

Table of Contents

Item	Page
I. Introduction.....	2
II. Data and Analysis.....	3
III. Observations, Conclusions, Recommendations.....	14
IV. Summary	17
V. Thank you.....	19
 <i>Appendices</i>	

*Feasibility Study for Community
Evangelical Free Church Elverson,
PA*

I. Introduction

The congregation of Community Evangelical Free Church (CEFC) has been experiencing the blessing of God upon its ministries. Sunday morning's two worship services are well attended.

Holiday seating in the sanctuary has spilled into the narthex. Other ministries such as youth, young adults, and Sunday School classes are pressed for space on a regular basis. Off campus rentals, an on-campus tent, and space in members' homes are helping to accommodate the overflow of some of these groups.

Several plans for expanding facilities have been explored over the past 5-7 years. In November 2012, the congregation approved a budget of \$1.5 million to expand facilities to the west side of the property in order to accommodate youth and worship. As the Building Committee studied all aspects of need within the church's ministries, it came to be their conviction that the scope of the plan proposed in November 2012 was inadequate to address all areas of need. As a result, a plan much larger in scope was developed for presentation to the congregation. Cost for this expanded plan is estimated at \$4.5 million for the first phase of completion.

The services of Kirby-Smith Associates were contracted to assist with a feasibility study to measure responses to this plan from members and attendees. Letters and information were sent to church households in early and mid-September outlining the new plan and inviting all parishioners to an informational meeting after services on September 29. At that meeting, the expanded plan was presented in greater detail, the feasibility study was explained, and time for questions was entertained. Each household received a questionnaire and instructions. Those not in attendance had materials sent to them by mail.

Members and attendees were asked to participate in an interview with the Kirby-Smith consultant, Jeff Knauer, to discuss their responses to the questionnaire. Interviews were held at the church on Oct. 6, 8, 10, 14, and 19. Those who could not attend an interview were asked to submit questionnaires in writing. Participation was as follows:

	Total Individuals	Members	Not Yet Members	Households
Interviews	157	144	13	90
Written	180	120	60	113
Total	337	264	73	203

This level of participation represents approximately three-fourths of current members and better than one-third of attendees who are not yet members. This level of participation strongly validates the results of the feasibility study for the purpose of measuring participants' responses to the proposed plan and other questions posed.

II. Data and Analysis

Each question that was posed on the questionnaire employed by the study will be treated separately. Results will be shown for the group who was interviewed, those who submitted only written responses, and the overall totals. Brief comments will be offered while a more in-depth analysis of results will be offered later in the study.

Please note: Not all participants responded to every question. Non-respondent totals will be noted but percentages will be based on those who answered.

Question 1 Years in Attendance

	Interviews		Written		Overall	
0 – 5 Years	27	17%	52	30%	79	24%
6 – 10 Years	32	20%	25	15%	57	17%
11 – 19 Years	47	30%	56	33%	103	31%
20 Years or More	51	32%	39	23%	90	27%
No Response	0		8		8	
Members	144		120		264	
Not Yet Members	13		60		73	
Totals	157		180		337	

This first question was asked in order to establish demographics for study participants. The question asked how many years the participant has been attending CEFC. The church has a well-balanced pattern of attendance, which suggests a loyal core of longer attending members in addition to newer members.

An interesting pattern emerges when measuring by the decade. There were 27% who have been attending for 20 years or more, 31 % have been attending for 11-19 years, and 41% have been attending for 0-10 years. There is a definitive pattern of growth among study participants. This factor can be helpful in determining the church’s future direction.

Question 2
Overall View of the Church

	Interviews		Written		Overall	
Very Favorable	126	80%	120	68%	246	74%
Favorable	29	18%	53	30%	82	25%
Neutral	1	1%	4	2%	5	1%
Unfavorable	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%
No Response	0		3		3	

This question was asked for the purpose of soliciting an overall opinion of the church apart from the proposed project. The reason for the question was to gain a sense of the spiritual temperature of participants as their overall view of the church can have an effect towards any proposed project.

