

August 30, 2010

We wish to extend our thanks to all for the cooperation, support and gracious hospitality extended to Linda Buskirk and Glenn Holliman throughout the feasibility study process recently completed.

A special word of thanks goes out to all who helped with 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 157 units participated in the survey; 35 interviews were conducted (personal interview and/or focus group), and 122 responded to the mail/online questionnaires. This represents a total response rate of 33% 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.....	6
Section Two: Personal Interviews/Focus Groups	7
I. Listing of Persons Interviewed/Focus Groups	8
II. Personal Interview/Focus Group Responses	9
Section Three: Direct Mail/Online Responses	33
Section Four: Composite Analysis and Summary of Personal/Focus Group and Direct Mail/Online Responses	62
Section Five: Conclusions and Recommendations	74
I. Conclusions	75
II. Recommendations.....	77
Section Six: Appendix	79
I. Tentative Case Statement	

Section One:
Feasibility Study Methodology

I. Introduction

For some time the leadership of St. Paul's Episcopal Church 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 or focus groups. A total of 35 interviews were ultimately conducted by Linda Buskirk and Glenn Holliman of the Episcopal Church Foundation. Three focus groups were held. A listing of the persons interviewed may be found in Section Two: Personal Interviews/Focus Group.

Phase III

A mail survey was sent to 412 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 46 households. Included in survey was a letter requesting participation, the questionnaire, and the tentative case statement.

STATISTICAL NOTE:

- ◆ A total of 412 direct mail questionnaires were mailed to the parish community.
- ◆ Of those, 93 were returned: a mail response rate of 23%.
- ◆ A total of 46 online questionnaires were e-mailed to the parish community.
- ◆ Of those, 29 were returned: an online response rate of 63%.
- ◆ Including the 35 who were interviewed, 476 units were exposed to the study. Of those, a total of 157 units or 33% participated.
- ◆ Based on experience, this response rate is a good representative involvement from the parish community, lending credibility to the study findings.
- ◆ Of the total that participated, the majority, 53%, attend worship services one or more time(s) per week.
- ◆ Regarding the financial-giving practices of those who responded, the majority, 89%, 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 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. Paul’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/Focus Groups

Listing of Persons Interviewed/Focus Groups

John & Jane Adams
Ken Argentieri & Paula Hopkins
Melissa & Stephen Bailey
Laura & Daniel Buerger
Norma Cappello
Mary Katherine Coleman
The Rev. Canon Richard & Doris Davies
Lionel Deimel
June Delano
Ron Delano
Mary Dunbar
Paula Gerstenberger
Harold Hall
Edmund Hanraty
June Hanraty
Josie & Jack Harmon
Melanie & Bob Johnston
Eric Linn
Jane Little
Maud McDowell
Albert Plantz
Mike & Mary Rago
Gary & Millie Ryan
Linda Sadler
Annette & Preston Shimer
Barbara St. Clair
John Sozansky
John & Margot Strong
Mary Sweeney
Thomas & Chris Thompson
Janet Toth
Karen & Rich Viggiano
Melissa Vito
Pat & Tony Waterman
Ken Weidaw

Results from 35 Personal Interviews/Focus Groups

Note: Not all respondents answered all questions.

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

 33 Yes 1 No

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

 26 Aware 0 Not Aware 9 Aware of some of the needs

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

 13 Yes 2 No 17 Yes, but with some concerns

Comments:

This is a wonderful congregation and church. It requires maintenance and upkeep.

We have Jesus!

I seriously question the need to air condition the nave; it is not cost efficient. The maintenance items on the list should be the number one priorities. I question the need to change the undercroft. \$100,000 is a lot of money when we already have room dividers.

This is a very big proposal. The physical projects need to be done. The proposal is vague, rushed and inadequately justified – 40% is for current expenses! Some of it is just to make us feel good. Deferred maintenance should be in the annual budget. There are too many black holes. Yes, we need a campaign but not an empire building.

I can't image people have the income to pull this off.

I have mixed feelings about all of this.

Some of the things are really important.

I am in favor; my hesitation is just how I can financially participate. It is not a good time because of the economy.

They are all important.

It should be done. We have to keep this building up. We can't let our 80 year-old building get run down.

Yes, there are certain things beyond the normal budget. We need some of this, but not all of it.

I am very impressed by the success of the last campaign. Bricks and mortar is easier to raise.

I am 50/50. We have never met the goals before. Economically it is a bad time. Also, Calvary Camp is planning a campaign.

We should focus on the bricks and mortar issues. The other items should come out of our operating budget.

The amount is too high. Modifications need to be made.

No, I am not in favor of this. Leadership is not listening to the people. People are coming to roundtables and voicing concerns and getting no response. Changes in naming the undercroft, changes in service, decisions are being made without input. Some large giving members have left because of this. Others have decreased contributions. I know we need to move forward, but I just don't agree with what has been proposed.

Yes, if the congregation wants it and if it brings consensus rather than conflict.

Some of the needs are rather obvious. I am surprised about the roof which I thought was repaired, and the huge amount for ministry enhancements, pastoral care and outreach. If we go line-by-line, we could find fault with just about all of it. Mostly, just because I am not sure it is necessary. In regards to outreach, if we can't take care of what we have, why go outward? This should be in the operating budget, not in a capital campaign.

I understand some needs, but this is too large an endeavor at this time.

I am concerned that there are many maintenance and space issues looming and I am not sure how much money should be devoted to these things when other needs could come up soon.

Some of these needs seem more operating than capital needs.

This is a tough economic time.

We have had some of our members for decades. The church is in pretty good condition. It is the wrong time for a major capital campaign.

The building needs significant maintenance. I would love to see funding for Ministry 15 Projects, particularly for children.

I think it is time.

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.

Please select only one option - High, Medium, Low, Opposed or Lack Information - next to each proposed project.

	PRIORITY				
	High	Medium	Low	Opposed	Lack Information
a. Retire Current Debt	<u>24</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
b. Brick and Mortar Projects	<u>29</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
c. Initiate a Facilities Maintenance Fund	<u>20</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
d. "Jump Start" the Endowment	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>
<i>Vision 15 Ministry Enhancements:</i>					
e. In reach/Pastoral Care for the congregation	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>
f. Ministry to children, youth, young adults and families	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>5</u>
g. Music Ministry	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>3</u>
h. Outreach	<u>10</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>

Comments:

I love the music.

We need the Facilities Maintenance Fund. Plan for it ahead of time, like a new coat of paint every five years.

These are all things that churches should be doing.

We are extremely fortunate in our music program.

Get rid of the previous campaign debt.

We need a door for the handicapped accessible elevator lobby.

Three years for Vision 15? That means you will be coming back for more. This is a misnomer, not a capital expenditure.

The facility needs to be debt free and in good shape.

With the exception of the undercroft and the air conditioning, we need to bring the building up to par.

The outreach part is a way of guilt-tripping people into this.

We definitely need the sound system. The air conditioning is essential for the church. Generally, we must do these things.

Please further explain the \$100,000 for miscellaneous undercroft. Is it needed? I need details on the entrance. Our sign is in deplorable condition. I feel we are rushing to judgment.

This seems to be primarily personnel. What do we do after three years? Do we fire these people?

Let's see what other churches are doing.

The current staff is sufficient. We pay a full-time salary already. We do not need to fund extra programs that were originally funded by a special grant.

Regarding outreach, whatever the financial goal, 10% should be for outreach.

Pay off the debt first.

The sound system is spotty and is very important.

Yes, do the air conditioning. The humidity is hard for older people to tolerate.

Where is the second handicapped entrance? I don't think we need it.

Power wash and also clean the stained glass if it needs it. Maintain the roof.

I think the lighting is adequate.

The undercroft plans are absurd, a waste of money, and ridiculous. Use the downstairs rooms and/or offices for classrooms.

We must keep the building up, but the air conditioning is not necessary.

The Facilities Maintenance Fund is very important.

In some cases, endowments are necessary to hold churches together.

We have a splendid music program and should support it.

Let the congregation participate more in ministries and not use staff if possible.

We fretted away an earlier endowment.

The church has dead sound spots.

The steps need repair; this is not welcoming.

Are our exits from the nave adequate?

My main concern is keeping the structure in good shape. Air conditioning and cleaning the church is important. We also need the endowment.

This all works in together. All those who worked on this did an excellent job.

We have five clergy on staff. Why hire more? How many more people do we need?

We must support each others “buzzes”.

I am very much in favor of maintaining the property. A minor concern is the \$100,000 for the sound system or the \$250,000 to air condition the nave. The portable units cool us down the few very hot weekends. The choir does not robe in the summer.

I disagree on power washing the building. It does remove limestone destroying toxins.

Yes for bricks and mortar. We have always robbed Peter to pay Paul. With real issue, like the roof for example, we raised the money like that.

Debt retirement should be part of the regular budget. Maintenance yes, building no.

The endowment is a low priority.

I have no idea what the undercroft changes are.

Debt is not large in relation to the budget.

For the facilities and endowment, \$100,000 for each is a good start.

I am not sure what salaried positions are being created.
\$35,000 is sufficient for the music.

I do not agree with the two things being funded in the outreach. We can do a lot better.

Eliminate air conditioning.

The interior signage is good. This was done recently.

Modifications of the undercroft should be eliminated.

I would be very surprised to see this amount of money given to outreach. In the past we have had problems raising much smaller amounts for causes. Why these two causes for so much money?

Regarding in reach/ministry, and the lack of funding, the clergy should be doing some of this ministry now. It is a lot of money. We had an outreach to youth that was stopped.

The new director of family ministry position is overkill. Our full-time youth pastor is under utilized. I am not sure if the associate pastor could do more.

I am concerned about the music ministry. We got a grant from the diocese to add another part-time music person. We have no youth choir and no bells anymore. We have performers and that is not why I come. I come to listen to the Word of God.

Outreach is important, but there are other outreach activities that should be included. We need small, long-term projects like Shepherd's Heart rather than big, short-term ones.

In regards to outreach, we have a responsibility to impact the lives of others. I like the 10% formula. We would like to get back to the point of St. Paul's contributing to charities.

Retiring the current debt must be our first and highest priority.

Items e, f and g are about leadership. They need to set goals and get people enthused to follow. The church can get polarized over things like this. Clergy must be aware of the need for building connections and relationships as part of being an effective leader.

Bricks and mortar is high because the building is old and needs maintenance. However, not everything is essential so this list need careful prioritization.

