



FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Have a question? Let us know: growingroots@sjsmarysville.org

Throughout our GROWING ROOTS campaign, we encourage you to ask questions. Your questions are important and so are the answers that you seek. Transparency is our goal as we navigate through this process together.

HOW WILL THE FINANCED PORTION OF THE TOTAL NEEDED FUNDS BE PAID BACK?

The remaining portion that is not paid off through this campaign through the construction process will be financed by Lutheran Church Extension Fund through a construction/business loan. LCEF will use all of our raised funds first to ensure the least amount of interest is paid by us. The "mortgage payment" will become part of our operational budget. We have been significantly in the black the last few years. It is likely that this campaign will continue to increase giving beyond the 3 years. There will be other opportunities for income such as upper grade retention, increase in enrollees in our various programs, increase in 3rd source funding (LEAP et al) and regular occurring tuition increases. We also have a substantial Operational Reserve and healthy general fund.

WHEN DO WE EXPECT TO BREAK GROUND ON THE 1ST PHASE?

The building committee reviewed the initial material from two architects, and will be setting up interviews in the next few weeks. Perhaps in that interview we could get our arms around a timeline as to when we can start digging. Ideally, the design phase will be followed by the bid phase, and then construction will begin.

HOW WILL THE NEW BUILDING AFFECT OUR GENERAL BUDGET I.E. INCREASED MAINTENANCE ETC.?

In commercial applications the average utility cost is just over \$2.00 per square foot per year. With a newer more efficient building it would likely be lower than that.

WHAT WILL BE THE ADDITIONAL OPERATING COST FOR UTILITIES, JANITORIAL AND NORMAL BUILDING MAINTENANCE?

We really don't have a projection for operation, maintenance and day to day costs. Yes there will be more square feet to heat, clean, etc. But we will also have newer and more efficient HVAC systems that will run cheaper than what is in the old existing facilities.

WILL WE KEEP THE MODULARS AFTER THE EXPANSION IN CASE OF MORE GROWTH? "IF YOU BUILD IT THEY WILL COME".

It has not been decided as of yet what will ultimately become of the modulars. Some possibilities have been: To dispose of them. To re-sell them for their market value. To re-purpose them elsewhere on the campus as support buildings for our outdoor sports programs as concession stands or

coaching rooms if we eventually build additional ball fields or soccer fields on the Kendal Rd property. The modulars were always supposed to be temporary fixtures and have been here since before latchkey existed. The first phase of building would create enough classrooms to eliminate the need for the modulars and move all classrooms inside the school building.

WHAT WILL THE CURRENT OFFICE SPACE BE USED FOR ONCE THE NEW "OFFICE HUB" IS COMPLETE?

At this time the specific use of the various spaces that will be available have not been decided upon yet. Some thoughts have been a dedicated space for band and choir. If the space is not able to be used by the school due to code restrictions, it was thought that additional space for bible studies or adult Sunday school could use these spaces or a place to display historical items for church and school viewing through a return to the "old gym" medium size group area. Possibilities also include a library, office space for our Social worker, meeting space for tutors, etc. The "hub" is not specifically for replacing all of the church offices, but more of a central gathering point for students arriving. There will be areas that could be used for office space and more school related staff, but again, nothing specific. We basically know we need classrooms and know some of the old building will be repurposed from early childhood to other uses, but we are still a ways off from filling in the boxes.

WILL THE NEW ROOMS BE USED FOR THE SCHOOL CHILDREN OR FOR JEC/PRESCHOOL?

At present, the new classroom building, though not specifically designed at this time, is being considered with the needs of the JEC (Before, During & After school program) & Preschool current needs and growth in mind. The spaces that would then be released allows us to bring the upper grade students back into the school building.

Currently Phase 2 of the Master Plan addresses the growth in the day school program with additional space built on the east side of the school where the current playground is now located.