Of the 337 participants, a positive view was held by 99%, with 74% being very favorable and 25% being favorable. There was 1% who had a neutral opinion of the church, while only one participant indicated an unfavorable viewpoint. These results suggest that the vast majority of study participants are quite satisfied with their church and its ministries.

This does not suggest that there is no need for improvement, but members and attendees feel blessed by the church’s preaching, teaching, and ministries. Many parents also commented that their children were blessed by youth and children’s ministries.

Question 3
Involvement in the Church

	Interviews		Written		Overall	
Very Involved	76	48%	33	19%	109	33%
Involved	56	36%	69	39%	125	37%
Somewhat Involved	20	13%	49	28%	69	21%
Not Very Involved	5	3%	27	15%	32	10%
Want to Become More Involve	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
No Response	0		2		2	

This question was asked in order to measure the level of involvement of study participants in the church. The reason for the question was to ensure that the pool of participants represented the broadest span of members from the most involved to those who are less involved. A secondary purpose was to measure how involved members see themselves to be as this often indicates the level of ownership people feel regarding church matters.

There were 91% of participants who saw themselves involved at some level; 33% very involved, 37% involved, and 21% somewhat involved. This compares to an average national benchmark of 60% involvement of church members, suggesting a stronger than average commitment on the part of participants at CEFC. This level of involvement also indicated strong interest in Christian service along with a sense of loyalty to the church.

Question 4
How Well the Revised Plan is Understood

	Interviews		Written		Overall	
Very Well	52	33%	30	17%	82	24%
Well Enough	72	46%	112	63%	184	55%
Somewhat	29	18%	30	17%	59	18%
Not Enough	4	3%	5	3%	9	3%
Not at All	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%
No Response	0		2		2	

This question was asked to determine if information about the revised plan, along with pros and cons, was understood by study participants. A clear enough understanding is necessary for people to offer comments in a meaningful way. There were 79% who

indicated they understood the revised plan very well or well enough. Another 18% somewhat understood the information provided. This response suggests that the distribution of information and subsequent presentation of the plan was successful in communicating with most participants. Plans at this stage are still conceptual, awaiting a response from the congregation as to how a project might proceed.

Participants were invited to share comments and questions at this point. In order to measure trends of thought, those offered by 9 participants or more are listed.

24 said that more details would be helpful. Not a lot has been communicated about how much will actually be completed in Phase 1.

24 said we would rather see space for the teens and classrooms added more quickly.

22 asked what the plan is for a new kitchen, stressing that it needs to be fully functional from day 1.

22 said that the kitchen needs to be designed by those who use it most.

14 said they like the fact that the expanded plan offers more room for fellowship and teaching space.

12 asked what was the main reason for expansion? Do we have a projection for growth that shows we need a larger facility? Will Elverson support a church this size?

11 asked what is the timeframe for construction and a capital campaign?

10 asked why is this plan so much larger when we only need space a few times a year during holidays?

10 said that larger restrooms for the ladies are needed in this plan.

9 asked how large the foyer will be, stressing the need to share hospitality.

9 said that disabilities issues needed to be understood, such as classrooms needing enough space to accommodate special needs children.

9 said that this plan offered more sanctuary space that is much needed.

Question 5
Support for Moving Forward with this Revised Plan

	Interviews		Written		Overall	
Very Supportive	68	43%	40	23%	108	33%
Supportive	39	25%	69	39%	108	33%
Supportive with Reservations	43	27%	43	25%	86	26%
Not Supportive	5	3%	12	7%	17	5%
Undecided	2	1%	11	6%	13	4%
No Response	0		5		5	

This question was asked for the purpose of measuring the congregation’s response to moving forward with the revised plan that was presented. There were 92% of study participants who indicated support for moving forward; 33% very supportive, 33% supportive, and 26% supportive with reservations. There were 5% who were not supportive and 4% were undecided. This response suggests strong support for moving ahead with the revised plan.

Again, participants were invited to comment at this point. Responses given by 10 or more participants are listed. Many of the responses given reflect thoughts of those who were supportive with reservations.

57 said they were confident in the elders and building committee members. They have prayerfully considered this and trusted their leadership.

47 said that this plan made sense. It builds for the future and prevents building again in just a few years.