The music ministry is a flagship ministry for St. Paul's. We have a competent director. I would like to see a children's choir. The music must be maintained. Many don't realize how taxed the music department is. If we do a campaign, the music program must be a beneficiary.

The Facilities Maintenance Fund is good fiscal planning so we don't have emergency funding requests as in the past.

Once the parish sees a good endowment, we will see a greater response in the future. We should have done this a long time ago. It is good that starting an endowment is on the radar.

Our aging parish is part of why we need more pastoral care. This is the most important of the Vision 15 items.

I see the re-vision ministry as operating budget items. If included in the campaign, what will happen when the campaign is over for funding these things?

I support the 10% theory of giving to outreach. These are both good projects.

The music ministry is a great program, but they have their own fundraising now.

Outreach might be a good ministry to be funded through a special fund.

For bricks and mortar I agree with doors, stained glass, steps and maintenance of exterior. The air conditioning is low. The sound is medium. Power washing is low. The undercroft is medium.

The maintenance fund makes sense for current operating needs.

How will we pay for an increased annual budget? We will have to ask people for both things (capital campaign and an increased budget). We need more justification and need to know how it will be paid for on an ongoing basis.

Ministry is important but I do not see a need for the increased levels of service and cost for project f. This is personnel. We are adding staff. This conversation should come with the operating budget discussion.

Regarding ministry, we do a fairly good job, so I am not sure adding new staff is necessary. I am not vehemently opposed, I just think it is a low priority. I am not sure that it is as needed as improvements to the building.

We concentrated on the music ministry last time, although I do agree with the need for a new sound system.

We fund outreach through event fundraisers, and that is how it should be funded.

Some things need more explanation, like the current debt.

\$200,000 to start the Facilities Maintenance Fund is too much, although it is a good idea.

In regards to bricks and mortar, accessibility has already been taken care of. The prices seem really high. They are grandiose ideas. \$100,000 for the undercroft is way too much. We just spent a lot on that.

The endowment isn't needed to be started in a capital campaign.

Find other part-time clergy and stay within budget.

We have a youth ministry and a wonderful Sunday School now. I don't see a need as outlined.

The music ministry proposal seems based on Sunday evening service, but we should wait to see if it is necessary and put it in the operating budget if needed.

Do the maintenance categories before enhancement projects. Maintenance numbers only go up if you wait.

These are not isolated items. They constitute a system and interrelated/mutually supportive items.

I support the re-vision less, because it is more a part of the annual budget. I am not sure I understand it all.

Music ministry does its own fundraising.

I support the 10% theory for supporting outreach.

Music ministry is already well supported.

Items e and f are high, because these ministries are why we are at St. Paul's.

The bricks and mortar projects are obvious. The air conditioning needs to be done, big time! We have a magnificent building and it needs cleaned, new doors, the side entrance is not inviting, and the stained glass needs maintenance. If you don't do the maintenance items, you are digging a deeper hole. The undercroft project would make this space more flexible, although I haven't seen the need for this.

It is difficult to save for a rainy day when the wind is blowing in your face. It would be wonderful if this could be a budget item. The same for the endowment.

We support the music ministry enough!

I agree with tithing for outreach.

As a group, bricks and mortar is high, but lower priorities are power washing and the parish hall.

The improvements to the nave, stained glass, and air conditioning are less important.

The Facilities Maintenance Fund is high because if you had a fund, perhaps things wouldn't get out of hand in expenses.

The endowment isn't a priority at this time.

Item e is important, but this should be in our regular budget. We need to stabilize our regular operating budget before asking for new things.

I support the first part of item f, because we are trying to jump start the positions, get people excited, and gain new church members. All that will make it self-supported. I don't agree with the second part of item f.

I don't understand the need to enhance the parish hall. The exterior doors and steps are problematic and seem like a high priority. I am not sure the air conditioning is worth the price.

Some problems have gotten worse because we haven't had a maintenance fund.

I am opposed to item e because it should be in the operating fund. I am not opposed to pastoral care, just feel it is inappropriate in a capital campaign. At the end of three years, they will be in the operating budget anyway. These are stewardship issues.

To me, a capital campaign is bricks and mortar. We need to strengthen our annual stewardship campaign to make it a more spiritual goal for our parishioners. Also, the two things listed under outreach aren't known as outreach projects that there is a consensus for.

Air conditioning is a must. Repairs to maintain the building are a high priority. The sound system is a lesser need as are additional handicap access doors and entrances.

The sound system is poor and needs improved so people can hear prayers and announcements. Our aging parishioners need to be able to hear.

Handicap doors and power washing are high priority, also the roof repairs.

I am opposed to the Vision 15 Enhancements because this should be in an operating budget, not raised in a capital campaign.

We need to better understand how existing staff spends their time.

The needs are great in our own community and country. I am opposed to the Uganda mission. Also, it is not appropriate for a capital expenditure.

Debt, in relation to other things, isn't the biggest priority.

The Facilities Maintenance Fund is important, but in relation to all our needs, this is low. There hasn't been one and we have managed to struggle through.

Every item is important, but many have been discussed for many years.

The Vision 15 Enhancements don't seem appropriate to include in a capital campaign, and the amount is way too much for these items.

The smarter way to build the endowment is to promote planned giving and build it that way. It may be slower, but it could build.

I thought we have a youth minister. These things shouldn't come in a capital campaign it should be in the annual budget.

We need to preserve what we have here. The stained glass must be repaired or we will lose it forever (also for energy efficiency).

More handicap accessibility is good, but I am not convinced all the new internal doors are needed.

The organ must be maintained.

In regards to the undercroft, if it means losing a big reception space, that is a loss.

Air conditioning isn't needed, especially for the amount of money. The energy costs would be high.

The sound system is not needed at this price.

The cost of the side step repair seems overpriced.

Brick and mortar projects are the highest priority. Fixing the outside steps is important. Also, the church needs a nicer outside sign.

We need to bite the bullet on the air conditioning and do it.

Air conditioning is not a high priority for use only two months of the year. Everything is nice to wish for, but the main priority must be the brick and mortar.

We have been blessed with having retired pastors, but we need to have a strong pastoral care in place for the future when they retire.

I would like to have a youth choir back again. The music ministry will get the funding it needs outside of a capital campaign.

Bricks and mortar, especially the side stairs is high priority. A closed sign doesn't say welcome. I also don't feel strongly about central air.

Music ministry would be high if it means starting a young choir, but I am not sure about the rest of it.

I am not sure about washing the building, but most of the other brick and mortar projects are high priority. I am not personally a promoter of air conditioning, but I know others believe it is needed.

A jump start for the endowment is needed.

It is a worry to not know how long the two existing ministers can serve.

Youth ministry definitely needs more staff. Several years ago women/mothers volunteered, but that is not realistic to expect now.

I love our music program. It is important as worship, not for performance.

I am willing to support the outreach ministries.

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

Comments:

It is automatic for handicap restrooms and lighting in the church. Also, the woodwork does not match in places.

We need to invest in more publicity when we do things.

If we grow, parking will have to be dealt with in the future. (3)

We need an effective coffee hour setting.

I thought a security system for the building was to be included. We don't have one and we need one.

The exterior stonework needs grouting and repaired, not just washed.

We need a nicer sign in front of the church.

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

Calvary Camp (2)

Dennis Theatre (3)

Retirement Community

Local Schools (5)

Taxes are going up (7)

The symphony

Veterans Memorial

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

 0 Excellent 7 Good 21 Fair 3 Poor

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

 7 Improving 21 Remaining the Same 2 Declining

9. Does a proposed solicitation period for pledges in the fall of 2010 seem appropriate to you? (Members of the congregation would be asked to consider not only a gift to the capital campaign, but also to make an annual stewardship pledge. The reason to ask for both at once is to make the most efficient use of volunteer time.)

 16 Yes 8 No 8 No strong feeling

10. Do you think a goal of \$1,826,000 (as outlined in the proposed plans) can be raised in gifts and pledges?

 5 Yes 22 No 8 Don't Know

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

\$900,000

\$1 million (7)

\$1.2 million (3)

I seriously question it. We have difficulty making the annual budget.

It depends on how generous people are.

Yes, if we take five-year pledges.

It should be able to be accomplished, but it is difficult to know if it is really possible now.

Big gifts will be difficult to obtain.

Money is down and attendance is down. We need to build the congregation back before we undertake something this big. It is going to be a hard sell.

\$1.8 million was a stunner. I was shocked at the amount. Anyone can have a wish list, but this is too much. It should be broken down and done one at a time. For instance, we could have fixed our side steps a long time ago.

It might be better if the church sold bonds rather than raising it through pledges.

If our parish is declining as the ask increases, it doesn't seem possible to reach the goal.

It will be very difficult.

Even \$1 million would be a stretch. I don't think there is that level of financial capacity in the congregation.

We have fewer people than in 1991 and 1997; I would be shocked if we can raise \$1.8 million.

\$1.8 million was a lot of money. I don't know if the church has enough big donors to be able to reach the goal.

**11. 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.)**

 25 Yes 5 No 4 Not sure at this time

12. 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> 0 </u> \$500 or less | <u> 2 </u> \$500 to \$1,000 |
| <u> 4 </u> \$1,000 to \$3,000 | <u> 4 </u> \$3,000 to \$5,000 |
| <u> 8 </u> \$5,000 to \$10,000 | <u> 3 </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 \$150,000 | <u> 0 </u> \$150,000 to \$250,000 |
| <u> 0 </u> \$250,000 and above | |

13. 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.

- 5 Make a gift to your parish through a bequest in your will.
- 5 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
- 2 Donate appreciated real property such as a house, vacation home, farm or business property.
- 6 Send me the *Ministry of Gift Planning* brochure which explains Planned Giving options.
- 3 Add me to the Episcopal Church Foundation e-newsletter.

13a. 2 St. Paul's Episcopal Church is already in my will or estate plans.

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

 9 Yes 11 No 9 Not sure at this time

15. Among individuals you know, who would make ideal CO-CHAIRS for this proposed capital campaign?

John Adams	6
Ken Argentieri	2
Barrie Athol	
Beth Athol	
Melissa Bailey	2
Mara Barker	
Heidi Daley	3
John Delano	3
Jeff Dunbar	3
Mary Dunbar	2
Jim Frantz	4
Paula Gerstenberger	
David Hall	
Paula Hopkins	
Bob Johnston	2
Kari King	
Carl Kylander	5
Mark Lamendola	2
Eric Linn	2
Abe Nader	
Richard Ritchie	
Andy Roman	
Mark Ryan	
Millie Ryan	3
Pam Ryan	
Linda Sadler	2
Dan Sandman	
Preston Shimer	
John Strong	
John Sweeney	3
Karen Viggiano	
El Vines	8
Sue Vines	2
Mark Vito	
Melissa Vito	
The Wilcox	
Chris Wiles	

Younger people

A constructive, pro-active leader woman.

