organize and regularize things, to make rules and create standing committees. The sense of spontaneous, lay-lead activity and enthusiasm has withered. The place is not as much fun as it used to be. The suspicion lurks that the impetus for taking on a capital campaign is someone's idea of how to crank up energy and enthusiasm at St. Mark's. This feels like putting the cart before the horse.

The project is budgeted too low, probably to reflect the real value of the work.

Money is tight and fundraising is hard right now among the typical income levels at the church.

Members' cash flow; can we afford a capital campaign and annual canvass?

Turning off potential new members could be a problem.

I favor outreach and do not favor increasing the goal to fund it. If we do fund it, then much more explanation regarding use of funds is needed.

It could be tough for people to actually give more.

Discouragement and lack of a sense of mission for the parish currently is a problem. There is a lack of excitement and cutting edge worship, of making less of a name for ourselves. The retirement of our minister may be an issue as we kick off the campaign but the impact of that remains to be seen.

Increasing costs of construction and coming up short on campaign funds could be a problem.

Figuring out how to get all existing activities and programs to continue during construction is an issue. We may need to reach out to surrounding churches for help with space needs.

It's a difficult economic climate, in general, and could get worse before it gets better. There needs to be some risk management in the planning.

Fundraising for the capital campaign may start this winter, shortly after this fall's annual canvass. Parishioners will make a connection between the two, because both affect family finances.

It will sap the finances and energy of the congregation which should be directed into other areas. It will adversely impact the annual fundraising for the other needs of the church.

We are perceived as a luxury church. Maintenance is one thing but why does everything have to be new and fancy? Any expansion of space will be perceived as wasteful/overly ambitious when the church does not appear to be growing. For whatever reason, St. Mark's has not attracted hardly any of the 1000+ new families who have moved to the Hill in the past 10 years (8 just on our block) and there is no reason to think that's going to change. Many will look askance at having any dedicated space for music or other groups. Sharing is annoying but it is less wasteful and more environmentally appropriate. We use every inch of our little house every day (4 people - one teeny bathroom); that is the model the church should be following if we really want to help save the planet.

Contractor cost overruns or delays, possible shoddy workmanship, or lack of appropriate oversight could be problems.

Disruptions of programs in the undercroft and parking problems are issues.

There could be a possible challenge to future annual giving campaigns and disruptions to utilities.

The financial ability for members to give.

Our parish is aging.

Raising the funds in tough economic times or unforeseen expenses that could crop up, resulting in higher costs.

Not as many of the congregants feel as deeply connected to St. Mark's. I would view this as a community activity. Years ago my home town built a playground and any member of the community who wanted to help with the project had a role. They built it in three days and someone who was 90 helped as well as someone who was 3-4 years old. Sometimes St. Mark's can feel like - "oh, there is someone else who will do that".

Not enough money and no realistic fundraising ideas.

Logistics of the construction and sale of Baxter House to save the most money and prevent the most disruption could be a problem.

With reduced membership, and many who are still recovering from the recession, how does one succeed in raising operational funds in the two canvasses before the capital campaign?

You need a full time director for this project. It should be a paid position. Without that, it is TOO MUCH responsibility for someone to assume.

It is bad timing. It is not a good time to be spending money on ourselves.

The most obvious problem is that times are tough right now, economically, with many uncertainties for the future.

I do not like the way that St. Mark's talks about money. I do not care if 30 parish families give between \$7,500-\$5,000 each year (or whatever the figure is). My life as a Christian does not turn on what 30 parish families do. I pledge to my church because that is my responsibility. I believe that my family and many other parish families would benefit from a discussion of what it means to be a Christian -- and how that faith commitment impacts one's decision around major life issues, including but not limited to money. Instead of a capital campaign, why not focus on faithful giving that leads to a surplus in the budget? Instead of a capital campaign, why not focus on the barriers to St. Mark's growing and increasing the number of giving units? At a recent meeting to discuss these plans, a member of my "discussion group" said to me "can we not talk about Jesus?" This is not the first time someone has said something like that to me at a St. Mark's meeting. I am at a loss as to how to respond to that in a Christian manner and I do not have much patience for individuals who do not respect my faith journey.

Getting committed leadership, the impact of the economy on people's perceived ability to give, and newer members not having a history of stewardship are problems.

I don't sense any great enthusiasm for the project among parish members. Those who're promoting the project have yet to demonstrate a critical need for additional office and classroom space, or how the modifications to the Parish Hall will affect the appearance and operation of what is now an open, airy, and architecturally appealing building.

Too little money and too little need for major renovations!

The economy continues to be poor and employment is still stagnant. The total dollar amounts involved are a bit frightening. Retired people on fixed incomes cannot contribute much and younger people with small children may be tapped out.

There may be disagreements about the scope of the effort.

Younger members do not seem to pledge significant amounts. Older members are in or approaching retirement and concerned to control expenditures.

Knowing exactly how the new space will be used/doled out?