43 said we need to do this. We need the space. Our church is growing and we need to accommodate those who are coming. Let’s not drag our feet.

20 asked if a church plant was being considered as opposed to expansion.

18 said they were concerned over the total cost and size of the project.

17 said they liked the fact that services will not be disrupted during construction.

15 said they liked the fact that this plan preserves the west lawn and uses less useable lawn area.

12 said they preferred a smaller size church where the people and clergy know each other well.

10 said that this is too big a project for a church this size.

Question 6
Support for a 3-Year Capital Campaign

	Interviews		Written		Overall	
Very Supportive	70	45%	21	12%	91	27%
Supportive	50	32%	72	41%	122	37%
Supportive with Some Reservations	30	19%	65	37%	95	29%
Not Supportive	3	2%	10	6%	13	4%
Undecided	4	3%	7	4%	11	3%
No Response	0		5		5	

This question asked participants how supportive they would be of a 3-year capital campaign to generate funding should the church move ahead with construction of a revised plan. There were 93% of participants who expressed support at some level; 27% being very supportive, 37% supportive, and 29% supportive with some reservations. There were 4% who were not supportive of moving forward with a 3-year capital campaign, while 3% are undecided. This suggested very strong support for this method of generating funds to address costs associated with construction of a revised plan.

A place for comments was given at this point. Not a lot of different responses were offered to this question, but those given by 5 participants or more are listed here.

25 said the church budget is tight. Can we afford this project?

16 said more information was needed on the financial plan for this project and how it would be paid.

10 said that they preferred a minimum of debt.

5 said that the church should have half the money in cash or at least as much as possible before beginning construction. Must we still have at least 30% according to our last congregational meeting?

Question 7
Range of Potential Financial Support

Per Year Amount	Int.	Written	Total	Low Range	Medium Range	High Range
Specific Range/Amount	15	6	21	\$ 149,560	\$ 153,160	\$ 156,760
\$100,000 or More	0	1	1	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000
\$50,000 - \$99,999	0	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$25,000 - \$49,999	1	1	2	\$ 150,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 300,000
\$15,000 - \$24,999	1	0	1	\$ 45,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 75,000
\$10,000 - \$14,999	0	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$8,000 - \$9,999	2	1	3	\$ 72,000	\$ 81,000	\$ 90,000
\$6,000 - \$7,999	0	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$4,000 - \$5,999	9	7	16	\$ 192,000	\$ 240,000	\$ 288,000
\$2,000 - \$3,999	10	10	20	\$ 120,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 240,000
\$1,000 - \$1,999	31	40	71	\$ 213,000	\$ 319,500	\$ 426,000
Less than \$1,000	17	30	47	\$ 0	\$ 70,500	\$ 141,000
TBD	2	6	8	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
No Additional Giving	2	11	13	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
No Response	0	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	90	113	203	\$1,241,560	\$1,629,160	\$2,016,760

This question was asked for the purpose of measuring potential contributions should a capital campaign be engaged. Though no firm commitments were registered at the time of the study, responses gave an indication of possible financial support and can be used to determine the extent to which the proposed project may progress forward.

Of the 203 households represented by study participants, 182 offered either an estimate of giving or a specific amount they have already decided upon. This represents a response rate of 90% who offered a financial estimate. Of those who did not offer a response at this time, 4% indicated they need more time to decide, while 6% were not able to offer any additional giving at this time. Of this number, some are limited in their ability to contribute at this time due to unemployment, under-employment, health issues, or other circumstances.

Responses were measured within the ranges indicated, using the low, medium, and high extents of each range. Those who offered specific amounts, or a specific range other than

those offered, remained constant throughout the chart. Figures were also rounded up to even numbers to make estimates even numbers. Should estimated giving be realized at the low range of responses, \$1,241,560 could be received from these participants. At the medium range, the total could amount to \$1,629,160. And at the high range, a total of \$2,016,760 could be received.