THERE HAVE BEEN VARIOUS PLANS OVER THE YEARS. HAVE THESE BEEN TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN PREPARATION FOR THIS CURRENT PROJECT?

The various committees over the last several years have looked deeply in to the plans of the past and they have been considered both in discussion with the committees and the consultants and contractors we have spoken to.

With regard to the windows by the hall way going to the gym and cafeteria: Due to the current code restrictions, a fairly large access way needs to be maintained for fire access to the old school building which houses the furnace for the facility. The access way limits the size of the rooms or building for classroom purposes and so the idea of a central hub and office space seemed to be the best use of space as per the architects initial floor plan.

DO WE HAVE A PLAN TO DO ANY TYPE OF DONATION REMEMBRANCE/MEMORIAL FOR CONTRIBUTORS? A PLAQUE? ETCHED BRICKS? ETC FOR THOSE WHO HAVE GIVEN A LARGER DONATION?

We do plan to have a designated area to thank and honor contributors!

What exactly memorials will look like has not been finalized but it is in discussion and will be included in the expansion.

DO WE HAVE A PERSON/COMMITTEE LOOKING FOR GRANTS FOR THE EXPANSION/BUILDING?

We are in the infancy stage of having team members from the Board of Finance explore this area.

IS ST. JOHN'S SCHOOL TURNING AWAY FAMILIES CURRENTLY DUE TO LACK OF SPACE?

Yes, there is currently a wait list of students we were not able to accommodate this year in 3 y.o. PK and 2nd grade.

HOW CAN I INVOLVE OR COMMUNICATE THE CAMPAIGN TO MY COMPANY OR CO-WORKERS?

We would be happy to provide a Campaign booklet for you to share with your company and co-workers. You are welcome to invite them to any of our campaign events or give them the campaign email for any questions they may have!

ARE "CORPORATE SPONSORS" BEING SOUGHT OUT?

Yes, there is a corporate liaison who will be reaching out to corporations for donations and sponsorships!

ARE THERE PICTURES AND DOLLAR AMOUNTS OF WHAT WE WOULD ACTUALLY BUILD?

We currently do not have any exact pictures of what the building will look like until an architect is finalized. The Building Committee is currently interviewing several architects and that information will be shared as soon as it becomes available.

WILL THERE BE FUNDRAISER PROJECTS?

Currently, we will be talking to members of our church, school families, local businesses and corporations. As things progress fundraisers may be planned.

HOW WILL WE MANAGE ANY NEW DEBT WE INCUR?

Through fundraising and fiscal responsibility.

HOW WILL THIS CONSTRUCTION ADVANCE OUR PURPOSE AS A LUTHERAN SCHOOL?

We are very blessed to have a great staff many of whom are Lutheran teachers and who all share Christ love with our school children each day. Correct, a fancy structure will not help anything, but having room to have all children in the school building and out of the modulars will be a huge blessing. We also have to consider how many families (including church member families) have children who are very appreciative to have before and after school care for their children because they have a household where both parents work. St. John's still gives children a Lutheran education and there are no plans for that to change.

WHY DOES THE COMMITTEE FEEL THAT THIS PROJECT IS BEST FOR OUR CHILDREN?

Many Members of our congregation have been involved in discussions about our school's growth and do not feel pushed by the school administration.

WHO IS ON THE BUILDING COMMITTEE?

Dale Scheiderer, Gary Scheiderer, Pastor Jack Heino (abstains from voting), Principal Rich Rausch (abstains from voting), Alex Blewitt, Amy Balderson, Doug Alderman (Board of Properties), Trevor Burns (Board of Education), Mike Priday (Board of Elders), Kelly Gallmeyer, Chris Ingram, and Marie Leng.

ARE NON-MEMBERS PART OF THE BUILDING COMMITTEE

When the building committee was first created, the only non-member on the Building Committee was Alex Blewitt as she had much information to offer the building committee. However, she is now a member at St. John's Lutheran Church. In our voting, Pastor Jack and Rich Rausch have abstained.