Getting the money together! (8)

We're just coming out of the worst recession in 70 years and many people are feeling battered and are hunkered down psychologically. Therefore, it seems to me that there's a real risk in embarking on something this big in the current climate. On the other hand, unless we try, we'll never know whether we could have been successful.

There could be unexpected infrastructure problems, especially when digging out from under the Parish Hall or adding additional weight. To what extent will structural reinforcement be required? This will be the added expense. Another issue will be incomplete pledges and the possibility of needing to mortgage the property.

The country's financial situation is very precarious. We are going through what is called the worst economic downturn since The Great Depression. Some people think the next decade or more will see further economic declines. If that happens, the St. Mark's community could be significantly affected.

Too much talking; like the Nike ads say, "Just Do It!"

We can't afford it!

Why do this? The church seems to have problems meeting monthly expenses now.

There could be neighborhood activism against any expansion.

There will be a true lack of ability to raise the full amount just by contributions.

There could be a lack of funding, if miscalculation occurs. Also, there is an uncertain overall vision for the project.

The rotten economy, the fact that we are a parish that has not run its finances and budget controls effectively in the past ten years, and tired leadership.

The economy will remain a stumbling block. There are many young singles with limited income, young married couples with small/teen children facing educational expenses, and a significant retired component not able to contribute as much as they might have in years past.

I am very concerned that our current maintenance company may not be capable of the increased responsibility should we build additions; nor do I think they can handle the more sophisticated responsibility of 'green' energy should that be installed.

The parish works hard to scrape together the \$800,000 it needs annually to operate. Why do we think our members will be likely to give more for this effort?

St. Mark's membership has grown very little for years and our budgets are essentially flat. I think the top of the range of costs for this project is too high. I would like to see more options, like these options pared-down by 20%. I think a capital campaign can be good for the church but if the timing is off or it is too ambitious it will have a deflating effect on the community.

Our eyes are bigger than our pocketbooks!

I do believe the economy will continue to improve slowly. All I have read says it will ----- SLOWLY! Since I am a senior with little monetary means to support these dreams, I am very skeptical about "saddling" the younger members of our parish with huge debt.

It seems overly ambitious and it seems that funding the deferred maintenance should be the top priority.

You may have trouble getting commitment from parishioners and buy-in from future parishioners.

All construction presents unforeseen problems. It could be more than what is estimated but it needs to be done.

Too many cooks in the kitchen!

This is already foreseen as a few people's pet project.

Near-sightedness!

Crankiness!

The economic climate may not support a campaign at this time. However, this may be the best time to procure needed work at more reasonable prices (e.g. good time to negotiate on goods and services).

Those who have a good bit of money also tend to have many demands for it (colleges, private schools, etc.). People also have lost wealth over the past couple of years.

Logistics and construction staging.

Cost overruns! (4)

People don't give to make the annual canvass so why would they pony up for a capital campaign?

Older members letting go of "sacred cows".

I feel like those with moderate to little income are being ignored. Immense pressure is being placed on the congregation by a few loud spoken people. I feel very uncomfortable being pressured to give money; I am starting to be put off by the church on this matter.

It is always hard to raise all that money. And, of course, we are an opinionated bunch.

We will have difficulty raising money.

The effect that raising money would have on the yearly stewardship campaign.

Getting consensus, with hundreds of members and hundreds of opinions.

People are still feeling unsure about the economic future, and hesitant to part with their retirement funds that have dwindled.

People at St. Mark's seem to resist change, often for no apparent reason.

Everyone may not be on board with this.

Getting agreements on requirements.

There may not be enough leadership donors and we have an aging parish demographic.

Outside forces...like the over-all economy could be a problem; it is hard to predict but easy to have faith we can do this.

There is a lack of parishioners who can make large gifts.

The same people seem to pay for everything; younger members don't give like they should.

There may be obstacles from the DC bureaucracy.

We are in a terrible economy. Even though St. Mark's is a relatively affluent community, I think people feel insecure financially.

Money is tight!

People are feeling tapped out.

The possible departure of our rector and conflict with leadership issues could cause problems.

The unpredictability of adequate funding!

Financing; we can't sell Baxter House until space is ready in the Parish Hall, thus Baxter House will need basic maintenance in the meantime.

Continued job loss among parishioners and a lack of wealthy donors are problems.

21. What added ideas or suggestions do you have which might be helpful to the leadership in making this important decision?

Comments:

Perhaps additional interviews with individuals should be considered.

Emphasize pastoral ministry.

I appreciated the work that has gone into surveying parishioners and doing the ground work for a possible campaign.

Bring the buildings up-to-code.

I think we should sell Baxter House. I don't see the point of continuing to own it when it is in such bad shape and is almost unsafe. I would like the sale included in Option C which I support.

Some individuals may prefer to apply their gift to particular programs to ensure their support, such as Christian Education and outreach activities. Might this be possible as an alternative, for individuals of limited means?

Within the next two or three years we will face a change in clergy leadership. Perhaps the arrival of a new rector would be a good occasion for launching a capital campaign. Indeed, the work that has been done so far, and the needs that have been identified should be an important backdrop to our search for a new rector.

