



## **7/21/24 Congregational Meeting to Approve Capital Appeal Priorities**

### **Meeting Minutes**

A quorum was confirmed, and the meeting was called to order by Natasha Werner at 11:20 with a motion by Laurie Brown, second by Jewel Ekern and subsequent approval by meeting attendees.

The agenda was reviewed by Natasha and then Paul Ludwig motioned for approval of the agenda with a second by Lisa Krause and subsequent approval of the agenda by meeting attendees.

Laurie Brown provided the background for the Capital Appeal and how we got here, followed by additional comments from Tim Johnson and presentation of the five capital project options and estimated costs.

#### **Option 1: Cameras for \$6,000**

Tim shared the details of what is included, and Katie shared more background and details about the purpose/functionality of the new cameras. No questions were asked

#### **Option 2: Electronic Building Security for \$18,000**

Tim shared the details of what is included. There was a question about whether ongoing costs were included. The answer is yes, that the first contract period for any ongoing services to be provided were included (rough cost is ~\$26/mo. for entry level monitoring so quite minor).

#### **Option 3: Sanctuary Steeple/Ceiling**

Tim shared the details of what is included. No questions were asked.

#### **Option 4: Parking Lot Options A and B for \$135,000 and \$71,000 respectively**

Tim shared the details of both options. There was a question about how long they will last, and Laurie shared that it is unknown, but likely 10+ years on both options, knowing that the more expensive option likely has a longer life. Laurie also shared the council's discussion about the possibility of doing option B two times and still being less of a cash outlay than option A. A question was asked about how long the parking lot repair will take and Brandt responded via text that it will likely take about a week. A question was asked about how durable option A would be, and Laurie shared that it was not as durable as a county highway that endures heavy truck traffic but was the same as a city street. A question was asked about a warranty on the parking lot and Brandt shared via text that there is a one-year warranty, with an option to buy an extended warranty. A question was asked about whether the area included the dirt area that had trucks parked on it for a while (and whether that was an ongoing arrangement) and the answer is that the pavement will only cover the currently paved area and that the trucks belonged to the city and were only allowed to park there for a finite period. A question was asked about heavy trucks causing damage to the new parking lot with the fellowship hall renovations, and the answer is that no heavy machinery will be needed for the current scope of fellowship hall renovations. However, if we ever decided in the future to do a larger



scale capital project that would require excavation and concrete that required heavy machinery, there could be a risk of damage at that time that would need to be address by that future capital campaign.

#### **Option 5: Fellowship Hall \$250,000**

Tim shared the details of the smaller scope for the fellowship hall. A question was asked about how much wider the hallway would be and Tim shared that the hallway will be 6 feet wider by the nursery and shorter with the removal of the classrooms. The bathrooms will not be changed. A question was asked about whether new bathrooms were included, and the answer is no, because Vanman is fairly confident the project will be approved without needing more bathrooms given the same population in the sanctuary would be present in the fellowship hall (rather than additive populations). A question was asked about whether the additional space in the opening would make a difference to whether people would move into the fellowship hall following service. Tim said that we will need/want to make intentional efforts to make sure it does make a difference.

After reviewing the projects, Laurie explained that we would take an initial vote on the smaller cost items totaling \$39,000 followed by a vote for the higher cost items as described on the screen and ballot. Laurie mentioned that in no scenario do we have pledges to date that would allow us to move ahead on fellowship hall renovations as currently planned, but that with whatever funds are available/pledged as we look ahead, the building committee will consider options and potential phasing to move forward with as much as possible until/unless more pledges are received. All members who have not yet pledged or who want to reassess their pledges to give more (if they like what they see) were invited to do so. A question was asked about how quickly the low-cost items could be done, based on funds received. Pastor shared that \$49,000 has been received to date, so these items would happen immediately.

The first vote to approve spending \$39,000 on projects 1-3 was passed with a unanimous vote with 100% for and 0% against. Thus, capital projects 1-3 are approved to begin immediately.

The second vote resulted as follows:

Option 1 (Parking lot \$135,000 and Fellowship Hall \$20,000) received 14 votes (20%)

Option 2 (Parking lot \$71,000 and Fellowship Hall \$84,000) received 56 votes (76%)

Option 3 (Fellowship Hall \$155,000) received 3 votes (2%)

Thus, Option 2, having received a majority vote was approved.

Jon Wissink motioned to adjourn the meeting and Steven Dickey seconded, attendees voted in favor and the meeting was adjourned.

# CONNECTING

---

2024