WHY DID THE CAMPAIGN STOP ITS PUBLIC WORK FOR A FEW MONTHS?

The purpose of moving the campaign planning out of the public eye was to allow the campaign team to get organized and be able to offer a well ordered and organized. Nothing has been changed or added to the building plan during this time. T

WHY WAS A VOTE TAKEN DURING THE PANDEMIC?

Regular voters meetings were planned after it was decided that groups could assemble safely.

WHAT IS THE HISTORY BEHIND THIS PROCESS?

-SMP Committee

-Feasibility Committee

-Design Feasibility Committee

Dale Scheiderer, Gary Schiederer, Chris Ledley, Amy Balderson, Marie Leng, Rich Miller, Rich Rausch, Pastor Jack Heino, Chris Ingram, Kelly Gallmeyer and Alex Blewitt.

Following a review of the Board of Administration on January 7, 2020, the approval was given to proceed on the next step of obtaining a site plan for church and school campus prior to requesting design bids from architects. The committee has \$22,000 in funding approved for the initial step of obtaining the site plan. After discussion, the committee decided to request site plan bids from two

firms (listed below) and to contact Fanning-Howey architects to see if they had any additional recommendations on firms to perform the site plan.

1) Page Engineering Inc., 112 East 5th Street, Marysville, OH 43040. Gary Scheiderer accepted the action to contact Andy Clarridge, PE, from Page Engineering and request a quote.

2) Humble Construction Co, 1180 Carlisle Street, Bellefontaine, OH 43311. Rich Rausch accepted the action to contact Humble Construction and request a quote.

3) Rich Rausch accepted the action to contact Fanning-Howey architects for site plan firm recommendations.

b.) Mike Priday from the Board of Elders, Charlie Fisher from the Board of Education. Doug Alderman will be the representative from the Board of Properties, were added to the committee.

1) Keiser Design Group – Gahanna, OH (<https://keiserdesigngroup.com/>). Keiser Design Group performed the design for Grace Christian School expansion in Blacklick, OH. Cindy Phillips from Grace Christian School highly recommended Keiser from their experience working with them.

2) VSWC – Cincinnati, OH (www.vswc.com) VSWC performed the design work for Prince of Peace Lutheran Church in Loveland, OH.

3) BSHM Architects – Columbus, OH (www.bshm-architects.com) We reviewed multiple school projects performed by BSHM Architects in Columbus, OH.

4) Meachum & Apel, M+A Architects – Columbus, OH (www.ma-architects.com). We reviewed the Childhood League Center project.

b.) Lutheran Extension Fund (LCEF)

Building Committee (April 2021)

- **Motion Approved:** the motion to proceed with Phase I of the Master Plan was approved by a 2/3s vote at the Special Voter's Assembly on February 28, 2021 under the conditions that 50% of the Phase I cost would be in hand before starting construction, and no more than 50% of the Phase I cost would be financed. Additionally, Phases 2 & 3 were authorized to proceed, however, these phases would not proceed until any amount financed for the construction of Phase 1 must be paid off prior to starting another phase.

- **Design Feasibility Committee Released:** the committee was released during the Special Voter's Assembly on Sunday, February 28, 2021. Most of the members the Design Feasibility Committee chose to continue onto the Building Committee, however, a few chose to step down and we thank them for their service and contributions.

- **Building Committee Formed:** the committee was formed following the Special Voter's Assembly on February 28, 2021. The committee will be supervised and report directly to the Church Board of Administration and will report quarterly to the voters. The following members have answered the call and are current serving on the Building Committee: Dale Scheiderer, Gary Scheiderer, Pastor Jack Heino, Principal Rich Rausch, Alex Blewitt, Amy Balderson, Doug Alderman (Board of Properties), Trevor Burns (Board of Education), Mike Priday (Board of Elders), Kelly Gallmeyer, Chris Ingram, and Marie Leng.