I just hope that the plans have been clearly articulated and construction needs understood before committing to a campaign amount. I would strongly suggest having a second opinion on the cost before launching a campaign.

To avoid turning off potential new members, solicit only people who have been members for at least a year and make that clear in all bulletin announcements. If they want to give, that's fine, but no pressure from us.

Community engagement funds: I favor outreach and do NOT favor increasing the goal of the campaign for that. We should fund that through pledges.

Don't bite off more than we can chew. I am in the choir and I think we are fine rehearsing in the nave. Use the additional undercroft for offices and do not alter the Parish Hall with additional floors.

I can only say that there is no putting the project off if we are to be good stewards of our community, now and for the future.

We need an idea for bringing all of the community into the campaign, like a pre-campaign kick off and fundraising parties to generate enthusiasm and build small pots of gold to get us started.

Would it be possible to get grants from federal/local sources to renovate Baxter House specifically for the shelter project (thus keeping it in church hands, but re-purposing it to specifically serve community-oriented needs)?

Use this survey. Talk to people who are involved in various activities around the church about their willingness and energy to embark on an extensive campaign.

I know you feel you have to offer something "renovated" or "new" on the theory that people won't donate for maintenance. Perhaps Option A could be altered so as to renovate the Parish Hall/kitchen and convert the space behind the mural (instead of spending money on Baxter House, which impacts very few people). Making the Parish Hall more appealing would seem to give more bang-for-the-buck and might actually help with growing the church while satisfying those who are itching for something new and fancy.

Long-term goals are very important in making decisions like this.

We need more thought about how improvements to our current facilities might service us (without straining finances or obtaining another mortgage).

Expansion of the present physical plant is exactly the kind of growth that Bishop Chane has spoken strongly against. St. Mark's is missing the mark. The time, effort, and dollars should be going into helping the needy in the world.

Maintenance of the existing physical facility should be funded in full through the annual operating budget and given a high priority in both asking for the funds and dedicating those funds to present and future maintenance.

I need more information to answer some of these questions. I'm not certain a campaign or debt are the only options. Since maintenance will be a continuing need, it would be useful to see a long term strategy over 3 to 5 years of where the Church expects to go financially, what other sources of funding it is actively pursuing and how it is pursuing them; who it expects to serve, and a projection of what it believes the economic climate will be. A business plan would be helpful. It would also be helpful to know who each part of the three options is intended to serve: that is, expansion of the undercroft, renovation/expansion of the second floor, renovation of Baxter House, etc.

Be clear about all intentions, engage the community to insure buy-in, and don't be timid with the design process.

Specific ideas/visions about how the space will be used will be helpful to raise enthusiasm for some members.

Include a mix of age groups on the committee(s) leading this effort, because people of different age groups tend to have different needs from St. Mark's and incentives to contribute.

When I heard a capital campaign was being considered, I wasn't certain of amounts. Now that I see what the options are and the costs, I am actually pleasantly surprised we could do this much for this level of cost. It would seem we should stretch to do what we can at this time, but also utilize it as an opportunity to bring our community closer together. I also think the economy is getting better and if this begins next year and builds for three years, that is a good trajectory.

Survey members for money-making ideas.

Figure out what work can be done by folks at St. Mark's either on a volunteer basis or low-cost. I bet some people have plumbing, electric, roofing, etc. skills that they would be willing to donate. Also, we could use a parish clean up day once a year where everyone comes and cleans up the church. It would go a long way in the way of maintenance. Kitchen renovations should be incorporated.

Make an option for just the deferred work on the church but with sustainable systems. Make a separate option for Baxter House and develop information on the value of the asset, now, later, as is, and renovated.

It seems to me that an important element of this effort is the need to create spaces that will sustain and encourage the growth of the community in the future. I've heard more than one person speak of the need to encourage new, and younger, members to sustain the parish. As wonderful as the spirit and energy carried by the people of the place can be, older facilities in need of repair and renovation send their own message of whether or not the parish is strong and well-supported. Thinking of attracting and keeping new members, not everyone wants to buy a beautiful and historic house that is in need of a lot of work - they may instead be looking for a move-in ready parish home from which they can spend their energies reaching out more, rather than one that carries with it the burden of being in need of lots of care and maintenance and looming renovations... If not now, then when?

We could begin and end all St. Mark's meetings with prayer.

Slow down the process; take up and respond to parish concerns.

Make the case statement available and document the advantages of the option selection over and over. Have small group meetings, household canvassing, and lots of opportunity to discuss. Hold a really great kick-off dinner when the first large chunk of money comes in. Make a scale model of the project so people can look at it and touch it. Keep everyone posted on the progress.

Don't drag this out. Decide to go forward or to pull the plug.

We need to reach out to members who are against the project; they need to be heard and understood.

List and discuss priorities, the must do's and the pros and cons, along with the "would like to do's" and the pros and cons. Risk factors should be clearly identified and discussed with the membership.

Do it but don't give money to charities if it means borrowing the money to give to them.