Anyone on the campaign projects committee.

16. Hypothetically, if you were a co-chair, whom would you select to serve with you?

John Adams	2
Melissa Bailey	
Dan Buerger	
John Delano	
Jeff Dunbar	3
Mary Dunbar	2
Jim Frantz	2
Paula Gerstenberger	
Bob Johnston	
Carl Kylander	
Richard Ritchie	
Millie Ryan	
Pam Ryan	
El Vines	2

Vestry members.

People who can speak persuasively.

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

Comments:

This is a dedicated congregation that loves the church and wants it to succeed.

This community is pretty well-to-do. There are many affluent members and people are fairly generous.

There is a history of strong lay involvement.

Our rector provides wonderful pastoral care and is a very genuine person. I like him.

There is a most welcoming group of people in South Hills. We love the fellowship.

I love our worship at the 10:30 service. The music is great.

People will give for specific projects. Circles and Women are still strong.

Our music is excellent.

We have an active, young congregation. I am impressed by our families.

This is a friendly church, very outgoing with a lot of activities going on. There are a lot of younger people coming in. We are drawing a lot of talented people to this parish.

People are concerned about each other and are very supportive of one another.

St. Paul's has weathered the diocesan division.

There is a need for some of it.

There are a lot of involved and active people with fairly high average incomes.

There is a core of committed and faithful people here.

We have a lot of committed people.

There is a long history of fundraising.

People do have vision and families are joining (although some are still leaving so we aren't gaining).

There is recognition that there is work to be done.

People have ownership and commitment here.

There are some new members.

Many people want the church to move forward.

Lou has gotten newer people involved; more fertile ground. Although, younger people may not have the ability to give.

Our location and facilities are great.

We have a fantastic music ministry.

We have an excellent Sunday School and nursery school with a good reputation of being child oriented. However, the case needs to be made.

Our Sunday school, youth program, fellowship and Bible studies are strengths. There is something for everyone.

We are committed.

There is a large group of dedicated and loyal parishioners.

Many members are affluent.

The parishioners are a good cross-section including affluent members. There is potential and room for growth.

The church has positive ministries, including those who get into the trenches to serve others.

We have many talented members.

I think the ministry enhancement goals of the campaign are needed and exciting.

The church isn't 100% stable, but we are moving in the right direction. I feel we are on the cusp of doing something good that will click and make a difference. We are attracting newcomers, but not all are staying.

There are a lot of new people. There is a feeling that we are at a turning point and moving in a positive direction with Lou here.

There are many people with roots here.

We have wonderful relationships and we take care of each other and minister to each other.

There is a young and growing base of families who will be part of the church as it continues to grow.

It is worthwhile going through the capital campaign effort, because the items are needed.

Our parishioners are very supportive of the church.

There is a large core group of parishioners who are passionate about coming to St. Paul's.

Other churches in our area are making improvements and it helps us see what we need to do.

We have a lot of young families.

The size of the parish is a positive.

Our youth program gets many people involved.

This is a very supportive church. We get involved with each other.

The Welcoming Campaign is wonderful and it is working.

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

Comments:

There may be a diversity of priorities. It will be difficult to satisfy the broad spectrum of opinions. Many people are set in their ways.

The economy! (6)

Raising the money! (2)

It is a lot of money to raise and will take a lot of work. It will not be an easy thing to do.

I think the prioritization of the projects is a problem. We need to do maintenance first, and programs last because I don't know how we can afford them in three years.

Some people's feelings about the direction of the church may impact their commitment to a campaign.

We may yet lose more due to the schism. Financially, what will happen to the properties?

Young families have big mortgages and priorities with their children. How can they pledge? Will they support a capital campaign?

The past schism is still a problem.

Clergy needs to speak up on Sunday morning. Their voices are too soft.

Young families don't have a lot of money.

People's interests may be downtown, not here in the suburbs.

There are many younger people coming in which is a good thing, but they don't have the ability to give as did the older folks who have left.

The diocesan splits have hit us hard. I fear the vision is too much top-down, and we need more bottom-up visioning. We have been through a lot of change.

We have a hard time with operational expenses. There is a lack of enthusiasm.

I am not sure all of these things are urgent. Pittsburgh is generally tight-fisted and approaches things in a negative fashion. This is not a very giving community.

There is too much change. We are not signing the doxology. Do we kneel or stand?

We need more listening. I don't think this is a very friendly church.

We have run a deficit budget for too many years.

There is no enthusiasm in the congregation or in the pastoral staff. It is not a good time, in general.

The church has a history of being poor givers. This will be a tough row to hoe.

Some of the things being asked for are pipe-dreams and detract from the real needs.

Under Ministry Enhancements, we seem to be costing new personnel. Will we be able to keep them in three-to-four years hence within our operating budget?

Our leadership is not listening.

If the vision is reworked with less inflated figures and without the ministry enhancements, we would be more likely to consider a gift.

The goal will not be met, so how will we know that the survey results will be honored as far as priorities?

There is a leadership gap here.

There is a group of 15-25 people who have voiced opposition to the recent changes in the parish. Some of their concerns seem small, but there is a strong negative spirit. We have lost some parishioners because of the negativity.

We need to be prepared for not getting the full amount.

Our clergy leadership lacks support. There are a lot of negative comments, not all deserved.

Some people will cherry-pick parts of the campaign.

There is a fiscal-conservative philosophy.

The Vision 15 Ministry portion seems to duplicate our operating budget.

People fear tax increases.

Many people are frightened because of the economy and may be holding on to their money. Although, we have heard that charitable giving is on the rise.

There is a group of disgruntled people here. Some don't like current leadership. Some have cut back their regular giving because of this, so they won't contribute at all.

St. Paul's always seems to have a problem with giving.

There is some leftover dissention.

We have a lot of chiefs and fewer Indians it seems, which can be problematic.

There are literally a handful of people who are very negative about the church and the rector.

It seems there have been turmoil and power struggles for several years. Lou has stabilized the church and has organized so many facets. It has improved the services and organization. We know who the rector is and that is important. Lou has brought in new people, but this comes at a price. Not everyone embraces change or a different clergy leadership style.

I do not believe we have sufficient members to raise the funds needed.

We have a nice mix of families, but some older and wealthier people have left.

We have trouble raising our existing budget.

Many of the wealthy have died or moved away. This has eroded our financial base in the past five years.

There are a number of people upset about the format of the early service. Much of the Vision 15 Projects are tied to the 8:45 service. If you aren't happy with that, you might not want to give to the Vision 15 components of the capital campaign.

No church is perfect. There will always be malcontents, but, I believe they are the minority.

In a previous campaign, we could have successfully raised our \$1 million goal had we not included starting a mission church. Leadership now needs to be very careful about prioritizing.

When people give, they know what the churches budget is, so they may think why should I pay for this again through a capital campaign. Leadership needs to educate the church on why these ministry items are needed now with additional giving.

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

Comments:

In addition to contributions given by parishioners, consider other fundraisers to support generating funds like a food event (pasta dinners, pancake breakfast, etc.) which largely targets

the community outside of St. Paul's. This option could attract people who cannot afford a monetary contribution. They could contribute their time to one of these fundraising events. Also consider a multi-family yard sale in the parking lot in the summer, and a winter concert series (seasonal activities, again all targeting people outside of the church which could attract them to become members).

Have something permanent in place to recognize people who have given, like stones in the new walkway with the family name (the size of the stone equating to the size of the gift) or plaques on a cross in the entry. Something that incites giving.

When people do pledge, give them a small token (a CD, rock with a cross, etc.) of appreciation in front of the congregation in a Giving Sunday Service. Seeing others get up and make their contribution and then getting a token could encourage others who are on the fence about doing it.

It is absolutely essential to move forward with a campaign. We will need to prioritize based on levels of support.

We need to try to generate new members.

We are the Episcopal Church in the South Hills. If you belong to a denomination, we are the only game in town. EYC is active and has wonderful mission trips.

We can't do everything. This proposal is unfocused. Some things are essential. I need more information. Slow down. For every item, what are the needs and the alternatives? Why is the proposed solution the best? Rank the priorities.

We must not let the rector do all the work. Laity must share the ministries. How do we bring people along?

Keep up the good work.

Our rector should develop a stronger relationship with the leadership and families of the nursery school. There is a void and a missed opportunity for St. Paul's to gain support and parishioners from the pre-school families. There are wealthy people who don't attend any more, but for some of them, their children come here. It would be great if their heart and connections are strong enough to financially support in a major way.

Everyone works hard to keep things going.

The first Saturday in November is the ECW fair. Will this collide with the campaign? Everybody in the church is involved with it. It makes about \$20,000 in one day.

People will step to the plate for repairs and emergencies. Use our current space to a better advantage.

Pray hard about all of this. Let's not over reach, due to the economy. We need to do some of this. We need three full-time clergy. We must do a good program for our youth. We have had

numerous changes in the past few years.

Go slow. Think it through and take your time. This is a wonderful church.

Get everyone involved in what is going on. Be open about what is happening. People can give money over a period of time. We are a young congregation.

Think positive. We can go up or down – I prefer to go up. We have to do something. This building can't fall into disrepair.

Spend this fall talking about the plans; take a little more time.

I don't think we are the most welcoming congregation and it bothers me. We need a handle to make this exciting. This is worthwhile, but intellectual, not emotional.

I don't know that every project should be a part of this. It is a good thing the rector has pushed this.

It might make sense next year to have directed fundraisers for music and outreach.

The normal stewardship drive seems to be out of the loop. We must guard against erosion of operating fund pledges over the next three-to-five years.

Possibly consider a large fundraiser.

In regards to the growth of the parish, I haven't noticed it. There should be hard numbers to justify increasing staff.

Create opportunities for the rector to have one-on-one relationship building experiences with parishioners.

Make the goal reasonable.

The leaders of the campaign need to be articulate and persuasive.

Make sure each constituency of the church is represented (new and old members, young and old, women and men, wealthy and stretched).

Consider using a small number of dedicated categories such as structural funds and program funds.