- **Two Subcommittees:** The Building Committee will be organized under the structure of two subcommittees, the Construction subcommittee and Campaign subcommittee. The Construction subcommittee will be responsible for completing the design and construction of the project. The

Campaign committee will be responsible for planning and executing a capital campaign to fund the construction project.

1. Campaign Subcommittee

- **LCEF Ministry Solutions Selected to Lead Campaign:** The Lutheran Church Extension Fund (LCEF) was selected on April 13, 2021, to lead our capital campaign. The Building Committee and Board of Administration invited LCEF and Cornerstone Stewardship Ministry, who led the "New Start from the Heart" campaign, to come and present their plan. Pastor Tom Eggebrecht, LCEF Vice President of Ministry Solutions, and Lisa Hall, LCEF Ohio District Vice President, presented their campaign plan on March 25, 2021. Jeff Davis, President of Cornerstone Stewardship Ministry, presented their campaign plan on April 8, 2021. Both presentations were excellent, however, LCEF was selected to lead the campaign. Please note that the Board of Administration was also directly involved in receiving the presentation and in the selection of LCEF to lead the campaign.
- **LCEF Campaign:** Pastor Eggebrecht has selected Pastor Eric Kennaugh from Immanuel Lutheran Church and School in Palatine, IL, to lead our campaign. Over the next several months, Pastor Kennaugh and LCEF will lead a series of workshops and planning sessions in preparation for an early fall launch of the capital campaign. More details to follow, but we are very excited about this selection.

2. Construction Subcommittee

- **Priorities:** the construction subcommittee has outlined their top three priorities, (1) design and expansion of the wastewater package plant, (2) Complete a Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing (MEP) study of the school, and (3) the hiring of an architect/engineer firm to design phase I.
- **Funding:** the construction subcommittee has provided budget numbers of these top three priorities to the Board of Education. The Board of Education has authorized \$16k to proceed with these priorities.
- **Wastewater Package Plant:** it is an accepted fact that the wastewater package plant will need to be expanded to handle additional capacity from the increased headcount. This was selected as the top priority as it will have the longest lead time due to engagement with state and local government agencies along with local stakeholders. To avoid repeating this process again in Phase 2 & 3, the plan is to account for the additional headcount of Phases 2-3 in the design of this phase. The budget estimate for the design to expand the package plant is \$10k.
- **MEP Study:** this study will be necessary to proceed with the design of Phase I. M+A provided the names of several local firms they recommended to perform the MEP study and the expected budget is \$4k.
- **Selection of Architect/Engineer Firm:** this purpose of this step is to complete the design and engineering of Phase I. The plan is to move through the design process in phases to minimize cost commitments, but still provide updated architectural renderings to assist in the campaign initiatives and to maintain an updated estimate of the construction costs.

ARE THERE ANY RESOURCES I CAN USE TO DETERMINE THE VARIETY OF OPTIONS I MIGHT HAVE TO MAKE DONATIONS LIKE RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS, CAPITAL GAINS I.E. FINANCIAL PLANNER TOOLS?

Yes, members of the "Growing Roots" campaign will be producing information that explains these options.

IS THE GYM FLOOR REPAIR PART OF THE PHASE 1 PROCESS OF WHERE DOES THIS FIT IN? CONCERNED ABOUT SAFETY OF THE UN-LEVELED AND AGING FLOOR. THANK YOU!

- o *Current church and school offices to be repurposed, possibly two classrooms.*
- o *Building offices or classrooms on the south side of 1989 edition per architect's recommendation.*
- o *Remove the two modular classrooms behind the school.*
- o *Move the playground to a safe location.*
- o *New traffic flow in front of the school.*
- o *Remove old basement bathrooms (not spend any more money on old restrooms) per architects' recommendation.*
- o *Remove or cap existing gym floor.*

WHAT IS THE ANTICIPATED TIMELINE FOR THE EXPANSION?