As with so many things, the leader or leaders are key. I would recommend co-chairs -- a long time member and a more recent member. They'll have to have "fire in the gut" and be highly credible to all sectors of the community. No "Pollyannas" for this job. In this fiscal environment, hard-headed and sober are essential requirements.

I appreciate the proposition that if we can raise money, some of it should go to outreach. However, this is a capital campaign - one that might require obtaining a loan - or a short-term loan since pledges will be coming in over several years. Use of funds for a one-shot deal is not prudent. I urge the leadership to refocus and impress upon those individuals that if the same funds are applied to the capital project itself, we can offer greater opportunities for outreach and access within our Capitol Hill community and broader use of our improved property.

These maintenance issues aren't going to go away so you may as well act. Money is cheap to borrow right now (if that is necessary).

The decision to do a capital campaign was made long ago. This is just a ploy to be able to claim that it was a community decision. At the same time, St. Mark's is never going to be in as good financial position as it is now because of legacy financial supporters. So, I would say do the campaign now. Don't sell Baxter House because space is a huge commodity. Start teaching stewardship to everyone or these updates may be the last we see at St. Mark's.

Go for it. Take out a mortgage and we'll pay it off over the years, just like we did before.

This is not an architecture or construction project. It is something else -- that uses architecture and construction techniques. But *what* is it? Is it something to allow us to do just what we're doing now, only more easily and safely? Or will it also allow us to do more than we do now? In what ways? What is that vision?

I would like to see more parishioners taking more responsibility for the building to reduce the expenses we currently have (turning out lights, using materials responsibly, taking as much care of this facility as they do of their own home/property). More parishioners in general need to participate in the operation of our property.

I agree that our buildings need to be restored and strengthened, but what is this campaign really about? In the last 10 years St. Mark's has lacked the leadership to make the church stand for or be something. A capital campaign seems to be something to do because we're doing nothing else.

If it isn't already obvious, I feel pretty disconnected from this process and not enthused. I am not sure what to say to leaders that would be helpful other than to request a realistic assessment of the capacity of our community vs. the needs presented. It is a challenging space in which to make decisions.

I will support and work to help the success of a campaign that would support needed maintenance. I think it important we preserve the buildings out of respect for our forbearers who sacrificed to build them for us, and as a symbol to our progeny of our faithfulness.

Somehow lead givers need to be identified and locked into commitments. I imagine some work in this regard has already been done. Perhaps a \$2.5 million campaign will not prove to be as challenging as contemplated.

The plan should include some storage space for the St. Mark's Players, a vital part of the church community.

I would suggest keeping the practical in mind.

Constant communication!

Prioritize and have a plan A, B, and C. A would have the "dream" package. Then, scale back a little in B and bare minimum in C, always striving for safety and energy conservation with potential to slowly build back to plan A.

Consider not just the larger donors but also the future of the community. Pay close attention to the needs of the younger generations that are going to be the future of St. Mark's.

Pledging by monthly automatic deductions is excellent.

Look at tax gifting and or write/off.

Have long-range strategy in place to deal with disruption and pain during the transition.

LISTEN!

Will there be any fundraising events that incorporate people from outside the church family?

"Man's reach should exceed his grasp."

Be as open as possible. Keep explaining the three ideas and make sure that in listening to everyone, those who are not for this are heard and valued in this process just as much as those who want the campaign.

Help people envision the benefits of a redesigned and expanded space.

Perhaps we need an 'if we do nothing' scenario . . . explain how that would be fiscally irresponsible. We may also need to hear how needed maintenance has been deferred and the case/cost savings envisioned by investing in new HVAC systems/technology rather than repairing what we have.

I might have missed this information, but how long would one have to make the gift. I'd do better with a three-year plan than a one year plan.

Ask someone to include a prayer, each week, in prayers of the people, for guidance, for inner vision, for discernment, etc. St. Marks' loves to have a party; have one that leads up to and includes a summary of this survey (assuming it is positive) and if possible, have an announcement of a major gift.

Go for it. We have nothing to lose! If you don't ask, you've settled for a no. If you do ask, you have another option -- a yes!

In no case would I favor raising the contribution to non-capital campaign uses beyond 5%.

Section Four:

**Composite Analysis and Summary of
Personal and
Direct Mail/Online Responses**

Results from 32 Personal Interviews and 155 Direct Mail/Online Responses **Total of 187 Responses**

Note: Not all respondents answered all questions.

1. Prior to this survey, were you aware that the parish was considering a capital campaign?

 180 Yes 7 No

Ninety-six percent were aware that St. Mark's Episcopal Church is considering a capital campaign. This is a very positive indication that the church leadership has prepared the ground for a major capital campaign.

2. Prior to this survey, were you aware of the needs as expressed in the accompanying proposed plans?

 134 Aware 15 Not Aware 38 Aware of some of the needs

Seventy-two percent of the respondents were aware of the capital needs of St. Mark's Episcopal Church. Another 20% were aware of some of the needs. Only 8% were not aware of the needs. This is an indication that the leadership has done a fine job of communication.