In order to determine a reasonable campaign goal from the data received, several factors are considered. Historically, the medium range estimate is closest to what campaigns usually realize. In this case, that amount is \$1,629,160. Other factors to consider are church households yet to be heard from, congregational demographics, economic conditions, momentum of both the project and the church itself. The study represents 203 participating households of approximately 240 total potential giving units in the church. So there are at least some potential giving households yet to be heard from. It cannot be assumed that they will participate, but it would seem possible that at least some may do so. Demographics show that there are a number of households who are retired, some nearing retirement, as well as those supporting children in college.

Some were unemployed or under employed. Some who were self-employed experience fluctuations in income. Among younger households, some are starting families, adding to their families, or repaying school loans. Yet most households are willing to contribute within their abilities to do so.

These factors weighed together suggest that the medium range estimate may be a fairly reasonable starting point at which to establish a goal. Several factors would tend toward raising that amount. There are some households yet to be heard from. A number of participants offered conservative estimates pending results of whether or not a project may move forward. Forward progress often tends to build momentum. And progress itself usually solicits additional financial support. Factors that would tend to lower the medium range estimate would be any negative economic occurrences, instability of job situations, and unforeseen circumstances.

Weighing all factors, a conservative campaign goal of \$1,250,000–\$1,425,000 should be attainable, with a stretch goal of \$1,600,000–\$1,700,000 total within a 3-year period. Comments given by 5 or more participants at this juncture include the following.

9 said our household budget is still tight, we are struggling to tithe.

9 said they are either losing a job soon, are underemployed, unemployed, expanding their family, or paying off student loans.

5 said we are sorry we do not have much to give. We are on fixed incomes with health issues.

Question 8
Support for More Than One 3-Year Commitment Period

	Interviews		Written		Overall	
Very Supportive	41	27%	19	11%	60	18%
Supportive	51	33%	60	35%	111	34%
Supportive with Some Reservations	39	25%	59	34%	98	30%
Not Supportive	12	8%	19	11%	31	10%
Undecided	11	7%	15	9%	26	8%
Unable	2		0		2	
No Response	1		8		9	

This question was asked for the purpose of measuring support for more than one 3-year commitment period should the cost of a project exceed the ability of the congregation to cover costs in one 3-year period of time. There were 82% of participants who indicated some level of support if more than one 3-year commitment period would be needed to move forward with a project; 18% being very supportive, 34% supportive, and 30% supportive with some reservations. There were 10% who were not supportive, while 8% were undecided.

This level of support suggests sufficient support is available to move forward with a project that may require more than one 3-year commitment period to financially complete.

Comments given by 5 or more participants at this juncture, regarding the possibility of a longer commitment period than 3 years, include the following.

20 said it depended on life circumstances, if I am still alive, or living in the area, or we are already planning to move.

11 said we needed more families giving than just the core families. We need to generate enough in the church budget.

10 said that 6 years is a long time. We need to know up front how long it will be.

8 said that \$4.5 million divided among 180 giving units amounts to about \$25,000 per household. We are concerned that members will stay to pay this off.

6 said that they would soon be retiring, which will affect their ability to give.

5 said they were concerned that the economy will worsen.

5 said that they prefer a mortgage to multiple campaigns.

5 said that the congregation needs to be flexible as a project this size will need more than 3 years to be paid for.

Question 9
Commitments in Memory or Honor of Someone

	Interviews		Written		Overall	
Yes	2	1%	6	3%	8	2%
Maybe	32	21%	37	21%	69	21%
No	122	78%	132	75%	254	77%
No Response	1		5		6	

This question was asked for the purpose of determining interest in making all or part of potential campaign commitments in memory or honor of someone. If sufficient interest in these options exists, campaign opportunities may be designed for this purpose. If little or no interest exists, there was no need to spend time designing opportunities should a campaign take place. Responses to the question are as follows:

Of the 331 participants who offered a response to this question, there were 77 (23%) who expressed at least some level of interest in this opportunity. It may be worthwhile to include memorial or honorary options for giving if a campaign moves forward. As parishioners learn of these opportunities, interest may grow. In any case, such opportunities may be important to certain households who wish to remember or honor loved ones through contributions to a meaningful project such as this one. Recognition of such gifts may be accomplished by a method in keeping with the church's pattern of avoiding specific accolades or attaching plaques to items.