The building committee reviewed the initial material from two architects, and will be setting up interviews in the next few weeks. Perhaps in that interview we could get out arms around a timeline as to when we can start digging.

DOES 5.6 MILLION REPRESENT COMPLETE WITH FURNITURE/TECHNOLOGY/FIXTURES?

Please refer to page 12 of the Master Plan as it lays out the estimated costs of various expenses that are included in the \$5.6 million 1st Phase.

HOW DO YOU ENGAGE A BETTER CROSS-SECTION OF MEMBERS INTO THIS PROCESS?

Each church member will be given the opportunity to be visited in person by someone on the committee.

IF THE 50% DOWN PAYMENT IS MET - WHAT WILL THE MONTHLY PAYMENT BE ON THE REMAINING 50%?

The St. John's Voter's Assembly approved the formation of the Building Feasibility Committee a few years ago. That Feasibility Committee brought to the voters a feasibility concept that included 4 phases showing foresight far into our future allowing the work that was being done to share insight and save costs in the future. The feasibility committee then asked the voters to approve the feasibility concept with the clarification that a phase would be paid off before the next phase is considered. The passage of this motion states that one half of the money should be raised before construction begins. The formation of a building committee then commenced.

The feasibility concept of Phase 1 includes infrastructure improvements and additional space to have all classrooms again in the school. The building concept projected cost was brought to the voters at \$5.6 million. Fifty percent of that amount is \$2.8 million. The 2nd half of the building costs will be financed. Changes to the building concepts and plans as well as construction materials will impact the overall cost. Financing of the 2nd half will vary based on the amount raised with the initial campaign, interest rate and the length of time St. John's decides to take out a loan for. The following table shows what a mortgage may look like depending on the amount raised from the campaign, the interest rates and other factors that will come up as financing is considered. St. John's currently operates with a budget in the black and will continue to do so. Considerations to balance the budget with the loan amounts will likely come from a variety of means including but not limited to increase in student enrollment, increases in tuition, increases in tithing and 3rd source funding increases. There are also safety nets in place including a positive General Fund and healthy operational reserve.

Loan	Percent	Years	Monthly	Total	Budget Impact	Interest
\$2,800,000.00	3.63%	25	\$14,205.87	\$4,261,761.00	\$170,470.44	\$1,461,761.00
\$2,500,000.00	3.63%	25	\$12,683.81	\$3,805,143.00	\$152,205.72	\$1,305,143.00
\$2,000,000.00	3.63%	25	\$10,147.05	\$3,044,115.00	\$121,764.60	\$1,044,115.00
\$1,500,000.00	3.63%	25	\$7,610.29	\$2,283,087.00	\$91,323.48	\$783,087.00
\$1,000,000.00	3.63%	25	\$5,073.52	\$1,522,056.00	\$60,882.24	\$522,056.00

WILL THE COST OF THE ARCHITECT FEES AND OTHER FEES BE INCLUDED IN THE TOTAL COST FOR THE 50% UP FRONT REQUIREMENT?

Please refer to page 12 of the Master Plan as it lays out the estimated costs of various expenses that are included in the \$5.6 million 1st Phase.

ARE THE CURRENT DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS IN OUR COMMUNITY FAVORABLE TO BUILDING AT THIS TIME?

Yes.

WHAT ARE THE COSTS TO THE SPECIFIC PARTS OF THE PROJECT I.E. REPAIRS/UPGRADES TO EXISTING PLUMBING OR HVAC, RENOVATIONS TO THE OLD SCHOOL BUILDING, SEPTIC SYSTEM UPGRADE/REPLACEMENT ETC.?

Please refer to page 12 of the Master Plan as it lays out the estimated costs of various expenses that are included in the \$5.6 million 1st Phase.

WILL THE WINDOWS BY THE GYM/HALLWAY BE USED AS CLASSROOMS?

The windows by the gym are slated to be used in the Master Plan Phase 1 by M & A Architects. This plan is conceptual and as we move further into the building process the architect will be engaging and our stakeholders will make this decision.