Tell success stories from comparable campaigns. Make it clear and ever present that this campaign will not result in further debt, immediately or down the road. Clarify how the campaign monies will not supplant budget supported items.

Have conversations to educate people that if they are not participating/giving because of changes in clergy leadership style, they are hurting the church.

The vestry needs to pay attention to the results of this study and be prepared to adjust the plan if necessary.

I think this capital campaign seems to be a substitute for a stewardship campaign. What the church needs is a year-long effort to increase peoples understanding of what stewardship means – it is a personal relationship with God. I would rather see the energy and resources be spent on that, perhaps using ECF’s expertise rather than a capital campaign.

If people could just objectively look at all the positive differences that have occurred here in the last three years, they would see so much good has happened and we are heading in the right direction.

Reduce the expectations on the funding level.

Our vision of “the most welcoming” is somewhat insulting, especially to other churches. We are all trying to do good.

I don’t hear support for a major campaign, only for some needs like maintenance. The church is pretty well maintained. The steps and stonework are needed. I don’t hear a strong urge at this time.

Getting more people involved in helping with the campaign, beyond the current committee is needed. We need people who are excited about this who can speak from their heart about its importance. More volunteers involved make it easier to help because responsibilities are less daunting.

I think everyone sees a need for the building projects. I wonder if the Vision 15 emphasis will make the overall campaign less successful.

Many people in the congregation feel that outreach is not emphasized enough, so there is support for that by some people.

Section Three:

Direct Mail/Online Responses

Results from 122 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?**

103 Yes 17 No

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

38 Aware 18 Not Aware 61 Aware of some of the needs

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

30 Yes 25 No 63 Yes, but with some concerns

Comments:

The economy has left people strapped.

I strongly believe that we need to retire the current debt first and go ahead with the bricks and mortar projects. These should be our top priorities at this time. The endowment can wait for another year. We do NOT need the Vision 15 Ministry Enhancements.

The goal should be for an increase in our pledging units. Every family who attends St. Paul's on a regular basis should be encouraged to pledge something! Encourage the non-pledging to be a part of the whole family known as St. Paul's.

St. Paul's needs to raise some money for necessary projects, but our church needs to live within its means!

I think it is a big mistake to conduct this campaign at the same time as the stewardship campaign.

We think the capital campaign funds should go toward physical improvements/repairs to the church and not for outreach or service items.

This campaign appears to be an extensive wish list. Is it realistic?

It sounds like a big adventure in these economic times.

Often a campaign starts out with much enthusiasm, which wanes in the second or third year.

A capital campaign should be only for physical plant improvements, not increasing staff numbers.

I believe we should fund any program growth by increasing our regular stewardship giving (annual pledge), not a one-time spending blitz.

The campaign, as outlined, is a typical administration money grab, with a few necessary needs plus ego-boosting pork.

We have supported the campaigns for the organ and roof and, to our knowledge, they are still ongoing.

Stability of the parish needs to be reestablished. The leadership focuses on right and wrong, rather than inclusiveness and diversity of opinion. A primary role of a church is to worship the Lord in a beauty of holiness. At St. Paul's, we have an 8:45 family service where the worship style is dictated. Attendance has greatly decreased. Is this service truly family friendly? The clergy talk to the children assembles in the front of the altar, with their (clergy) backs to the congregation. No changes have been made in this service through the year.

I think the capital campaign may be overly ambitious given the current economic climate.

First, I am opposed to any capital campaign that allocates funds to non-capital items. In this particular case, adding staffing when we haven't been able to balance our budget for at least the last five years doesn't seem financially responsible. But, I believe much more important than any structural improvements is the need to develop community and relationships within our parish. This must be changed before I would support any capital campaign.

I am not favor of this, except for making the steps and doors safe.

With so many people out of work, some wants (not needs) should be placed on the back burner.

I believe the timing is bad due to the economy at this time.

Our church is open-minded to trying new things. Some work and some don't, but that is the only way to grow.

Can the parish afford debt in light of the national and local economies?

With the economic situation being what it is now, a lot of people and families do not have a reserve of dollars to give to any charity. It may be better now not to commit to everything or every project on the to-do list.

I am concerned that you are asking for too much money.

This is a time when we should carefully watch the money that is spent because of bad economic

times.

We need to wait before embarking on such a campaign. With all that has happened in the Episcopal Church in the last two years, we need to heal and settle a bit. Some of the bricks and mortar projects should NOT be capital campaign items, they should be a line item in the annual budget as part of the Property Commission.

I agree with the need for a capital campaign, but not under the present situation of not listening well enough.

We need to prioritize and I am not confident we can raise \$1.8 million.

I do favor a capital campaign. However, extra money is hard to come by right now in our family and I am not certain how much we can pledge.

Air Conditioning is not needed. Overall, it is much too general, all "we need this and we need that" with no focus. It looks more like notes taken from a brainstorming session than a distinct statement of purpose. What is the interest rate on our loan? Maybe refinancing it at the now historic low rates may suffice. What's with the lack of pastoral care? We have three or four clergy and around 10 Stephen Ministers.

Personal tax rates will dramatically increase in 2011 leaving even less money in the parishioner's pockets after tax to give.

Campaign funds are non-recurring funds. Therefore, they should be used to accomplish capital needs and the remaining invested using the earnings for future capital needs. No positions should be funded by this campaign unless there are specific plans showing how future operating budgets will fund the recurring positions. The campaign should exclude MUSIC and Pastoral Care which are operational items and should be funded by the operating budget. A facilities fund (endowment) is appropriate if only the earnings are used and the principal preserved. Outreach funds should be invested and use the earnings for future programs.

I think there is a mixture of legitimate capital needs with items that should be part of the annual budget.

Many capital improvements are needed. I strongly object to a capital campaign that is raising money for current expenses, as this one proposes to do.

Not all funding initiatives are congruent with a capital campaign

Money is tight for everyone at this time.

I feel that capital funds should be used for brick and mortar projects and that staffing and ministry funding should come from the operating budget.

I would rather see a prioritizing of the stated needs and then on-going campaigns to achieve each in order. It seems like a very poor time to be considering such a large asking in light of the

uncertainty of the economy and high unemployment and the certainty of much higher taxes on the horizon. I would like to be able to vote on the individual brick and mortar projects rather than vote yes or no on the entire amount. I favor door replacement, window repair, general maintenance and restructuring the Undercroft. I oppose air conditioning (stick with the rentals), have a low priority on the sound system and power washing the building. I think the outreach tithe should be 10% of the actual total reached. Endowment funds are nice in theory, but vestries regard them as a pot of gold and rather than just using the interest earned, they soon tap principle and soon there is no endowment fund left.

Given the current economy and struggles most families are facing, I question whether some of the items might be moved to nice-to-have status....and wonder what priorities are.

I question the extent of all the needs.

I think it is way too much money. Some things should be taken out of the annual budget. Some things that people want to change are not necessary.

Retire the current debt first.

I believe we need to get our house in order first before we start a major campaign.

Property taxes increased 10% this year, more than expected. Utilities have all increased, people have lost jobs stock markets are down, and there are five pages of Sheriff Sales weekly in the paper.

I am concerned about the state of the economy because of the upcoming tax increases and unemployment.

My concern is that from the St. Paul's newsletter, a balanced budget has not been achieved for several years.

I am concerned about the economy as it impacts the ability of many to give, but I think, overall, this is a positive and much needed campaign that focuses on the ministry of St. Paul's going forward into the future. It is very positive, especially in light of recent events.

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.

Please select only one option - High, Medium, Low, Opposed or Lack Information - next to each proposed project.

	PRIORITY				
	High	Medium	Low	Opposed	Lack Information
a. Retire Current Debt	<u>73</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
b. Brick and Mortar Projects	<u>67</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>
c. Initiate a Facilities Maintenance Fund	<u>38</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>4</u>
d. "Jump Start" the Endowment	<u>7</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>8</u>
<i>Vision 15 Ministry Enhancements:</i>					
e. In reach/Pastoral Care for the congregation	<u>32</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>1</u>
f. Ministry to children, youth, young adults and families	<u>39</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>2</u>
g. Music Ministry	<u>20</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>0</u>
h. Outreach	<u>34</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>3</u>

Comments:

Outreach is high, if it is all within Pennsylvania or the United States. We don't agree with funds to help other countries.

Bag the Vision 15 projects. There is grumbling and unrest with some of the personnel here at St. Paul's. Goals are lofty but empty, no passion, just words. You will not get the support you need to carry this out. Because of the state of the economy in general and current leadership, I don't think we can do this. The passion and personality to recruit new people, who pledge, is not here.

Keep the goal of eliminating the debt and planning to do the bricks and mortar projects, but don't do anything else until you have the money! No new outreach or new paid employees!

Only replace the doors, do handicap access, stained glass windows, and the sound system in the bricks and mortar part.

We do not need the Facilities Maintenance Fund or the endowment at this time.

Regarding project f, what happens in three years? Does this become a regular budget item?

First of all, I don't agree with our mission statement "The most welcoming congregation in the South Hills for all generations". It seems like an ad campaign. It seems so disingenuous. I also wonder who is calling the shots.

The campaign should be rounded off to \$500,000.

We feel that outreach ministry should be handled within the existing budget, not through capital campaign funds.

The sound system is a low priority for bricks and mortar projects.

I am conflicted about Vision 15 Enhancements. While I am supportive of some of these, especially outreach, I feel these should not come from a capital campaign. What happens when the money runs out?

I am not supportive of several bricks and mortar items beyond those that are necessary for the nursery school. I feel that we spend too much time being trapped by our bricks and mortar.

Music ministry is a lower priority, compared to the rest of the list.

I do not agree with the undercroft.

The Facilities Maintenance Fund should be a line item in the annual operating budget so we have money when something breaks.

The current clergy, both full and part-time should be adequate to provide pastoral care with the active involvement of lay ministers. We need to have more active members, not more paid providers.

With a full-time youth and part-time children's program, we do not need another staff position. We need to hold staff and parishioners responsible to own their programs. Parishioner involvement is what makes for a spiritually alive and caring church community, not more staff. We had an after-school program, but it was shut down. Let the full-time youth director do this!

We have a full-time organist/choirmaster, yet no longer have a children's choir or any music on Saturday evening. We don't need another music staff person! Make the early Sunday service family-friendly by having a kid's choir again.

Once item b is accomplished, item c becomes an annual budget item.

The endowment should not be included in a general fund raiser. Items e and f are budget items.