Question 10
Additional Comments, Ideas, Concerns, or Suggestions

This question was meant to offer participants a final opportunity to comment on any aspect of the proposed expanded project. While all input offered is of value, the purpose of the study is to measure leading trends of thought. Therefore, those responses given by 5 or more participants are included in this report, along with the number of participants who made similar statements.

17 said they would prefer one service together.

16 said new nursery space was needed with a sleeping room for babies and a nursing room for moms.

15 asked if we can address youth space sooner. They need and have been promised space. Perhaps a separate youth building can be built.

15 said basement fellowship space was a good idea. This will benefit many ministry groups.

14 said the feasibility study was very important, a good way to handle this process. It will validate results.

12 asked how much more will be needed in the general budget to maintain the additional space?

11 said they were concerned that a larger building will require more ushers and greeters than were currently available.

8 said we need classrooms sooner than the renovation timeframe.

7 said we can help with fundraisers. Will the elders allow fundraising events to be part of this effort?

5 said this is a lot of money for a building. Much could be done for missions with that much money.

Many other ideas, concerns, and suggestions were offered. While some comments may seem critical, it should be remembered that participants were invited to share their thoughts in a confidential format. Therefore, comments were received with appreciation to those who took the time to offer them. All those who were part of the congregation were invited to do so. Those who participated assisted in identifying those things which, when addressed, may make CEFC an even better place to be.

III. Observations, Conclusions, Recommendations

Observations

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

1. The congregation of CEFC includes a wide spectrum of age groups with an abundance of children and teens, young adults, families, and seniors. These groups have blended well together to form a strong and vibrant church. Most enjoy close relationships among other church members, and maintain a sense of belonging and purpose as part of CEFC.
2. There is a strong sense of loyalty to church leaders, including the pastoral staff, elders, and other key committees. Teaching is taken seriously. Involvement is personal.
3. Many members and attendees heeded the invitation to participate in the feasibility study. Responses were thoughtful and detailed. Participants are interested in the future of CEFC and their part in that future.
4. Most recognize that CEFC has been growing. Those excited by this growth see it as the result of relevant ministry, a fulfillment of CEFC's reason for being. They are interested in seeing this growth accommodated with sufficient space for worship and ministry. A much smaller contingency is not as excited by the growth, preferring a smaller, more intimate-sized congregation where members and clergy enjoy closer relationships. Some from this group wonder if the idea of a church plant may not provide a better solution.
5. A strong majority are in favor of moving forward with the revised plan. Focus is on providing space to worship together, accommodating youth on campus, adding classrooms, and making room for fellowship and proper hospitality. Many more comments and discussions centered on having space as opposed to the specific architectural details of the space.
6. Though some are economically challenged due to various circumstances, most are willing to contribute to the best of their abilities. There is a reasonable level of concern over both the affordability of the project and the ongoing condition of the general budget. From comments heard and read, it would seem as though more participants would rather consider some concessions to the plan than stretch the budget beyond reasonable limits.

Conclusions

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

1. This study began with a desire on the part of church leaders to gather input from the congregation regarding the revised plan to add space to the church facility. In order to make the study results viable, a participation goal of at least half the membership and as many attendees as possible was established. A total of 264 members and 73 attendees who are not yet members participated, representing about three-fourths of members and better than a third of attendees. This number of individuals represents a total of 203 households. Participation at this level renders study results as very representative of the views of the overall congregation.
2. Church growth is seen in the results of the question about years in attendance. There were 27% of participants who have been attending for 20 years or more, 31% for 11-19 years, and 41% for 10 years or less. Youth and several other groups are using various facilities and homes off campus to hold gatherings.
3. Participants have a very positive view of CEFC. There were 99% who hold to that view, with 74% being very favorable and 25% favorable.
4. There were 92% who support moving forward with the revised plan; 33% being very supportive, 33% being supportive, and 26% being supportive with reservations. A strong sense of trust and confidence is given to the leadership of elders and the building team. The merits of the plan itself made sense to many. Reservations centered on cost and affordability, growth to a larger size congregation, and economic concerns.
5. A 3-year capital campaign to generate funding for a project has the support of 93% of participants while 90% offered a potential estimate of giving should a campaign take place. Using the low, medium, and high ranges of giving selected, the totals of estimates offered amount to a low range of \$1,241,560 to a medium range of \$1,629,160 to a high range of \$2,016,760. Tempering these estimates with a number of economic and demographical factors, a conservative campaign goal could be established at \$1,250,000–\$1,425,000. A stretch goal could be set in the range of \$1,600,000–\$1,700,000. While these totals do not cover the entire projected cost of the proposed project, it should be noted that most churches attempting a major project such as this one expect the payoff period to be at least 10 years. Those who work aggressively and give generously can reduce that period, and the faithfulness of God must never be discounted or forgotten.