WILL THE NEW ROOMS BE USED FOR THE SCHOOL CHILDREN OR FOR JEC/PRESCHOOL?

The SMP and Feasibility planning has noted that part of the new space is dedicated to JEC/Preschool. This was also noted in the Master Plan by M & A.

WHY ARE WE DOING THIS?

This has already been considered and addressed by the voter's assembly. We believe, teach and confess that the primary means through which the Holy Spirit speaks within a congregation is the voter's assembly. Having sought His guidance through the hearts of His people they resoundingly agreed that this is what God wants do at St. John's and we are acting according to His directives through His people.

The SMP having looked though ALL the past "vision" campaigns, workshops and plans plus surveys and several town Halls and ultimately presenting recommendation to the Voter's came to the conclusion and priority:

3 Pillars for SJL Vision 2016-2021:

1 Financial Security

2 Facility Expansion

3 Future Staffing

Ultimately though, it is in response to the Great Commission. This is our chance to plant the seed of the Gospel in the lives of the kids in our community.

WHY NOW?

The modulars have been used for over 20 years in an attempt to be temporary. Our programming in line with the public schools has grown to incorporate latchkey and preschool, and our facility is full. If we do not begin to plan for growth now, while the community is growing we will be unprepared to meet the needs of the harvest fields that are growing ripe around us.

The NOW is also rooted in the fact that it is next on the list of congregational priorities after financial stability and sustainability initiatives. This NOW has been a 3 year research and discussion process by 3 separate committees (Feasibility, Feasibility Design and Building).

WHAT IS THE CORRELATION BETWEEN UNION COUNTY'S POPULATION GROWTH AND STUDENT POPULATION AT ST. JOHN'S?

Our student population has and continues to correlate with the growth in Union County.

The Strategic Ministry Plan (SMP) states a need to expand capacity in order to support targeted future state student population across grades.

The difference between the growing community and the decreasing in congregational size is addressed with an expanded view and commitment to outreach on the part of both the church and the school.

Phase 1 of the project does NOT address the desire for growth. Growth is addressed in Phase 2 and 4 plus conversations about adding a High School. Phase 1 only addresses facility needs for who are at SJLS CURRENTLY and some upgrades/updates to current school facilities and "traffic flow" to accommodate future use and growth.

WHERE DID THOSE NUMBERS COME FROM? HOW WERE THEY CHOSEN?

Initial census data for the community at large were gathered by the committee from the local published census demographics

The numbers for desired growth at St. John's were projected hopes and general in nature based on info 5 years ago with the town halls and creation of the SMP

HAVE THEY BEEN SERIOUSLY REVIEWED SINCE 2016?

2021 Growth Rate

2.00%

County Website

Union County

State

Ohio

Founded

April 1, 1820[1]

County Seat

Marysville

Lat./Long.

(40.000, -83.000)

2010 Population

52,464

Growth Since 2010

17.03%

Yes – SMP is scheduled for an update in 2021-22

WHAT PERCENT MUST BE MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH?

The first duty of members listed in our St. John's Constitution:

ARTICLE V

Duties of Members

It shall be the duty of every communicant member:

1. To unceasingly witness the Word of God and salvation to members and unchurched;

We have not limited the enrollment of non-St. John's families in the past.

WHAT MEMBER TO/NON-CHRISTIAN CLASSROOM RATIO IS ACCEPTABLE BEFORE WE ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE SCHOOL IS NO LONGER PROVIDING A CHRISTIAN ENVIRONMENT?

Providing a Christian Environment in a school is a staff and leadership responsibility, not a student ratio – we as staff and leaders are to create the environment of Christ and “expose” both Christian AND non-Christian students to a biblically Lutheran World View of Jesus and the Gospel lived out each day.

IS THE EXPECTATION THAT ALL OF THESE NEW STUDENTS WILL BE SUBSIDIZED BY THE CHURCH?