Too much money is spent on music. The church is not a concert hall.

The church should strive to commit at least 10% of ALL income to outreach.

Is in reach/pastoral care not a responsibility of the clergy staff? Why the need to hire someone else?

Ministry to children and young people is vital to the growth of a church. St. Paul's has a full-time youth director. Do we evaluate the decreased attendance of youth activities? How many young people were involved three years ago?

The Facilities Maintenance Fund is a budget item, along with outreach.

The Vision 15 Enhancements are generally items that should be addressed in an operating fund budget, not a capital campaign.

Highest priority should be air conditioning.

Maintenance on the church is important, but I don't need a grand structure to feel the gifts of God.

What is the split between the two outreach projects?

I am opposed to \$100,000 for a new sound system.

I am opposed to \$70,000 for two handicap entrances and new doors. I would support repair of Mayfair entrance and installation of one automatic handicap entrance.

I am opposed to cleaning of the exterior. The church looks beautiful as it is.

\$100,000 for installation of a new divider system is ridiculous!

Only the steps project should be done for bricks and mortar.

The Vision 15 enhancements are not capital items.

I am opposed to power washing the outside.

I am opposed to air conditioning in the church or choir room. The choir hardly meets in the summer. The choir director has air conditioning in his office.

Do not modify the parish hall; be more creative.

The church signage was done once during the last capital campaign, and again in the early 90's. Why do we need new signage again?

I am opposed to the outreach. People already redirect their money and time to proposed projects. They know it is important and should be part of our budget.

I am opposed to the music ministry portion of this. No more staff! We have a full-time music director, not paid singers!

The debt will be paid by 2014.

Bricks and mortar with the exception of air conditioning should be first.

The initiation of a facilities fund is ok. Because of this, the endowment should be last.

Music ministry is a must.

Pastoral care should be by a full-time priest.

I think \$250,000 for air conditioning is too much. It is ok as it is now. Attendance is always low in the summer because of people traveling.

The present rector does not want to leave the next rector with any debt. Also, he wants to use the final amount to fix what he can. He is very opposed to leaving debt; he has said this publicly.

We are not healthy enough to take on these project costs. The financial support is not here without the hard emotional and stable support of enough parishioners behind projects to see it as a wise idea.

People are struggling with the difference between operating and capital. This looks like we are trying to jump start programs.

I think that we need an honest assessment of the importance, or not, of the music program. We spent \$750,000 for an organ that we are still paying for and now putting more in this budget to improve music. I believe that music here is overrated as a draw. I am not saying that the music is bad, in fact it is probably quite good, but I do not think we draw anyone other than choir to this church. If we want to attract young families, go see the music of churches that attract young families. It is very different!

Item f should be covered by the current staff and volunteers.

Adding more staff or clergy to our declining congregation is ridiculous.

No air conditioning.

The endowment is too restrictive and not necessary if a maintenance fund is available.

Outreach should only be 5%.

Many of these things should be annual budget and not capital.

Debt is important, as well as maintenance, but ministry also requires consideration. These take top priority.

The numbers for the brick and mortar project seem excessive, although clearly some work needs to be done.

We should enjoy the older ministers in our church and let them be more involved with our services. They look as if they are being pushed out.

The campaign expenses seem too high. Whenever I see campaign expenses it turns me away from donating because I think that is where my money will go and it will not help anyone. I avoid charities with high overhead and overpaid CEO's.

We are very opposed to the music department having its own fundraisers, like Mike's Café. If there is no money in the annual budget for Easter and Christmas instrumentalists, we do without! The hand bell choir didn't cost anything, so what happened to it? There used to be a children's hand bell choir as well and it is gone! It is nice money for college students to earn and a nice enhancement for the choir, but we can't afford them! Our choir is fine.

Priorities e, f, and h are the purpose of the church

Brick and mortar very important, but not all projects are equally important.

I feel right now the church should focus on the building and debt and not so much on the programs or outreach. We have wonderful programs and outreach now.

The current political climate within the Episcopal Church and law suits over existing endowments would lead one to question why to create another one.

I favor some brick & mortar & oppose others. I would like to vote individually on them.

The endowment fund belongs outside a capital campaign.

Children are the key to growing and maintaining a congregation.

I think there is already very robust financial support of the music ministry, yet other ministries (both in reach and outreach) are severely under funded.

I am not against ministry for youth, children, young adults and families. I think the current staff, if utilized and educated could do the job.

I think we could raise funds for the brick and mortar projects, but the other items would be

achievable if we had a strong congregation.

I believe the music program is already adequately funded, if not over-funded.

I generally support a tithe for outreach but believe it should be spaced over a wider-range of programs. The recommended amount is just too much for the programs cited.

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

Comments:

Whoever came up with the vision statement does not know St. Paul's. It is a pompous statement and curdles my stomach every time I hear it. I wish we would get rid of it and stop saying it! We are the Mission Statement, but certainly don't need to hear the Vision Statement. We are not it!

Get bodies into the pews!

I have other thoughts, although nothing concerning money.

I feel we have a gap to fill in middle-age parishioners (30 to 40 year olds) offering to help at our functions. We are blessed with many older parishioners.

We need renewal of the family atmosphere between members of the congregation and staff. It does not require any additional financial expenditure, only personal commitment.

Why is there an inability to reach out to bring in new members to contribute and stay with St. Paul's?

You need to establish a more stable, unified community within our parish, not throw more money to projects and staff. We need more development of our existing staff to reach our Vision 15.

Revisit who we are as a community; help to recreate a true, vital and alive community.

A few current positions need explained to support their current duties in a full-time position.

We have lost many old and valued members due to changes

Improved flooring in Parish Hall is needed. The linoleum is unsightly.

St. Paul's has a rector, two assistants, a youth leader and a permanent deacon. Are we such a huge parish that we really need more staff? Why not better utilize the laity?

Repairing or improving our outdoor sign, making the woodwork in the narthex and church consistent and improving church lighting.

Does the plan address the sound system?

We are quite capable of doing most of the things on the wish list if we used the staff we had effectively.

Yes, but nothing to do with money. We need listening and responses to that listening.

There should be some kind of additional support for single mothers and older people.

A youth choir should be established to fulfill the needs of families, and this responsibility could fall under the full-time director of music.

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

Calvary Camp (4)

Dennis Theatre (3)

Local schools (7)

The public library

South Hills Food Bank

Tax increases (8)

Veteran's Memorial

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

 1 Excellent 47 Good 60 Fair 7 Poor

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

14 Improving 73 Remaining the Same 27 Declining

9. Does a proposed solicitation period for pledges in the fall of 2010 seem appropriate to you? (Members of the congregation would be asked to consider not only a gift to the capital campaign, but also to make an annual stewardship pledge. The reason to ask for both at once is to make the most efficient use of volunteer time.)

42 Yes 27 No 43 No strong feeling

10. Do you think a goal of \$1,826,000 (as outlined in the proposed plans) can be raised in gifts and pledges?

7 Yes 52 No 59 Don't Know

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

\$500,000 (2)

\$500,000 to \$600,000

\$700,000

\$800,000 (2)

\$800,000 to \$1 million

\$900,000

\$1 million (5)

Half the amount would be a generous guess. (4)

Fundraising events may also be necessary to reach out to the community.

It seems too high to me.

I think some people might have a hard time fulfilling their annual pledges, let alone contributing to a capital campaign of this size.

We will get enough for what is truly necessary, and not over the top.

I don't know, but historically we never match the proposed budget for the coming year.

This seems very dependent on the major gifts.

The church, in the past, has done well in financing and supporting one project or need at a time. At this time, my thinking is that this may be a better way to work toward getting the end result.

There is difficulty achieving the stewardship campaign of \$750,000

\$1.5 million by eliminating music, pastoral care and reducing youth by \$150,000. Jump starting endowment should have low priority.

I believe a case should be made for individual projects. Fund the top priority and then move to the next.

11. 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.)

68 Yes 19 No 30 Not sure at this time

12. 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>23</u> \$500 or less	<u>12</u> \$500 to \$1,000
<u>12</u> \$1,000 to \$3,000	<u>8</u> \$3,000 to \$5,000
<u>5</u> \$5,000 to \$10,000	<u>2</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 \$150,000	<u>0</u> \$150,000 to \$250,000
<u>0</u> \$250,000 and above	

13. 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.

- 6 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.
- 0 Send me the *Ministry of Gift Planning* brochure which explains Planned Giving options.
- 1 Add me to the Episcopal Church Foundation e-newsletter.

13a. 5 St. Paul's Episcopal Church is already in my will or estate plans.

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

 15 Yes 66 No 35 Not sure at this time

15. Among individuals you know, who would make ideal CO-CHAIRS for this proposed capital campaign?

John Adams
Bill Andrews
Melissa Bailey
Mara Barker
Dan Buerger

Nancy Brown	
Heidi Daley	
John Delano	2
Arlene Dorow	
Pat Eagon	
Paula Gerstenberger	2
Karna Goldsmith	
Ed Hanraty	
June Hanraty	
Courtney Horrigan	
Geoff Hurd	
Bob Johnston	3
Carl Kylander	
Mark Lamendola	
Maude McDowell	
Andy Muhl	
Elaine Myckoff	
Abe Nader	
Mary Rago	
Pam Ryan	
Linda Sadler	2
Bonnie Sandman	2
Dan Sandman	3
Jan Toth	
El Vines	5
Mark Vito	2
Debbie Wiles	

I don't know, but I am skeptical about anyone who has been involved in putting the present plan forward.

The younger generation.

16. Hypothetically, if you were a co-chair, whom would you select to serve with you?

John Adams	
Nancy Brown	
Jackie Cornell	
Joan Craft	
Kathleen Davies	
John Delano	2
Arlene Dorow	
Lois Foss	
Jim Frantz	
Paula Gerstenberger	

Courtney Horrigan
 Carl Kylander
 Mark Lamendola
 Andy Muhl
 Al Plantz
 John Sozansky
 Mary Sweeney
 El Vines
 Sue Vines

2

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

Comments:

The upkeep of our church is important.

It is a beautiful church and really needs to be brought back to life.

Some members with affluence may be able to pull this off.

We have a strong congregational base; a long and colorful history of peaks and valleys.

We have many things to offer a variety of people.

We really need to pay off our debt and repair and reopen the back doors to the church. They have been closed since last year. It is not a good reflection on our decision making.

Some of the items listed are for physical repair/enhancement of the existing property and buildings.

In theory, we are an affluent community.

