



CSO SCHENKEL SHULTZ

Meeting Report

PROJECT: St. Pius X Master Plan

PROJECT NO: 26103

LOCATION: St. Pius X

MEETING DATE: 11/15/2006

BY: Rosemary W. Rehak

REPORT DATE: 11/

PARTICIPANTS:

Maureen Allen
Paul Brumleve
Ted Caron
Mary Cates
Colleen Daniels
Andrew F. Davey
Susan De Lisle
Theresa Desautels
Rob Doyle
Max Eckert
Charles Farrell
Steve Ferguson
Ann Frey
Roland Gamache
Ellie Hawes
Mike Hoffmire
Mike Huntine
Eric Kellison
George Kempf
Jim Laudick
Kathy Laudick
Annie Martin
Mike Martin
Laurie McCormick
Barb Moriarity
Michael Nash
Scott Nickerson
Mark Nondorf
David Prechtel
Kathleen Prechtel
Rosemary Rehak
Jim Schellinger
Michael Scott
Jerry Semler
Susan Tsangaris

CSO Schenkel Shultz will proceed in reliance on this report. Any discrepancies should be brought to our attention in writing within seven (7) days.

SPX-FacilityMstrPlan-MtgNotes-061115a.doc

Page 1 of 4

PROGRAMMING • PLANNING • DESIGN

Meeting Report

Sharon Wagner
Bud Watts

1. Mike Hoffmire welcomed everyone and opened the meeting with a prayer.
2. Jim Schellinger reviewed the final evaluation from the master plan and the Building Committee's recommendation of Option 4A . He also presented the costs connected to the plan . Jim stated that the committee wanted to move forward to the Implementation Phase, but after discussion, decided that additional input from the Parish Council was crucial before moving forward. Getting that additional input was the reason for convening this evening's meeting. Jim directed everyone present to the final diagram in the handouts that showed all of the areas of renovation and construction with their connected costs to begin the discussion of Implementation. Jim then asked for input and/or questions from the group.
3. George Kempf, chair of the Capital Campaign Committee, asked Jim to explain the difference between hard and soft costs for the benefit of those new to the process. Jim indicated that hard costs were actually the "bricks and mortar" construction costs while soft costs included any additional fees that were connected with the building project, such as architect fees, soil testing, etc.
4. There was a question of whether or not there would be a possibility of additional costs because of the increased size. Jim answered that there would be additional costs in terms of operational costs because of the additional square footage. Those figures had not yet been determined. The archdiocese will require at least 2 years of the operational costs in the bank before beginning construction.
5. A question was asked about what was available right now from the capital campaign. George responded that there was about \$1million dollars available for the project with the endowment and the percentage for the diocese already taken out.
6. The question was raised about whether or not we should continue to raise money to try and get enough to get one of the areas of new construction built?
7. The question was asked about whether or not the parish was bigger now than it was 10 years ago and does it look like it will grow. The answer was no. The parish enrollment is fairly stable, but we are getting younger families back into the parish.
8. There was considerable discussion about school needs and what renovation was needed most. Theresa Desautels, Assistant Principal, responded that the school needs storage and renovation. (Accomplishing those two things would positively impact both the school and Religious Education.)
9. A comment was made that when the campaign process started last winter, the statement was made that this campaign would go to the endowment and to address the needs of the school. We haven't done much to the school and we need to take care of the school facility.
10. There was a great deal of discussion about what should be planned first for implementation. There seemed to be some general consensus that the multipurpose area and the school renovation were perhaps the most important. That area with the corridor connected to it would

CSO Schenkel Shultz will proceed in reliance on this report. Any discrepancies should be brought to our attention in writing within seven (7) days.

Meeting Report

be a little over \$5 million. There was additional discussion about whether or not that amount of money could be raised. George reported that the current campaign has raised about \$2.5 million. The goal is \$2.9 million and from that, there would be about \$1 million available for the Parish.

11. George reminded everyone that this plan was the first time the Parish had ever undertaken a master plan. It is important that everyone understand that the plan should be living and breathing and adjustments can be made as needed.
12. Jerry Semler asked Jim to talk about what Immaculate Heart of Mary is doing with their campaign. Immaculate Heart is at the part where they really have to do some building to meet needs. They determined they would need to raise \$5.3 million to do what they needed. That was the goal of the campaign. They have currently raised \$4million which is the largest amount they have raised. What they are struggling with now is whether or not they should try to raise the additional money or divide the project into pieces.
13. There was discussion about the feasibility of having another wave to this campaign. There was a general feeling that if members of the Parish had the information from the Master Plan, there might be additional pledges to the campaign. Only about 576 families out of 1500 have currently pledged/contributed to the campaign. The first town hall meeting gave parishioners the opportunity to tell the committee up front what they believed important in terms of the master plan. Rather than come to a conclusion of which piece of the plan should be done first, the suggestion was made to bring the plan back to the parish and get input on what they believed should be the priority. In order to move forward, a decision needs to be made if there will be a second phase to the campaign and let parishioners tell you with their pocketbooks what they are willing to do.
14. A question was raised about naming rights. The diocese generally frowns on that with buildings, but Immaculate Heart of Mary is doing that with classrooms.
15. A suggestion was made that moving the rectory be done as part of the initial phase and then the rectory could be used to provide space where there are gaps in available space or a need for programs that might be displaced through construction.
16. A statement was made that there has to be some renovation to the classrooms. With the veteran staff at the school, it is important to accommodate their needs.
17. There was discussion about whether or not the parish would be able to afford the increased operating costs when keeping up to date with current expenses is a problem. Affording the upkeep on more space is a concern. There was some feeling expressed that finding a way to breathe more life into the parish could help increase Sunday collections. As the parish becomes active, the money comes with it.
18. Ted Caron, School Principal, commented that he wasn't sure that the designated administrative space really needs to be that large. Jim responded that the program drove the size of the spaces. The administrative space as programmed was initially 4,500 and it is now only 2,900 square feet. There are a variety of services included under the nomenclature of "school administration", but that space can certainly be made smaller.
19. Bud Watts brought the group back to the discussion of whether or not we should have a second wave of the campaign, using the master plan work that has been done as a marketing tool.

CSO Schenkel Shultz will proceed in reliance on this report. Any discrepancies should be brought to our attention in writing within seven (7) days.

Meeting Report

There is a story to tell now when before there was no story to tell. That could change the amount of giving. It is important to show the parish at large the work that has been done.

20. A suggestion was made that a presentation be made at Mass to invite people to a review of the committee's Master Plan recommendation while having coffee and donuts after Mass. Jim indicated that he would be willing to make the coffee and donuts presentation of the Master Plan recommendation.
21. Consensus was that the Master Plan committee should work with Father and Sharon to determine what would be a good time to present the Master Plan recommendation. (Jim suggested December 9 and 10 if the committee wants the presentation before Christmas.) After that, the Campaign Committee should determine how they want to get the second wave of the campaign started. Implementation can be finally determined after the second wave, although some indication of priorities will most likely be necessary to give people enough information so that they might want to increase their contribution.
22. Jim thanked everyone for their attendance and input.

Respectfully submitted:
Rosemary W. Rehak
Senior Associate, CSO Schenkel Shultz

Cc: Those in attendance