All students at this time are financially treated the same regardless of membership status – all are able to apply for Worship Scholarship, Engagement Scholarship, Personal Funded Scholarship, State Funded EdChoice Scholarship. Please note that Preschool and JEC student's tuition are not subsidized by the congregation.

HAS THAT COST BEEN EVALUATED?

Tuition is evaluated and recommended each year by the Bd of Education and presented to the Voter's for approval

1. What is it (tuition?)?
 - a. K-8 \$5,400
2. Was it included in the total cost
 - a. “Staff & Stuff” = School employees and materials

WERE POTENTIAL NEGATIVE IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH A LARGE STUDENT POPULATION INCREASE IDENTIFIED AND DISCUSSED?

HOW WERE THEY MITIGATED?

At each step of the way we discussed all the negatives that came up, right down to the septic system. We currently “cap” enrollment in a class to 25 as per the Bd of Christian Education. We currently “cap” our preschool enrollment to the state required “square feet per child”.

WHERE DID THE BUILDING REQUIREMENTS COME FROM THAT LEAD TO A PROJECT OF THIS SCALE?

Feasibility Committee

WHO IDENTIFIED THE REQUIREMENTS?

Feasibility Design Committee with the help of M & A architects

WHAT OUTCOMES HAVE WE ACHIEVED WITH THESE CHILDREN?

The largest % of new members to St. John's first found out about our ministry through the preschool & JEC programs – the next largest % is from our K-8th program, primarily in grades K-3

HOW MANY PREVIOUSLY UNCHURCHED CHILDREN AND FAMILIES HAVE JOINED OUR CHURCH BECAUSE THEY WENT TO SCHOOL HERE?

2016-2021 – 17 families so far

DID THEY STAY WITH THE CHURCH AFTER THEIR STUDENT/S LEFT THE SCHOOL?

This has been an issue as long as we can remember, and it is our hope that the seed of God's word is planted and continues to grow in their hearts wherever they are.

HOW MANY PREVIOUSLY UNCHURCHED CHILDREN WERE BAPTIZED AFTER STARTING SCHOOL HERE?

2021 – 3 so far

2020 - 4

2019 - 1

2018 - 4

2017 - 7

2016 - 7

HOW MANY PREVIOUSLY UNCHURCHED CHILDREN WERE COFIRMED AFTER STARTING SCHOOL HERE?

2016-2021 – 14

- 1) Limited Courses of Action. (COAs) You originally presented two COAs; build a five million dollar building, OR tear down the existing school and start over for a 21 million price tag or thereabouts. That's not much of a choice.
- 2) These were not the only two choices presented by the Feasibility Committee. They offered 4 options – 1. Do nothing and 3 possible build plans 2. Upgrade current facilities only (was determined to not help us at all with meeting current or future needs and would incur costs that may need to be done again when move to building to additional facilities i.e. fixing basement bathrooms) 3 & 4 were included and presented in the Feasibility Committee Report
January 6, 2018

WHY WERE NO OTHER CHOICES PRESENTED?

At each step along the way of “feasibility” and into the Building Committee, the choice for the Voter’s was to “stop the further investigation” or to “move forward with the recommendation” – this is also true of the Building Committee which will continue to bring the “next steps” to the Voter’s to “halt consideration” or “continue to move forward with the recommendation” (the most recent was to begin a funding campaign and interview architects.

HAVE WE ELIMINATED ALL OTHER OPTIONS OTHER THAN BUILD?

No, however we are moving in accordance with the voters.

ARE THERE REALLY NO MORE COST EFFECTIVE SOLUTIONS TO OUR OVERCROWDING PROBLEM?

So far we have not come across any more cost effective solutions that achieve the goals presented to the congregation.