This is a great church with great people.

There is pride in this place by those who worship here.

There are many opportunities to serve.

We have a beautiful worship space in the well-respected Mt. Lebanon area.

The dedicated efforts of those who have come before us must be appreciated.

There is a diversified team of clergy in place.

There are many programs available, and we are really good at welcoming!

We are a very wealthy parish in talent and treasure; we just need to add our time to the mix. Volunteering to a ministry or a program buys ownership. Ownership brings support and loyalty and a huge sense of community where relationships are made and sustained.

We have a great group of helpers in our church. We have truly experienced people who are willing to give their time.

Positives are the administration, support staff and vestry.

We have some good committee members.

There are parishioners who have vast experience, wealth of knowledge, and personal goals to see St. Paul's survive and flourish.

This is an upper-middle class congregation.

This parish is committed to the success of the church.

I am in favor of fixing the steps and retiring the debt.

We have an aging parish that could benefit from better handicap access to our church.

I don't know. Hopefully the people who participated in the Vision 15 meetings will drive this through. Our congregation's stewardship revolves around the more senior members, but this vision has to be embraced and well-guarded by the mid-year folks.

There is a core group of people that have been here for a long, long time. That is an enormous asset, but many of them are just hanging on.

People care about this church!

There are some new people.

There are some supportive parishioners.

Some people love St. Paul's and are willing to support it.

There are some seemingly affluent parishioners.

There are physical reminders of the need to take action, like the crumbling steps.

There are parishioners who are committed to the future of St. Paul's.

There is an understanding of the needs and commitment to address the needs.

We have persuasive ministry and a group of young adults who are participatory and willing to

pitch-in.

There is good communication among parishioners in our church.

St. Paul's is a wonderful parish that does so much for our families. I am certain its members will do all they can to support the church. However, these are still difficult times for some of us financially.

People love St. Paul's.

There is a desire to be a part of something important.

We have some wealth in the church.

This parish is pretty active with people willing to work.

We have interested and active parish members.

There is an obvious need for building repair.

The parish family has the economic means to easily fund the campaign, if they choose to make it a priority in their family budgets.

There is a strong sense of belonging to St. Paul's, regardless of frequency of worship participation.

Money, talent, and loyalty to St. Paul's are positives.

Some of the Bricks and Mortar projects cannot be overlooked. They are the stained glass windows, the sound system, the walkways -- most important.

I am in agreement to pay off debt and to fix our beautiful church so that it is welcoming to newcomers.

The physical plant work is inarguable, and the programmatic support is necessary for the parish to grow and prosper.

There appears to be an influx of newcomers (many younger) for whom the campaign would invest and give sense of ownership and commitment.

We believe the St. Paul's family is a caring community that wants the parish to succeed in its mission.

This congregation is devoted.

There is a strong history of parishioner involvement. Unfortunately, we always seem to accomplish just a little less than we intend (case in point: the need to retire the debt from

previous campaigns).

We have a good plant, outstanding musical resources that need to be sustained, and a large children/youth constituency.

I believe that there are some people in the congregation who have secure jobs and above average incomes.

We have a very cohesive congregation that has risen to the challenges when presented to us.

I think there is a renewed positive energy in the parish after having gone through a very long period of transition, with first the series of interim rectors after the departure of The Rev. Bob Banse, and then the schism and uncertainty in the Diocese of Pittsburgh. During this period, I believe many parishioners were uncertain about the direction of the parish, thus unwilling to make a financial commitment to its future. Having stability in parish leadership and also a clear knowledge of where the diocese is headed is encouraging and energizing.

The location of the church is a positive.

We have a large base of parishioners.

We have positive and affirming clergy who are willing to respond 24/7.

We have wonderful members here at St. Paul's and we want to keep this a viable church. The best way to do this is the question.

We have a core of loyal, hardworking, Christian parishioners, an attractive plant, and some interest and enthusiasm for the campaign.

There seems to be support for bricks and mortar.

The parish has real life in it; strong programs and really solid people.

The leadership listed on St. Paul's letter of July 19 is outstanding.

This is a strong congregation.

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

Comments:

Our older members have traveled this road before.

You are going to have a problem getting people excited about the project and committing funds to it.

The economy! (15)

There is a shortage of wealthy parishioners.

The church routinely operates on a business model that spends more than it takes in and then brow beats/guilt's the congregation into making up the difference.

It seems to us that the proposed projects are very general in scope with high dollar amounts. Why not set up an endowment for maintenance and ask for gifts to specific areas as needed?

We have many seniors on fixed incomes. They may not be able to fully participate as they might wish were possible.

Several long-standing St. Paul's members have left St. Paul's in the past year due to problems with leadership. These people need reached out to and brought back to help in the campaign.

Younger families, in general, will not have much to give.

We are still in a recession which is not bouncing back as quickly as was hoped. The longer it goes on, the more people will reevaluate where their money should be spent. Very few will make any church their top priority.

The passion and leadership are not in place at this time to do a project of this magnitude. We have to nurture and concentrate on the people we have and the others, if they come, will enable us to go forward. We don't need more personnel and our outreach is just fine. I don't see our numbers increasing at this time to go forward.

The people who commit to capital campaigns don't always fulfill their pledges. Just look at our past two campaigns. By conducting campaign simultaneously, stewardship will probably suffer.

The separate fundraising by the music group competes with our fundraising for the general fund. Music is important, but some requests are not reasonable for our church, especially at this current time.

Raising money in the economic climate! (2)

How can you justify hundreds of thousands of dollars for pastoral care/in reach?

Can people designate what their contribution is used for, or does it all go into a general fund? Who decides what to spend, on what, and when?

We don't have enough publicity.

The congregation has unrealistic expectations unless we continue to push fundraising and participation in all church activities. I feel that this congregation is very inward-looking.

If nothing is seen being done in the early stages, people may become lax and decide not to keep

supporting the vision.

The main problem with this project is the affect it will have on the annual budget. If the proposal goes through, it will increase the annual budget by at least 15%. Even with the hoped for increase in members, given the current rate of giving, we will be in dire straits within two years of the project being started.

Trust and truth are necessary for any project to succeed. Communication and listening are important.

In the 2009-2010 directory of the Episcopal Diocese of Pittsburgh, based off a 2007 parish report, St. Paul's lists 1218 communicants in good standing. In the 2008 parish report, 1365 communicants are listed. Where are all these people?

Deadlines with a project this complicated are always a problem.

There will be an inability to fund the operations budget.

The capital campaign seems to actually be a mix of capital and operations priorities. Should a capital campaign be limited to funding bricks and mortar and facilities priorities?

The timing of a capital campaign for our parish at this point in time is bad. We have much more work to do with relationships.

Our parish isn't united and energized to support this campaign. Also, this campaign is supporting non-capital items.

There is no consensus among the members of our community, including vestry. I see this campaign and participants as misguided about St. Paul's needs. Our parish need motives, happy and spirit-filled staff, vestry and lay persons much more than improvements to the building (which are over and above what is needed) and more added staff.

We have trouble making our annual budget each year. This project would double our annual operating budget which is already a struggle.

There is a lack of community.

There is no energy in our church life.

I think it is hard to believe that this could be successful. It is hard to support when I question if I still belong and/or have a voice.

There will be competing capital campaign with other organizations.

We are not united or excited enough. There is not enough strength at the core.

Our bigger problems are not financial and need to be addressed first. We need more listening.

Money is very tight right now, but putting off the campaign would not be good.

The leadership has not built a broad base of support.

With the economy as it is and our current situation, I feel many parishioners are separating themselves from St. Paul's.

The amount of money is overwhelming to people who are losing money.

Many people who have served St. Paul's are leaving.

Consumer uncertainty persists with regard to the economic climate.

A timely response to solicitation for capital campaign by parishioners is unlikely.

I am not sure the people in the parish have the kind of money you seem to need.

Government policies are not instilling much confidence in the economic future. Therefore, we may need larger leaps of faith.

You may have a problem prioritizing projects according to an achievable timeline to fit the projected cash flow.

The creation of new positions to do the jobs that are currently being covered by fewer people is very expensive and I am not convinced it is a good value.

The building needs improvements. However, given the current economy, I think the funds projects are too great. We need to prioritize and only do what is necessary!

People have a lack of personal finances to support this project.

People pledging money and then not following through on their pledges would be a problem.

I think the timing is bad for the fall and with the holidays.

It is such a large amount of money needed that it will seem overwhelming to many.

There is a minority of very vocal opponents to the vision and mission of St. Paul's.

We have a fairly poor track record of stewardship.

The costs could be higher than projected.

Selling all of the currently included items to the congregation will be a problem. For example, why does the building need to be power washed when we have an entrance we can't use? Why

do we need a \$100,000 sound system when the last estimate was \$40,000? Would the \$100,000 system also include sound for a reconfigured undercroft? The interior signage was redone not too many years ago. Is the proposal to enhance or change it? The sign on the lawn was made by parishioners. The existing shape should be kept, just change inside.

The availability of the funds needed is a problem.

Too much funding is allocated for salary or staff. Much of St. Paul's outreach projects are processed outside of budget.

People who cannot distinguish between the politics and the parish is a problem. St. Paul's is not the rector, the building, or the parking lot, but rather is a community of people who worship together, help each other, and work together. Some think that not giving will make a political statement to the rector or the leadership. The big picture is completely lost on some individuals.

This is a wealthy parish but one that seems to under fund things. Stewardship is usually a struggle in spite of resources available.

You are trying to do too much.

I think that the church may be asking for too much. It is hard for us to make extra donations at this time. I think that the church should focus on repairs and debt.

Economic uncertainty, cynicism, and repercussions of the Anglican split are all problems.

We have many older parishioners with fixed or dwindling resources.

We run a deficit every year and some years have had to have multiple stewardship campaigns in order to raise enough funding. I do not think this will be well received.

Tax cuts expire in 2011, diminishing available fund for gifts. Federal deficit reduction that eliminates charitable donation tax credits.

There are a lot of negative vibes floating around that need to be resolved. I get the feeling that the entire vestry is not behind this. I don't see a lot of enthusiasm on their part. In addition, our attendance is down, as is our giving.

There is still a lack of confidence in the economy to turn around enough yet to free up people's extremely limited funds and looming fears of unemployment (at an age where you're not as hireable/marketable).

There remains a lot of financial instability in the economy. Although Pittsburgh has fared better than most, there is still a very conservative feeling in society right now that might cause people to hesitate to make a large financial commitment.