3. Generally speaking, do you favor the parish conducting a capital campaign as outlined in the proposed plans?

 94 Yes 21 No 68 Yes, but with some concerns

More than half, 52%, are in favor of the campaign, with another 37% in favor with some concerns. Another 11% are opposed to the campaign. This is a sign that the church community is willing to support a campaign.

4. Please indicate the level of priority you would attach to each of the projects outlined in the proposed plans by checking the appropriate line under each heading. At present, they are listed in no particular order.

**Select only one option per line and feel free to make comments.*

	PRIORITY				
	High	Medium	Low	Opposed	Lack Information
<u>Option A:</u>					
<i>(No new construction)</i>					
a. Deferred Maintenance on Church Buildings & Organ	<u>87</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>9</u>
b. Baxter House Renovations	<u>24</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>16</u>
<u>Option B:</u>					
<i>(All Option A maintenance work, no Baxter House Renovations)</i>					
c. Parish Hall Second Floor & Renovation	<u>68</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>13</u>
d. Current Undercroft Renovation	<u>35</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>19</u>
e. Install Sustainable Systems	<u>70</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>Option C:</u>					
<i>(Includes all Option B work)</i>					
f. Parish Hall Undercroft Expansion	<u>57</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>12</u>

In determining which parts of the proposed case are most attractive to respondents, the following system is used:

High Priority = 3 points; Medium Priority = 2 points; Low Priority = 1 point;
Opposed to Project = -1 point; Lack Information = 0 points

The most popular receives the highest number of points.

Option A:*(No new construction)***a. Deferred Maintenance on Church buildings & Organ**261 High Priority 32 Medium Priority 25 Low Priority0 Lack Information -30 Opposed to ProjectTotal Points: **288****b. Baxter House Renovations**72 High Priority 36 Medium Priority 34 Low Priority0 Lack Information -72 Opposed to ProjectTotal Points: **70****Option B:***(All Option A maintenance work, no Baxter House Renovations)***c. Parish Hall Second Floor & Renovations**204 High Priority 90 Medium Priority 19 Low Priority0 Lack Information -20 Opposed to ProjectTotal Points: **293****d. Current Undercroft Renovation**105 High Priority 126 Medium Priority 25 Low Priority0 Lack Information -20 Opposed to ProjectTotal Points: **236**

e. Install Sustainable Systems

210 High Priority 100 Medium Priority 18 Low Priority

0 Lack Information -11 Opposed to Project

Total Points: **317**

Option C:

(Includes all Option B work)

f. Parish Hall Undercroft Expansion

171 High Priority 64 Medium Priority 33 Low Priority

0 Lack Information -29 Opposed to Project

Total Points: **239**

RANKING BY POINTS:

Option B – Install Sustainable Systems	317
Option B – Parish Hall Second Floor & Renovation	293
Option A – Deferred Maintenance on Church	288
Option C – Parish Hall Undercroft Expansion	239
Option B – Current Undercroft Renovation	236
Option A – Baxter House Renovations	70

These rankings do not dictate those projects the church should embrace in the final case statement, but they are a strong indication of what communication and marketing must occur if leadership does elect to support projects that have a lower acceptance rating.

5. Would you favor the sale of Baxter House if the proceeds were applied to the capital campaign, thus reducing the amount of money needing to be raised?

143 Yes 32 No

Eighty-two percent of respondents favor the sale of Baxter House if the proceeds are applied to the capital campaign. This is a strong indication that, with a few exceptions, the majority of the parish would support the sale of Baxter House.

6. Are there additional needs that seem important to you which are not covered by the proposed plans?

A number of additional needs were offered and should be read, including the view of several respondents that more should be spent on outreach.

7. Do you know of other current or projected capital campaigns in the community that might impact the success of this proposed effort?

A few area campaigns were mentioned, but these should not affect the success of St. Mark's campaign.

8. How would you describe the present economic climate in your community?

 6 Excellent 74 Good 86 Fair 11 Poor

Forty-nine percent of respondents feel the present economy is fair, and another 42% consider the economy good. Six percent consider it to be poor and another 3% think the present economic climate is excellent.

9. Is the present economic climate improving, remaining the same, or declining?

 44 Improving 105 Remaining the Same 28 Declining

Indications are that the local economy is remaining the same, with 59% rating it as such. Another 25% believe the present economy is improving, and 16% believe it is declining. These responses express a degree of caution around the economy and how it might impact a capital campaign. When people feel the economy is good, they are more apt to make gifts.

10. Does a proposed solicitation period for pledges in the winter of 2011 seem appropriate to you? (*Members of the congregation would be asked to consider a gift to the capital drive in addition to their annual stewardship pledge.*)

 76 Yes 31 No 72 No strong feeling

Forty-three percent are in favor of the proposed timing. Another 40% expressed no strong feeling one way or another. The remaining 17% were opposed to the campaign timing. This is a relatively positive endorsement that a campaign could proceed as scheduled, with a high number of respondents not expressing a view that timing is a concern to them.

