

St. Chad's Building Committee 3
Meeting #34
10/19/08

Attendees – Bob Gough, Merri Jean Jones, Debra Kincaid, Susan Carson, Bo Keith, Paul Apodaca, Father Brian Winter, Eileen Simpson, Rich Simpson, Rich Lehoucq

Guests – Ruth Miller, Sherry Holmen

Handouts provided prior to meeting: agenda, summarization report of Small Group Gatherings

Bob Gough, Chair, opened the meeting and gave the prayer.

Bob explained that the proposed agenda for this meeting had been condensed to achieve three primary objectives: 1) to draw a conclusion from the information presented on the small group gatherings; 2) to outline a plan to communicate the conclusion to the congregation; and 3) to chart a way forward, preferably by making a recommendation to the vestry at its meeting on 11/9/08. Eileen asked that approval of expenses be added to the agenda. The agenda was adopted with this addition.

Rich Simpson motioned that the minutes from BC3-33 of 7/6/08, submitted by Eileen via email, be approved. The motion was seconded by Susan Carson and passed unanimously.

Financial Report:

Paul Apodaca distributed a financial report, current as of 9/30/08. Net projected cash flow (through 2010) for the building project stands at approximately \$552,000. There is some question as to whether contributions received in 2007 apply to 2008 pledges or are in addition to any formal pledging. Paul Ballmer and Paul Brocard are working to resolve the issue.

Bob Gough mentioned that an anonymous gift of stock, worth approximately \$42,000, has been received. The gift was received during the transition between church treasurers, and was not liquidated at the time of receipt. Given the recent downturn of the stock market, the Finance Committee has decided to defer liquidation of the stock until the market recovers. Neither this gift, nor the earlier gift of a painting, are reflected in the financial reports. Paul will add them as a footnote to the statements.

The recent repair of the well will be paid out of St. Chad's working budget, rather than from the designated "Special Reserve (sewer/water connection)" line item of \$33,000 in the Building Fund.

Reports on the Small Group Meetings (SGM):

Bob thanked those who worked so diligently in organizing, implementing, and compiling the results of the SGM, particularly Eileen Simpson, Sherry Holmen, Ruth Miller, Cathy Conn, and all the hosts and facilitators.

At the outset, Sherry commented that the attendance of 41% of parishioners in the SGM was very good in terms of statistical significance.

Eileen distributed a handout charting the responses/comments made during the SGM by category and by key questions (adaptations, financial viewpoint, “should we build”). She gave examples of comments that were placed into each category.

The question “should we build”? was not posed directly to the SGM participants; however, comments that included references to the issue were included under the “should we build” section.

The communications subcommittee outlined a brief analysis and listed the most common comments on page 14-16 of the summarization but did not attempt to make a recommendation based on the analysis.

Ruth said that the SGM process was not a scientific study, as there was not strict consistency in questions asked, facilitator methods, and reporting. There was a conscious attempt on the part of the SGM team to be transparent; i.e., to group and present the findings of the SGM with no bias or attempt to interpret data.

Merri Jean noted that part of the goal of the SGM process was to draw more parishioners into the building process and address the feeling that the BC3 was forcing a decision on the parish. To that end, the goal was achieved.

Debra brought up the idea of asking Terri Mathes to review the data. Bob reminded the committee that Terri was initially engaged to determine if a “close the gap” financial campaign would be feasible, and to engage the congregation to get a convergence of opinion about the building process. Her area of expertise is not in processing data, and would be an additional expense. Bob added that the SGM process had been successful in engaging the congregation, and that there had been some small measure of convergence, but not enough to give solid direction to BC3; and that the question of “close the gap” was not addressed directly.

The group discussed ways to continue the communication process with the congregation, including posting the summary on the website, making copies available for “check-out”, holding a congregational meeting, and a mailing. The topic of communicating the summary was deferred until the group addressed the questions of “what messages have we gleaned from the SGM” and “what is our suggested way forward”.

Discussion of the “the messages gleaned” included the need for prudent financial management, slowing down, making something happen with existing funds, and preserving the personality of St. Chad’s. Given the current financial climate and the

nature of the comments, the committee agreed that a secondary “close the gap” pledge drive was not advisable at this time. Several members expressed the opinion that we should defer the building process until the real and/or psychological effects of the economic situation changed. One outcome of deferring, however, might be to curtail growth in attendance. Father Brian noted that this might already be occurring, as attendance has hit a plateau of 160-180 and has not seen growth in several months.

The decision to defer would also create the need to address the issue of existing funds; i.e., giving those who pledged money the option of leaving the funds for a future building project or returning the funds.

Bob reminded the group that the BC3’s charge is to implement the building process, as that was the decision made by the vestry in 2007; we can make a recommendation to defer building but the final decision will rest with the vestry.

Rich suggested that we rework the financial data with a reduced budget, including what is pledged so far and what might be prudently borrowed, and go back to Bill Fanning for some idea of what we might do with the existing funds. After some discussion of whether the focus might be on the sanctuary or on the office/classroom space, the committee decided that a focus on the sanctuary might best achieve the objectives of continuing growth and addressing the comments made by parishioners.

The committee agreed to move forward with a new look at the financial picture. Bob, Rich, Susan and Debra will meet to review the data; Bob will call Bill Fanning and let him know that we are looking for some idea of what might be done with a smaller budget. In the interim, the Communication Subcommittee’s report on the SGM will be made available to the congregation, along with the information that BC3 is exploring the idea of a smaller building project. The target for recommendation to the vestry is still 11/9/08.

Eileen will ask Leslea Lehoucq to add the SGM summarization to the website. Father Brian will address the SGM process in his November column of the View, and include the notice that the report can be checked out through the church office.

Approval of Expenses:

Eileen submitted expenses of \$462.54 in conjunction with SGM process (supplies, mailings, etc.). Bo moved to approve the expenses; Merri Jean second the motion and it passed unanimously.

Other Old Business:

The well is now repaired, and the cost will be paid from the operating budget, as noted above. However, the issue of connecting to either Sandia Peak Services or the City of Albuquerque/Bernalillo (ABCWUA) for water/sewer services is still being pursued. ABCWUA feels that they have authority and would oppose a hook-up to Sandia Peak Services. Don Jones is looking into the claim of jurisdiction.

The next BC3 meeting, scheduled for November 2, is tentative, pending the rework of the financial data and the information from Bill Fanning.