There are plans for new staff ... where are these staff members going to have offices?

It is way too excessive! I don't believe in paying off the debt or the need for central air upstairs. The parish hall is fine as it is. Maintenance should be built into the annual budget. Ministry and outreach should come out of annual pledges.

This proposal goes beyond what many think should be part of a capital campaign. I question if the money could be raised, especially at this time. \$75,000 in expenses seems high!

It is the wrong time for this parish, given the economy and the fact that many of the projects are unnecessary. The parish is not healthy in terms of leadership. I am opposed to this campaign. The parish is split into several unhealthy groups and families are leaving. We need to work together to improve parish life before we endeavor to do a project such as this.

The steps on the side which need to be redone should be put back as originally designed for far less than \$10,000 as previously quoted.

The economy and present administration of St. Paul's are problems far too big to be overlooked at this time.

The uncertainty in the economy will cause people to be very cautious in pledging and if things get worse people will be unable to meet their pledges.

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

Comments:

We understand that the church and its upkeep are very important. But, over the last couple of years, the financial aspect is pushed and stressed too much on the congregation! We need to focus on what is really important and not a wish list of money. We feel as though the church has come to the status "keeping up with the Joneses". We should be a leader, not a follower!

Having worked on capital campaigns, I learned that as you request a donation for a specific area, monies need to be used for that area. I would tend to not give money to a capital campaign as much as I would to a specific area. Some areas of this campaign I do not support. Pray a lot!

Watch your expenses. If the pledges are in line with my expectation, the projected expenses could be 8% to 10% of the funds raised.

I very much admire the way St. Paul's is going. I am looking at the people running the show and I see great strength. Just keep leading with basic virtue and solidity when you do the ask.

Eliminate some of the projects.

Concentrate on increasing the pledging units at this time so we can pay the debt and improve the building with air conditioning and general improvements.

I do not believe our leadership has a good understanding of what we want for the church. I question how decisions are being made.

We can't forget to pray to God for guidance and support during this campaign, especially now.

What about Giant Eagle gift certificates? I know other churches raise significant funds this way.

Do something visible first!

Become our local parish church again, not the imagined leader in the diocese.

Keep it attainable. That means realistic, no pie-in-the-sky dreaming.

Please consider the economy. We need a loving place to worship and teach our children and young people. People will donate what they can out of the goodness of their hearts. Preach the goodness and it will come.

The proposed capital campaign needs to be amended to gain my support. Many of the proposed projects seem to be unnecessary in my opinion.

Have more meetings and small group discussions to truly get in touch with our needs and concerns.

People come to St. Paul's because they have a good experience and connect their faith to our worship and Christian formation. If our worship and Christian formation programs are inspired with servant leaders – open and reaching for others – people will stay and contribute the money that will sustain us with no capital campaign. People are looking for affirmation and growth in faith and fellowship. We have not had this at St. Paul's for a while.

I feel so strongly about worship – work of the people the liturgy – it is not all about paying singers and more staff. It is about developing choirs from our own to glorify God, not to glorify music.

Go with debt reduction and a trimmed down bricks and mortar project.

Solicit input from the parents of young children as to their opinions/relationship with services (liturgy) on a clergy interaction.

Improve and focus on the spiritual health of our church community. Listen and respond. Develop and heal relationships then pursue something of this magnitude.

You need to take a deep internal look at the strength of the fabric; there is a lot of turmoil and

emotional upset in the pews.

I think you should consider the declining Sunday attendance as a problem that deserves to be fixed and can't just be blamed on the split in the church. This is our problem as a church and should be the leadership's priority.

Just do it! We will then know how to proceed in the future.

This campaign would be good to bind the parish together with a goal which most all can embrace. We need a vision which we can all rally around and build a dynamic.

I wish you the best with this campaign and the future of St. Paul's.

Is it really important to have historically correct steps with stone?

I think St. Paul's would have a better chance of getting donations by setting the needs up in chunks.

You probably need to be more confident of our abilities to reach the monetary goals. People are getting less tolerant of organizations that overreach.

Prioritize the capital needs and detail funding requirements for each part.

Don't put the message before the people to the point of annoyance.

Instead of just asking for money, we could think of more fundraising ideas.

Allow donations to be given for specific projects and direct the money where those donating wish it to be spent.

Wait! The parish is unhappy and needs to be cared for before being asked for money. The parish has lost its togetherness as shown by the poor attendance at coffee hour before and after services. People don't gather to visit anymore.

Prayer.

Be flexible and listen to the priorities. I keep hearing that if we can't fund all this stuff, then we need to be very clear and transparent on what can be funded. Listen especially to what people are opposed to.

Be sure to involve the members rather than make autocratic decisions.

Communication with the parish should be ongoing and transparent.

Do away with our slogan - "The most welcoming church in the South Hills" - and emphasize that we are striving to BECOME "The most welcoming.....".

Give people the opportunity to rank the brick & mortar projects individually.

Some fun fundraising activities, along with the pledge campaign and more traditional ways of gathering financial commitments should be considered.

Write off the current effort and start over. The plan, as presented, will destroy the parish.

Ask givers to front load their gifts, giving the largest percentage in 2010.

I hope that children's and young people's ministries are a high priority in this campaign.

Patience! I am too new to this congregation to offer much more advice than that. However, I have experienced these campaigns before and they are very slow to start and then suddenly someone thinks thus-and-so is a good idea, and then another and another then it takes off and then there will be one final push for the last bits. I wonder if there is a way to find matching money?

Find out how much of the maintenance needed might be charitably donated, provided by congregation members with those skills or provided by out-of-work workers for a lower cost.

Continue to emphasize the good, the positive and the "warm fuzzies" - the emotional appeal to people to whom St. Paul's is central to their lives.

I always like to see actual data. This could be data on the revenue of other churches in the area compared to size and programming offered as well as nationally.

Bad timing for asking for more money! Stop bulldozing the parishioners and listen to them. It is their church!

Repair and maintain really necessary items and present at least three bids on any construction project. Use the monies from Canterbury Fair and dinner parties to take care of St. Paul's facilities prior to giving it to outreach. Charity begins at home! We need to get control of our own finances before we send it out of the community.

The funding of the music choral scholars confuses me as I thought that was funded through Friends of Music. Also, why are we raising money for a youth choir which we used to have? More importantly when are they going to sing, as the 8:45 is the family-friendly service and choirs tend to be more formal which would suggest the 10:30 service, but I doubt families want to attend multiple services. I find many of the bricks and mortar projects to be important. As the money is being raised over a number of years, please make sure to sequence work logically (i.e. don't install the new dividers in the undercroft until the air conditioning has been installed. Install the ramps and doors at the same time.) I guess I would like more information on what the director of family services is going to do? Also, I don't know the solution but if you are talking about growing the church then the parking needs to be addressed!

Consider fundraisers for outreach. I would think a lot of members have favorite outreach funds they already contribute to.

Section Four:

**Composite Analysis and Summary of
Personal/Focus Group and
Direct Mail/Online Responses**

Results from 35 Interviews and 122 Direct Mail/Online Responses **Total of 157 Responses**

Note: Not all respondents answered all questions.

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

 136 Yes 18 No

Eighty-eight percent were aware that St. Paul's Episcopal Church is considering a capital campaign. This is a positive indication that the church leadership has informed the congregation of a major capital campaign.

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

 64 Aware 18 Not Aware 70 Aware of some of the needs

Forty-two percent of the respondents were aware of the capital needs of St. Paul's Episcopal Church. Another 46% were aware of some of the needs. Only 12% were not aware of the needs. This is an indication that the leadership has done a fair job of communication.

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

 43 Yes 27 No 80 Yes, but with some concerns

The majority of respondents, 53%, are in favor with some concerns. Twenty-nine percent of respondents are in favor of the campaign as proposed. Another 18% are opposed to the campaign. This is a sign that the church community may be willing to support a campaign if their concerns are addressed and items are prioritized. Not all the proposals received adequate support to support a capital drive.

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.

Please select only one option - High, Medium, Low, Opposed or Lack Information - next to each proposed project.

	PRIORITY				
	High	Medium	Low	Opposed	Lack Information
a. Retire Current Debt	<u>97</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>
b. Brick and Mortar Projects	<u>96</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>
c. Initiate a Facilities Maintenance Fund	<u>58</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>6</u>
d. "Jump Start" the Endowment	<u>16</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>8</u>
<i>Vision 15 Ministry Enhancements:</i>					
e. In reach/Pastoral Care for the congregation	<u>41</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>6</u>
f. Ministry to children, youth, young adults and families	<u>49</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>7</u>
g. Music Ministry	<u>26</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>3</u>
h. Outreach	<u>44</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>4</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.

a. Retire Current Debt

291 High Priority 62 Medium Priority 9 Low Priority
0 Lack Information -5 Opposed to Project

Total Points: **357**

b. Brick and Mortar Projects

288 High Priority 58 Medium Priority 12 Low Priority

0 Lack Information -5 Opposed to Project

Total Points: **353**

c. Initiate a Facilities Maintenance Fund

174 High Priority 102 Medium Priority 17 Low Priority

0 Lack Information -11 Opposed to Project

Total Points: **282**

d. “Jump Start” the Endowment

48 High Priority 70 Medium Priority 58 Low Priority

0 Lack Information -25 Opposed to Project

Total Points: **151**

Vision 15 Ministry Enhancements:**e. In reach/Pastoral Care for the congregation**

123 High Priority 94 Medium Priority 19 Low Priority

0 Lack Information -34 Opposed to Project

Total Points: **202**

f. Ministry to children, youth, young adults and families

147 High Priority 78 Medium Priority 17 Low Priority

0 Lack Information -33 Opposed to Project

Total Points: **209**

g. Music Ministry

78 High Priority 68 Medium Priority 36 Low Priority

0 Lack Information -46 Opposed to Project

Total Points: **136**

h. Outreach

132 High Priority 110 Medium Priority 16 Low Priority

0 Lack Information -21 Opposed to Project

Total Points: **237**

RANKING BY POINTS:

Retire Current Debt	357
Bricks and Mortar Projects	353
Initiate a Facilities Maintenance Fund	282
Vision 15 – Outreach	237
Vision 15 – Ministry to children, youth, young adults and families	209
Vision 15 – In reach/Pastoral Care for the congregation	202
Jump Start the Endowment	151
Vision 15 – Music Ministry	136

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. Comments should be read concerning these issues as some received extensive commentary.