11. Do you think a goal of \$2,500,000 (as outlined in the proposed plans) can be raised in gifts and pledges?

49 Yes 44 No 91 Don't Know

Only 27% believe the goal can be attained, while the majority, 49%, have no opinion if it can be reached. Another 24% do not believe the goal can be attained. Normally, we like to see at least a majority believing the goal is feasible. Generally when less than half are confident about the projected goal, the proposed goal is usually too ambitious.

12. If convinced of the need, would you be willing to contribute to this proposed campaign? (All gifts, regardless of size, are needed and are important to the success of the proposed campaign.)

141 Yes 13 No 32 Not sure at this time

Seventy-six percent would be willing at this early date to contribute to the campaign, while another 17% expressed that they are not sure at this time. Another 7% indicated a negative response. This is a positive response, and an indication that a campaign can proceed and will be supported financially by the parish.

13. If "yes," please estimate your possible total range of giving. Gifts potentially could be paid over a several-year period. *This is not a pledge or in any way binding.*

<u>16</u> \$500 or less	<u>23</u> \$500 to \$1,000
<u>37</u> \$1,000 to \$3,000	<u>27</u> \$3,000 to \$5,000
<u>15</u> \$5,000 to \$10,000	<u>12</u> \$10,000 to \$25,000
<u>4</u> \$25,000 to \$50,000	<u>2</u> \$50,000 to \$100,000
<u>0</u> \$100,000 to \$250,000	<u>0</u> \$250,000 to \$500,000
<u>0</u> \$500,000 and above	

**Typical Gifts Essential to the Success
of a \$2,500,000 Capital Campaign**

Size of Gift	# Needed	Gifts Indicated in Study*
\$500,000	1	0
\$250,000	1	0
\$100,000	2	2
\$50,000	12	4
\$25,000	17	12
\$10,000	21	15
\$5,000	28	27
\$3,000	37	37
\$1,000	63	23
\$500 and below	Many	16

*Using the high range estimate

Respondents projected donations ranging from a low of approximately \$610,000 to a high of \$1,102,000. (While not indicated in the chart above, not all gift amounts were given within a range as presented. Some were given as singular amounts, e.g., \$5,000, instead of \$3,000 to \$5,000. The high and low estimates have been adjusted accordingly.) These early estimates fall short of supporting \$2,500,000 as a primary goal.

14. If the proposed total goal of \$2,500,000 cannot be fully funded by a capital campaign, how would you feel if the parish were to assume prudent long-term debt to ensure completion of these proposed plans?

69 Acceptable 74 Undesirable, but acceptable 37 Unacceptable

Thirty-eight percent of respondents feel that assuming prudent long-term debt is acceptable. Another 41% feel it is undesirable, but acceptable. The remaining 21% feel prudent long-term debt is unacceptable.

15. In addition to making a gift to the proposed campaign, some parishioners may wish to explore planned or legacy gifts. Check the blank next to the item(s) of interest. Materials will be sent to you from the Episcopal Church Foundation.

- 14 Make a gift to your parish through a bequest in your will.
- 2 Create a charitable gift annuity (minimum gift of \$5,000).
Benefits of a charitable gift annuity could include:
- receive guaranteed income for life (i.e. current rates of approximately 5.3% annually at age 65, approximately 6.3% annually at age 75)
 - receive an income tax deduction now for the gift portion
 - receive some tax-free income from the investment for life
 - possibly reduce applicable estate and inheritance taxes
 - enjoy the satisfaction that at the death of the final beneficiary, the principal would go to that part of the Episcopal Church you so designate
- 0 Donate appreciated real property such as a house, vacation home, farm or business property.
- 7 Send me the *Ministry of Gift Planning* brochure which explains Planned Giving options.
- 5 Add me to the Episcopal Church Foundation e-newsletter.

15a. 30 St. Mark's Episcopal Church is already in my will or estate plans.

Thirty individuals have already included the church in their estate plans. Several others have indicated they would welcome information. They will receive information confidentially from the Episcopal Church Foundation.

16. If asked, would you be willing to work on a committee in support of the proposed capital campaign?

 41 Yes 87 No 55 Not sure at this time

Twenty-two percent would be willing at this early date to volunteer. Another 30% are not sure at this time and may be persuaded to participate as the campaign plans are formulated. This is a relatively good response at this stage in the process. It appears likely that an adequate number of workers would be attracted to the campaign.

17. Among individuals you know, who would make an ideal CHAIR for this proposed capital campaign?

Paul Abernathy	
Kenn Allen	11
Elizabeth Athey	2
Charles Brodhead	2
Doris Burton	8
Jack Burton	
Edgar Corr	2
David Deutsch	3
Stephanie Deutsch	4
William Doolittle	
Pete Eveleth	
Linda Ewald	
Susan Flanders	2
Betty Foster	8
Wes Foster	2
Christine Greger	
Janice Gregory	8
Celia Hahn	
Rob Hall	12
Brock Hansen	
Penny Hansen	4
Tucker Harris	3
Kristen Hartke	2
Bill Jordan	4
Josie Jordan	6
William Kennedy	
Laurel Kennedy	
Ed Kneedler	
Lynn Kneedler	
Margaret Krenshaw	2
Keith Krueger	3
Rod Lawrence	2
Donald Lipscomb	
Elizabeth Mahood	2
George Meng	11
Crane Miller	2
Cecilia Monahan	
Julie Murphy	2
Greg Niblett	18
Matthew Ossolinski	2
Rita Ossolinski	
Kathryn Powers	2

