# **TIME LINE OVERVIEW FOR CHURCH RENOVATION**

**2005** Under the direction of Father Lee, the parish of Holy Family began to look into the potential of building a new church and other parish facilities. With the help of parishioners on the Building and Facilities Committee an architect was hired and an estimate was given to Fr. Lee. The costs would be somewhere around <u>\$7Million</u>.

**2006** To help the parish with the feasibility of this plan, Guidance In Giving, Inc. was hired to run a parishwide Feasibility Study. To see if there was support for NEW facilities versus a repair and renovation plan.

The results of that Study were:

Fr. Lee Invited for interview	PARTICIPATED IN THE INTERVIEW	
104	62	
SURVEYS MAILED TO FAMILIES	Responded to Mail Survey	
662	128	
TOTAL RESPONSES	<b>190</b> FAMILIES OR	
I OTAL ILLOI ONGLO	<b>29%</b> OF THE PARISH	

Overwhelming response for new was not there.

Response To New Church, Religious Education Center and Parish Hall	TOTAL Reponses	Percent Responded
Positive	76	42%
NEGATIVE	49	<b>F</b> 00/
Unsure	56	58%
TOTAL REPSONSES	181	100%

The biggest concern of parishioners who responded "UNSURE" was the cost. Where is the money going to come from?

RENOVATING AND EXPANDING CURRENT CHURCH- (MAIL SURVEY ONLY)	Totals	Percent Responded
Positive	65	51%
NEGATIVE	26	20%
UNSURE	37	29%
TOTAL REPSONSES	128	100%

51% of those responding supported renovation of the current church.

GIFT RANGE	TOTALS
\$25K-UP	2
\$15K-\$24,99	2
\$10к-\$14,999	5
\$5к-\$9,999	14
\$2,500-\$4,999	17
\$1-\$2,499	30
TOTAL	70
\$0	16
UNSURE/NO RESPONSE	91
FINANCIAL RESPONSES FROM 72 FAMILIES	\$207,410
AVERAGE PLEDGE	\$2,880

If a capital campaign was implemented the parish would need to see sizable support with a high average gift in order to raise the necessary funds to build NEW facilities. As can be seen by the above numbers the parish would have the capability to raise approximately \$1Million in a successful campaign (40% participation at the current average pledge).

**<u>2007/2012/2015</u>**: Increased offertory plan implemented at parish, to help meet operating expenses.

**2008**: Recession Hits Country, stock market and real estate market suffer significant declines.

**2009**: School roof begins leaking and the warranty is voided due too the death of the roofer.

**<u>2009-2011</u>**: Plan was formulated to move forward with a capital campaign to address the school roof, school doors and windows, church tuck pointing, repairs at Holy Cross Cemetery and St. Mary Cemetery, and bathrooms at the church.

#### CAPITAL CAMPAIGN LAUNCHED "CELEBRATING OUR HERITAGE/INVESTING IN OUR FUTURE"

**Late 2011-2014:** The Capital Campaign was implemented and we received a total of \$952,500 in pledges. The total amount of pledges lost to date is \$65,415.07 (7%), leaving a total of \$887,085.93 in pledges. The total amount in pledge payments received to date is \$881,392.02, leaving a balance of pledges to be collected totaling \$4,342.91. If we do not receive any more in pledge payments, the total for lost pledges would increase to \$71,107.98 (7.61%).We have also earned \$7,086.65 in interest over the past three years.

The \$880,922.40 in expenditures (see list below) was paid using \$873,835.95 of the pledge payments received + the \$7,086.65 in earned interest.

CAPITAL CAMPAIGN PROJECTS:	Cost
SCHOOL ROOF/CHIMNEY	\$315,548.10
SCHOOL WINDOWS/DOORS	\$460,980.00
CHURCH TUCK POINTING	\$4,394.50
HOLY CROSS CEMETERY REPAIRS	\$50,000.00
ST. MARY'S CEMETERY REPAIRS	\$50,000.00
EXPENDITURES TO DATE:	<u>\$880,922.60</u>

The remaining balance available for use on the bathroom project is approximately \$9,000.

A plan to address the doors and windows of the school was compiled by the Facilities & Maintenance Committee. This committee hired an architect who came up with an estimate for the doors and windows at the school, replacing some of the window sections with solid panels (**Option 1**). The architectural estimate was a cost of \$321,350, not including fees and design costs. There were no alternative plans put forth to compare different designs.

The Finance Council, under the direction of Fr. Laible, put together a group of parishioners to explore other options. This group reviewed a project at Chester-East Lincoln School that was comparable to what the parish was looking to accomplish. At this point **Option 2** was devised, which incorporated bigger windows that let in more light.