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

A few additional needs were offered and should be read.

6. 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 significantly affect the success of St. Paul's campaign. However, school taxes were mentioned numerous times and would have an impact.

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

 1 Excellent 54 Good 81 Fair 10 Poor

Fifty-six percent of the respondents to this question believe the present economic climate is fair, and 37% consider it good. Six percent believe it to be poor, and only one respondent rated it as excellent.

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

 21 Improving 94 Remaining the Same 29 Declining

Indications are that the local economy is remaining the same, with 65% rating it as such. Another 15% believe it is improving, and 20% believe it is declining. These responses express economic pessimism and caution. When people feel the economy is good, they are more apt to make gifts. This response is sobering.

9. Does a proposed solicitation period for pledges in the fall of 2010 seem appropriate to you? (*Members of the congregation would be asked to consider not only a gift to the capital campaign, but also to make an annual stewardship pledge. The reason to ask for both at once is to make the most efficient use of volunteer time.*)

 58 Yes 35 No 51 No strong feeling

Forty-one percent of the respondents are in favor of the proposed timing. Another 35% expressed no strong feeling one way or another. Twenty-four percent were opposed to the campaign timing. This is a lukewarm endorsement that a campaign could proceed as scheduled. Comments suggest that more time is needed to consider this study, prioritize items and allow the economy to recover. A campaign might be possible in the early part of 2011.

10. Do you think a goal of \$1,826,000 (as outlined in the proposed plans) can be raised in gifts and pledges?

 12 Yes 74 No 67 Don't Know

Only 8% believe the goal can be attained, while another 44% have no opinion if it can be reached. The majority, 48%, 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 too ambitious. Combined with comments and gift indicators, this goal is too high.

11. 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.)

 93 Yes 24 No 34 Not sure at this time

Sixty-two percent would be willing at this early date to contribute to the campaign, while another 22% expressed that they are not sure at this time. Another 16% indicated a negative response. This is a positive response although below the norms of most other Episcopal parish studies. Work needs to be done before proceeding with a campaign.

12. 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> 23 </u> \$500 or less	<u> 14 </u> \$500 to \$1,000
<u> 16 </u> \$1,000 to \$3,000	<u> 12 </u> \$3,000 to \$5,000
<u> 13 </u> \$5,000 to \$10,000	<u> 5 </u> \$10,000 to \$25,000
<u> 2 </u> \$25,000 to \$50,000	<u> 0 </u> \$50,000 to \$100,000
<u> 0 </u> \$100,000 to \$150,000	<u> 0 </u> \$150,000 to \$250,000
<u> 0 </u> \$250,000 and above	

**Typical Gifts Essential to the Success
of a \$1,826,000 Capital Campaign**

Size of Gift	# Needed	Gifts Indicated in Study*
\$250,000	1	0
\$150,000	1	0
\$100,000	3	0
\$50,000	4	2
\$25,000	10	5
\$10,000	20	13
\$5,000	40	12
\$3,000	60	16
\$1,000	75	14
\$500 and below	Many	23

*Using the high range estimate

Respondents projected donations ranging from a low of approximately \$259,500 to a high of \$468,500. (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 \$1,826,000 as a primary goal. The lack of major gift indicators at this date suggests caution.

13. 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.

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

7 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

2 Donate appreciated real property such as a house, vacation home, farm or business property.

6 Send me the *Ministry of Gift Planning* brochure which explains Planned Giving options.

4 Add me to the Episcopal Church Foundation e-newsletter.

13a. 7 St. Paul's Episcopal Church is already in my will or estate plans.

Seven 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. Regardless of whether the parish engages immediately in a capital drive, the leadership should pursue a planned giving program to build endowment. Indeed, the foundation is laid already.

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

24 Yes 77 No 44 Not sure at this time

Seventeen 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 cautious response at this stage in the process.

15. Among individuals you know, who would make ideal CO-CHAIRS for this proposed capital campaign?

John Adams	7
Bill Andrews	
Ken Argentieri	2
Barrie Athol	
Beth Athol	
Melissa Bailey	3
Mara Barker	2
Nancy Brown	
Dan Buerger	3
Heidi Daley	4
John Delano	5
Arlene Dorow	
Jeff Dunbar	3
Mary Dunbar	2
Pat Eagon	

Jim Frantz	4
Paula Gerstenberger	3
Karna Goldsmith	
David Hall	
Ed Hanraty	
June Hanraty	
Paula Hopkins	
Courtney Horrigan	
Geoff Hurd	
Bob Johnston	5
Kari King	
Carl Kylander	6
Mark Lamendola	3
Eric Linn	2
Maude McDowell	
Andy Muhl	
Elaine Myckoff	
Abe Nader	2
Mary Rago	
Richard Ritchie	
Andy Roman	
Mark Ryan	
Millie Ryan	3
Pam Ryan	2
Linda Sadler	4
Bonnie Sandman	2
Dan Sandman	4
Preston Shimer	
John Strong	
John Sweeney	3
Jan Toth	
Karen Viggiano	
El Vines	13
Sue Vines	2
Mark Vito	3
Melissa Vito	
The Wilcox	
Chris Wiles	
Debbie Wiles	

16. Hypothetically, if you were a co-chair, whom would you select to serve with you?

John Adams	3
Melissa Bailey	
Nancy Brown	

Dan Buerger	
Jackie Cornell	
Joan Craft	
Kathleen Davies	
John Delano	3
Arlene Dorow	
Jeff Dunbar	3
Mary Dunbar	2
Lois Foss	
Jim Frantz	3
Paula Gerstenberger	2
Courtney Horrigan	
Bob Johnston	
Carl Kylander	2
Mark Lamendola	
Andy Muhl	
Al Plantz	
Richard Ritchie	
Millie Ryan	
Pam Ryan	
John Sozansky	
Mary Sweeney	
El Vines	3
Sue Vines	2

17. 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:

- Love and support for the church
- Dedication of parishioners, especially those who have decades of membership
- Active members with talents
- Parishioner involvement
- Music and other programs
- Need to maintain facilities

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

Comments were many and varied. Some highlights include:

- The economy
- Higher local taxes
- Prioritization of projects
- Leadership style differences
- Leftover dissention from theological issues
- Size of the goal

19. 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 (88%) were aware that St. Paul's Episcopal Church is considering a possible campaign, and 88% 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 generally is a positive. However, each project should be studied and prioritized with consideration given to the degree of support, additional education and discernment required and the resources available. Comments and percentages indicate not all proposed goals are embraced.

Interest in and Support for a Drive

There is indication of support for a modest campaign, but also signs that suggest caution. Positive signs from respondents include:

1. Eighty-two percent are in favor of the campaign, although many with reservations on a number of proposed projects, especially the programming proposals.
2. Sixty-two percent of respondents would give to the campaign.
3. Comments indicate maintenance issues of the parish are the highest priority.

Concerns

1. Approximately 8% of respondents feel the goal is reachable. Forty-eight percent feel it is too high. The remaining 44% had no opinion on whether this goal can be achieved. This is an indication that the proposed goal is too high.
2. No major gifts were identified at this early date to allow a goal of \$1,826,000 to be considered.
3. The congregation does not endorse all the proposed programs.
4. St. Paul's has and is dealing with some major issues that would ordinarily be enough to postpone any vision process leading to a capital campaign. For this the clergy and lay leadership are to be commended for their energy and forward-looking planning. These challenging issues are:
 - The Diocese of Pittsburgh has suffered a theological schism that absorbed energies and took senior leaders away from parish investments in mission and ministry.

- This schism rippled through St. Paul's and numerous long-term members left, again depleting energies and good will. Church membership and stewardship have suffered as a result.
- Previous rectors, interim and full term, have had significant pastoral-care talents, but did not invest as much energy in administrative tasks or management issues.
- A new rector was called into a difficult atmosphere of schism and some anger due to the rupture in the diocese, which overflowed to a degree into the parish. Not every priest would have had the courage or energy to accept such a call.
- The new rector was given a charge to enhance administrative systems and to grow the church. Some parishioners have been challenged with this change in focus and a differing leadership style.
- With all these adjustments and bubbling issues, the U.S. economy dived into a deep recession from which the church community still suffers.
- In spite of the above challenges that would have slowed the faint of heart, the rector and lay leadership have boldly called the parish into visioning, seeking to renew the fabric of an aging structure and to offer programming and ministries that will attract new members and better serve the community.

Given these issues, it would be remarkable if this Feasibility Study was all wine and roses. It is not as the comments record, and so concerns and challenges confront St. Paul's and its dynamic program.

Influential Leadership

Strong leadership—both financial and volunteer—is absolutely essential for the success of any campaign. A leadership core must be strengthened before proceeding. 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. Involving others in revising the campaign vision would build commitment.

Gift Potential

Experience tells us we can take the average between the low estimate (\$259,500) and the high estimate (\$468,500) 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, \$364,000, when multiplied by this factor (1.5) reveals a suggested goal of \$546,000. 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 seven indicated the church was already in their estate plans. This is encouraging and suggests that such future gifts could be used to help build endowment or retire indebtedness.

Campaign Timing

The respondents mildly 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. Given the comments, economy and looming local tax increases, it may be wise to postpone the proposed launch of a campaign.

Recommendations

Recommendation #1

This Study reveals that a campaign launched this fall could raise an amount considerably less than desired.

Therefore, several options are to be considered:

- A. Cancel the campaign as the energy to raise \$500,000 does not justify the effort.
- B. Or postpone the campaign for three to twelve months until greater consensus can be attained and hopefully, the economy improves. With clarification of the proposed programs, i.e. articulating further air conditioning and space renewal items, and with more time to nurture potential gifts, a larger, challenge goal might be possible.
- C. If the campaign is postponed to allow greater discernment, listening efforts and repositioning of the vision statement, leadership could offer an enhanced vision for annual stewardship this fall. Such a mission-challenged budget could include the programming items offered in the tentative case statement. Comments suggest parishioners see programming as a budget, not a capital campaign, item.

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

Consider also the prioritization suggested by respondents. If a campaign is to be immediately pursued, it is still necessary to review the Tentative Case Statement and make final decisions based on the financial feasibility revealed in the Study. Respond in public to their concerns and recommendations. Invite again their participation. Demonstrate that leadership is listening.

Recommendation #4

Whatever decisions are made, share as soon as possible plans and a calendar with the congregation. Increase significantly all publicity concerning this project.

Recommendation #5

If and when leadership decides to launch a campaign, 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. Paul'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