William Rau	
Jane Rutherford	3
Rick Rutherford	
John Sedgewick	
Marilu Sherer	
Peter Sherer	
Bruce Sherman	4
Jane Sherman	
Lisa Sotir-Ozkan	
Joseph Tarantolo	
Elizabeth Townsend	
Michael Townsend	34
Loretta Veney	2
Catie Waland	
Charlie Walsh	
Louise Walsh	6
David Willson	4
Margaret Wood	

18. Hypothetically, if you were a chair, whom would you select to serve with you?

Scilla Adams	
Terry Adlhock	
Elizabeth Agle	
Paul Albergo	2
Kenn Allen	5
Leslie Allen	3
Kenn Allen	2
Douglas Ammon	
Adell Amos	3
Stewart Andrews	
Christi Anthony	3
Elizabeth Athey	6
Bart Barnes	2
Lou Bayard	
Mark Bildner	
Kevin Billings	
Eileen Blumenthal	
Jackie Boddie	
Charles Brodhead	
Bill Brooks	
James Brooks	
Eric Burneson	
Heather Burneson	

Doris Burton	9
Jack Burton	4
Joseph Calizo	2
Lee Calizo	
Pete Carlson	
Susan Carlson	
Kathryn Chefetz	
Rich Chefetz	
Martha Conner-Donnelly	
Mary Cooper	
Edgar Corr	3
Nancy Corr	
Tracy Councill	3
Leon Cover	
Philip Cunningham	
Susan Cunningham	2
David Deutsch	2
Stephanie Deutsch	4
William Dickinson	
Nancy Donaldson	
Charles Donnelly	2
Kitty Donnelly	2
Martha Donnelly	
Don Ellison	
Pete Eveleth	6
David Evelyn	
Linda Ewald	
Karen Falk	
Penny Farley	
Susan Flanders	
Betty Foster	7
Raiford Gaffney	
Karen Getman	
Tom Getman	
Christine Greger	
Janis Gregory	5
Ann Greiner	
Ray Hahn	
Rob Hall	7
Brock Hansen	
Penny Hansen	2
Rosemary Harold	
Tucker Harris	2
Kristen Hartke	2
Nadine Hathaway	2

Peter Hawley	2
Jo Ellen Hayden	
Rick Hayes	
Anne Headley	
Christina Herman	
Janis Hoffman	
Susan Hoffman	
Jeffrey Hunter	
Linda Huntington	
David Johnson	
Bill Jordan	5
Josie Jordan	4
Gene Kendall	
Laurel Kennedy	
Brian Killingsworth	
Ed Kneedler	
Lynn Kneedler	
Keith Krueger	4
Rod Lawrence	
Katherine Levinger	
Mark Lindley	2
Nancy Lindley	
Don Lipscomb	4
Janet Lipscomb	
Frank Lloyd	
Katherine Loevinger	
Will Long	2
Elizabeth Mahood	3
Randy Marks	
Bertha Martin	
Tucker McDonald	
George Meng	6
Jo Ellen Meng	
Crane Miller	3
Jane Miller	
Cecilia Monahan	2
Alvin Moseberry	
Don Mosher	2
Winnie Mosher	2
Julie Murphy	5
Greg Niblett	11
David Obromavitz	
Matthew Ossolinski	3
Rita Ossolinski	5
Amber Palmer	2

Tova Patterson	
Donna Pettit	
Kathryn Powers	3
Burton Reist	
Christine Rumpf	
Lenore Rumpf	2
Charlie Rupp	
Jack Richards	3
Jane Rutherford	5
Rick Rutherford	5
Donna Sabino	2
Jessica Sauer	2
Steve Schindel	
John Sedgewick	
Susan Sedgewick	2
David Shaw	
Marilu Sherer	3
Peter Sherer	5
Bruce Sherman	4
Jane Sherman	2
Julie Shroyer	
Lisa Soir-Ozgin	
Linda Staheli	3
Jim Steed	
Doris Strange	
Michelle Strange	
Arnold Taylor	
Susan Thompson	2
Elizabeth Townsend	
Michael Townsend	11
Loretta Veney	3
Mary Louise Wagner	
Louise Walsh	3
Rick Weber	3
David Wellman	
Thomas Wickenden	2
David Willson	4
Gretchen Willson	2
Margaret Wood	
Peter Yanish	
Phyllis Jane Young	

19. In your opinion, what major positive factors does the parish have in its favor for the proposed campaign?

Comments were many and varied. Some highlights include:

- Membership growth
- A strong sense of community/identity
- Compelling reasons to address specific needs
- Commitment to St. Mark's

20. What problems, if any, do you foresee for this project?

Comments were many and varied. Some highlights include:

- The economy
- Insuring Baxter House is sold for maximum profit
- Possible departure of the rector
- Raising the money

21. What added ideas or suggestions do you have which might be helpful to the leadership in making this important decision?