6. Should a project budget be designed to include more than one 3-year capital campaign commitment period, 82% of participants have given some measure of support to that idea.
7. Regarding comments shared throughout the study, the three most mentioned response were these; 57 said they have confidence and trust in elders and building committee leaders, 47 said that the plan makes sense, building for the future and not having to build again in a few years, and 43 said we need to do this, our church is growing and we need to accommodate those who are coming, let's not drag our feet.
8. Overall, the congregation is poised to move forward. Space is needed. Some feel as though plans are overdue. The challenge will be meeting the requirements of the final version of a plan to the financial constraints. Within the comments and questions offered by study participants, along with prayerful consideration, answers may be found.

Recommendations

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

1. Based on the level of information gathered in the study, we recommend the results be shared with the entire church family. We suggest a verbal report be arranged before the congregation, along with the distribution of summary reports. The entire report can be made available electronically, with hard copies available to those who may not have internet access. This step will help assure an ongoing practice of open communication throughout the process, which is something that is desired by members.
2. Since forward progress with a revised plan is strongly supported and a projected budget is established, we recommend that leaders determine a course of action. This course of action may involve adjustments to the design and phasing of the project, adjustments to the timeline for project payoff, or both. The congregation should be kept informed of progress on a regular basis as final decisions are made.
3. Since financial resources will be required to proceed with a project, we recommend engaging a capital campaign as soon as possible to begin generating funds. As part of the campaign process, we suggest helping the congregation to understand needs and methods of giving so everyone may understand the concepts and options from

which to choose. A variety of giving choices will enable a greater level of participation. The capital campaign preparation period will also allow leaders to clarify project details and costs to members so expenditures are fully understood before firm commitments are made. As part of the campaign process, overall stewardship education may be included to strengthen the pattern of regular giving as well, if leaders believe that aspect would be of value to the church.

4. Following the receiving of commitments, cash flow can be determined based on how members decide to make their contributions and the extent of any project can then be completely finalized. If the congregation makes a decision to proceed with a project, campaign planning can run concurrently with final project design so that commitments could be ready to be received when the project design and budget are prepared. A campaign could be planned throughout the early months of 2014 with commitments received sometime in the spring.
5. As planning and construction progress moves forward, we recommend that regular verbal and written updates be communicated to members. A clear accounting of amounts committed, received, and spent should be noted along with attention to items completed. This will maintain trust in leadership and momentum in project giving throughout the commitment period.
6. Kirby-Smith Associates is familiar with the project, the congregation, and all data gathered, and is prepared to guide CEFC through a capital campaign process. While churches may be capable of conducting campaigns themselves, fees saved are often eclipsed by the results of professional guidance that bring to light many additional methods of giving that members would not have thought of by themselves. Major campaigns also involve a level of complexity with which most members are not familiar. Mistakes can be avoided and effectiveness can be maximized with the church realizing a much higher measure of giving, easily absorbing the additional cost. We highly recommend following this course.

IV. Summary

Pastor Steve Estes, the Elders, the Finance/Communications Committee led by Cliff Montgomery, and the Building/Design Committee are to be thanked for their time, efforts, and prayers in preparing CEFC for this very important step forward. The proposal of a revised plan to expand the church facility reflected not only a need to address space issues but also a vision to prepare for growth of ministry into the future.