### **PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS & CONTRACTORS CONSULTED ON BOTH OPTIONS**

Mays Maune McWard Inc. did a complete proposal for <u>both options</u>. They bid Option 2 in January of 2014. The base bid came in at <u>\$460,980</u> for windows and doors. They bid Option 1 in March of 2014. The base bid for Option 1 came in at <u>\$467,485</u> for windows & doors, which is about \$6,500 higher than Option 2. Fr. Laible and members of the Finance Council consulted professional educators and looked at studies done in schools to determine the best option for the students, since the cost of both options were quite close. It was found that student performance was increased when more natural light was provided in the classrooms. In addition, simply replacing the windows as they were would not change the look of the school, so Option 2 was chosen.

Option	Соят	
Option 1	\$467,485	
<b>Option 2</b>	\$460,980	

# STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS - WJE FROM NORTHBROOK, IL

Also during this time, the Finance Council worked with an engineering firm to check the structural integrity of the church building.

Two Studies: One to determine the structural integrity of the bell tower, which resulted in the removal of the tower. The second study was conducted to determine the structural integrity of the Church and what repairs would be need to be completed in order to secure the future of the Church building.

# PARISH SURVEY'S MAY 27/28, 2014

The results of the engineering study were presented to the congregation at two parish meetings, May 27 and 28, 2014. The lead engineer from WJE stated that the bones of the Church were good, and repair and renovation of the building was a viable option. Parishioners could consider building a new Church, but it was not necessary based on his firm's assessment of the current building.

# A good steward would repair and renovate verse spending \$7Million on a new church, just to have "NEW".

## 2014 PARISH SURVEY

When we conducted the 2014 survey, we received <u>121 completed surveys</u>.

If you look at New Church versus Structural Repair/Renovation it is close, but when you add in the Structural only and either new or repair, that number changes dramatically. You have 58.6% of all votes for some kind of repair versus 20.66% for a new Church.

RESPONSE	# of Families	PERCENTAGE OF SUPPORT
UNSURE	13	10.74%
New Church	25	20.66%
STRUCTURAL/RENOVATION	44	
STRUCTURAL ONLY	21	58.6%
SUPPORT EITHER NEW CHURCH OR REPAIR/RENOVATE	18	
TOTAL	121	100%

As can be seen by the chart, there is insufficient support for a new church, which reinforces the path we have recommended, to repair and renovate our current historical church.

#### **2006 SURVEY RESULTS**

190 families responded. 62 in person and 128 mail surveys. 58% responded negatively to a building a new Church/religious education center.

51% of those returning mail survey's responded favorably to repair/renovation of the current church.

#### **2014 SURVEY RESULTS**

121 surveys completed. 20.66% responded favorably to a new church. 58.6% responded positively to repair and renovation of the current church.

#### **COST COMPARISON OF RENOVATION VS. NEW CONSTRUCTION**

#### The Cost Factor Involved

**2015-2016:** Finance Council, in review of the surveys and reports submitted, found there was more than enough support for repair and renovation of the current church building. To build new was cost-prohibitive and financially irresponsible, at this time.

#### **DIOCESAN REQUIREMENTS FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION**

The diocesan guidelines state that all parishes need 50% of the cost of the project in hand when construction begins and the remaining 50% to be able to be paid off in 5 years (max).

Campaign	RENOVATION AND REPAIR	New Church
Cost of Project	\$1,150,000	\$5M-\$7M
NUMBER OF CAMPAIGNS TO COMPLETE PROJECT	1	5-7
DURATION OF REDEMPTION FOR CAMPAIGN (S)	<b>3</b> years	15-25 years
COST TO REPAIR CHURCH DURING REDEMPTION OF MULTIPLE CAMPAIGNS		\$1,150,00
TOTAL COSTS	\$1,150,000	\$6.1M-\$8.1M

All the research and fact gathering states we could potentially raise \$1M on the high end in a successful campaign for a new church (based on 2006 numbers). That would mean, unless we have a few significant six figure gifts we would need to do a minimum of 5 consecutive campaigns over the next 15+ years, during which time the church would still need to be repaired so that we would be able to continue to worship in it. Either way the church needs to be repaired and renovated.

# And Peter said to them, 'Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ..." Acts 2:38

The word "repent" means to turn from sin, to change our actions. When it comes to change, do we take responsibility for change or do we think that others have to change instead? Change that is permanent comes from within, we must take control and be disciplined. Remember though that we are not alone, Jesus is there to help lighten the load.