Comments were varied and thoughtful and should be read in their entirety.

Section Five:

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

Awareness of Need

A majority of respondents (96%) were aware that St. Mark's Episcopal Church is considering a possible campaign, and 92% were also aware of some or all of the proposed plans. Of course, not all the items received the same degree of support. Present awareness of need is a positive; however, each project should be studied and prioritized with consideration given to the degree of support and the resources available.

Interest in and Support for a Drive

There is significant indication of support for the proposed campaign, but also signs that suggest caution. Positive signs from respondents include:

1. Eighty-six percent are in favor of the campaign, although some with reservations.
2. Only 17% are opposed to the proposed campaign timing.
3. Seventy-six percent of respondents would give to the campaign.
4. Twenty-two percent are willing at this early stage to consider a volunteer position.

Concerns

1. Approximately 27% of respondents feel the goal is reachable. Twenty-four percent feel it is too high. The remaining 49% had no opinion on whether this goal can be achieved. This is an indication that the proposed goal may be too high.
2. While some larger gifts were identified, no major gifts were reported at this early date to allow a goal of \$2.5 million to be fully embraced.

Influential Leadership

Strong leadership—both financial and volunteer—is absolutely essential for the success of any campaign. A leadership core is presently in place. It is the challenge of this leadership group to expand involvement within the parish, including other individuals who may have significant giving potential. With involvement comes commitment.

Gift Potential

Experience tells us we can take the average between the low estimate (\$610,000) and the high estimate (\$1,102,000) of the pre-campaign projections revealed in the Study and multiply by a factor of 1.5 when certain percentages and comments (such as revealed in this study) are attained. Thus the average, \$856,000, when multiplied by this factor (1.5) reveals a suggested goal of \$1,300,000. This recommendation is made factoring in the reality that additional gifts, not yet identified, will be forthcoming; hence the multiple of 1.5.

Planned Giving

A number of people requested planned giving information, and 30 respondents indicated the church was already in their estate plans. This is an exceptionally high number and very encouraging. It suggests that such future gifts could be used to build endowment or retire indebtedness. A strong legacy society and robust planned giving program are essential components of future financial strengths.

Campaign Timing

The respondents endorsed the proposed campaign timing. Of course, decisions on the priorities of projects must be made. It is imperative to revisit the proposed plans and make appropriate changes in the size of the effort, the proposed goal, and other sources of funding.

Recommendations

Recommendation #1

The information revealed in this Study suggests that a capital campaign for a Primary Goal of \$1,300,000 is realistic and appropriate. This presupposes that an assertive campaign involving the entire constituency would be launched, and that the type of methodology used by the Episcopal Church Foundation would be followed.

Recognizing that immediate needs are greater than what is revealed in the Study, leadership may wish to consider \$1,300,000 as the “primary” goal and establish a larger “challenge” goal, which would encourage the congregation to stretch to longer pledges—five years rather than three years, for example.

If the “challenge” was not reached, the congregation would still experience success by achieving the “primary” objective, but hopes would be high that the challenge, at least in part, could be accomplished.

Recommendation #2

Planned giving activities should be pursued during the campaign in an effort to encourage major gifts to underwrite the future of the church. Such gifts, often deferred and received in future years, are helpful in reducing mortgages or indebtedness. The Episcopal Church Foundation is responding to individual requests for information on planned giving.

Recommendation #3

Review the Tentative Case Statement and make final decisions based on the financial feasibility revealed in the Study. Consider also the prioritization suggested by respondents.

Recommendation #4

Share as soon as possible the revised plans with the congregation and seek increased consensus. Increase significantly all publicity concerning this project.

Recommendation #5

Once the leadership has had an opportunity to review the Study recommendations and revise the proposed plan, a timetable such as the following should be considered to maximize success:

Months 1-2	Determine campaign calendar and budget. Announce goal. Begin materials development (pledge cards, brochures, letterhead, etc.). Recruit and train campaign leadership and support committee chairs. Evaluate Advance Gift prospects.
Months 2-3	Continue to train leadership. Complete materials development. Begin Advance Gift solicitation. Contact planned giving prospects, if appropriate.
Months 3-4	Prepare for and launch the Congregational Gift division. Hold kick-off event. Begin personal solicitations and monitor solicitation efforts.
Months 4-5	Finalize all calls. Set up pledge collection and acknowledgment systems. Hold Celebration Event to acknowledge conclusion of the campaign and recognize the leadership and volunteers.

Recommendation #6

Select professional management to guide and direct the campaign to insure efficiency and the implementation of a proven, successful fundraising methodology.

A Final Word

The Episcopal Church Foundation thanks the leadership of St. Mark's Episcopal Church for the opportunity to work with the parish family. We enjoyed our work on your behalf and would welcome the opportunity to be of service.

Thank you, and best wishes.

Section Six:

Appendix