A total of 264 members and 73 attendees, representing 203 households, participated in the study. This number represents more than 75% of the membership, plus more than a third of attendees, providing a substantial cross section of the church family for purposes of the study. Demographical survey questions found that 27% of study participants have been

attending CEFC 20 years or more, 31% for 11-19 years, and 41% 10 years or less. This establishes a pattern of regular and sustained growth. There were 99% who have a favorable overall view of the church and 91% consider themselves involved at some level.

There were 79% who understood the presentation associated with the revised plan very well or well enough, with another 18% having somewhat of an understanding of details. This suggests that while distribution of information was successful, communication may be improved. The number one comment at this juncture was that more details would be helpful. Other leading input asked if teen and classroom space could be added more quickly, and stressing a conviction that the new kitchen needed to be functional within the first phase of the project.

There were 92% who gave support to moving forward with a revised plan; 33% being very supportive, 33% supportive, and 26% supportive with reservations. There were 5% who were not supportive with 4% undecided. The largest number of comments were offered at this point in the study. There were 57 participants who expressed confidence and trust in the elders and the building committee. There were 47 who said that the plan makes sense as it builds for the future, avoiding construction again in a few years. In addition, 43 said that we need to do this, we need the space, our church is growing and we need to accommodate those who are coming, let's not drag our feet. Reservations centered on cost and size of the project, and preference of a smaller size church.

A 3-year capital campaign to generate project funding was supported by 93% with an estimate of potential giving offered by 90% of participants. Totals for estimated giving over a 3-year period ranged from a low range of \$1,241,560 to a medium range of \$1,629,160 to a high range of \$2,016,760. Factoring in a number of considerations, including demographics and economic conditions, a conservative campaign goal in the range of \$1,250,000–\$1,425,000 should be attainable. A stretch goal of \$1,600,000–\$1,700,000 may also be within reach. Leading comments at this point were led by 25 participants voicing concern over the church budget being tight and a total of 23 sharing how they have been negatively impacted by the economy, affecting their abilities to contribute. If the funding of a project would require more than one 3-year commitment period, 82% were supportive, 10% were not supportive, and 8% undecided. The main comment here mentioned life circumstances, if people are still alive after 3 years, and the possibility of moving from the area. Giving in memory or honor of someone drew interest from 23% of participants.

The final survey question offered participants the opportunity to add further comments, ideas, concerns, or suggestions. Topping the list was a comment from 17 people saying they would prefer one worship service together. There were 16 who mentioned the need for better nursery space with a sleeping room for babies. There were 15 who asked about addressing the need for youth space sooner and 15 felt that basement fellowship space is an idea that will benefit many ministry groups.

After weighing all data supplied by the study, it is recommended that study details be shared with the congregation. It is recommended that a plan of action for moving forward be decided upon by leadership and, if a new congregational vote is required, that it be considered by the congregation for approval. This plan of action may involve adjustments to the design. It may also involve phasing of the project or of the timeline for project payoff, or both.

It is recommended that a capital campaign be started as soon as possible to begin generating funding for the project. It is recommended that professional guidance for the campaign be employed so as to assist members in learning of the broadest list of options for giving available, thus maximizing potential campaign results. And it is recommended that members be fully informed of campaign progress from funds committed and raised to monies spent and steps completed.

With the support of members and friends, and by God's grace, the congregation of CEFC may expect satisfying campaign results and a positive future.

V. Thank you

It is with great appreciation that we thank you for allowing Kirby-Smith Associates to assist you with this feasibility study.

A special note of thanks is extended to Pastor Steve Estes, the Elders, the members of the Finance/Communications Committee led by Cliff Montgomery, and the Building/Design Committee. Thanks are also given to John Barber and the office staff for contacting participants and arranging interview schedules. A final word of thanks goes to the 337 participants who gave their time and thought in offering input to the study questions.

As a decision to proceed is made, Kirby-Smith Associates would be honored to conduct a capital campaign for CEFC should you move forward. We will work with you, exerting the same diligence and care to design and conduct a campaign that will achieve your goals.

Again, thank you very much. It has been a distinct pleasure to serve you. We will join you in prayer for the success of your journey. God bless you.