The only other solutions that have been suggested are:

- to limit St. John’s students to members of the church only there by decreasing the enrollment of the school
- to close the preschool
- leasing other facilities

HAVE THOSE SUPPORTING THIS AGENDA CONSIDERED THAT TUITION CANNOT BE AN AMOUNT DICTATED BY THE OPERATIONAL COST OF THE SCHOOL, EVER RISING AND INCREASINGLY DISASSOCIATED FROM INFLATION, COST OF LIVING, AND INCOME LEVELS OF THE MEMBERS IT SHOULD SERVE?

Each year when tuition is recommended and ultimately placed before the Voters to approve – extensive research and planning goes into all aspects of the above and the “ability” of our families to bear the cost of tuition and the congregational support available.

WHY ARE WE NOW, AT A TIME RECORD HIGH CONSTRUCTION COSTS, AND LOWEST ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP, DOING THIS WITH APPARENTLY ZERO RISK MITIGATION STRATEGIES IN PLACE?

Ultimately it goes back to the Great Commission.

We have been advised that educational facilities are different than other business models due to the variety of unique needs that make for a good classroom for educational rather than lease an office.

Our history at St. John's has demonstrated that when we take the "risk" of building – God gives us the opportunity to use every inch!

Interest rates are also at a record low at this time.

WHAT IS BEING DONE TO ENSURE CAREFUL MANAGEMENT AND LIMITATION OF INCURRED COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS BUILDING AND TO ENSURE THEY CAN BE ABSORBED NOW AND IN THE FUTURE BY THE PEOPLE YOU EXPECT TO PAY FOR THIS?

We are planning on using a Construction Manager whose responsibility it is to keep things on track with the budget set in the design phase

HAVE YOU CONSIDERED HOW MANY MEMBERS YOU MAY HAVE ALREADY PRICED OUT OF BEING ABLE OR WILLING TO PAY THE AMOUNT NECESSARY TO SEND THEIR CHILDREN TO THE SCHOOL? LET ALONE AFTER THIS IS COMPLETE?

Through yearly exit interviews with families who remove their children from St. John's or interviews with people considering enrollment, it is very rare that the "financial" concerns play any role in their decision to stay or go. Most leave St. John's as part of their transition to public school or the student has needs that will be better served by the good public schools in our district. When speaking with people considering enrollment the "financial" concerns are addressed by the wonderful aid we can provide from our scholarships, personally funded scholarships and the EdChoice program.

HAVE YOU LOOKED AT THE MEDIAN AND PER CAPITA INCOME OF THE GEOGRAPHIC REGION AND THE CONGREGATION YOU ARE SAYING THIS SUPPORTS?

Yes - Mission Incite and local census data

WHAT DOES THIS TELL YOU THEY CAN AFFORD ON AVERAGE AS A PERCENTAGE OF THEIR INCOME? HAS THIS INFORMED YOUR AGENDA?

Yes – St. John's tuition is well within the range of other Christian Schools and preschools in our area.

Our Principal and Directors stay in direct contact with our families to reach a balance between the cost of education and the ability of our families to pay.

Ultimately it is a family's decision to decide where their priorities are and their willingness to pay for a Christian education.

WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF THIS BUILDING ON TUITION GOING TO BE?

Tuition is not based on the cost of the building. As per the SMP, we move forward with the vision of Tuition covering financially Staff & Stuff (curriculum, tech) and the church Faith & Facilities (including utilities etc.)

HAS A CAP BEEN SET ON THE INCREASE TO TUITION THAT WE WILL ALLOW TO BE INCURRED BY THIS BUILDING? IF WE FIND THAT WE ARE APPROACHING THAT CAP, WILL WE STOP THE PROJECT?

Addressed in previous question.

WHAT WILL THE YEAR OVER YEAR INCREASE TO OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE COSTS BE?

We have been told to project \$2 per square foot of additional space.

WHAT WILL IT COST TO FURNISH THE BUILDING, WHY IS THAT COST NOT INCLUDED IN THE ESTIMATES PROVIDED TO THE VOTERS?

We have been told to project \$6 per square foot of additional space but that is a cost that need not be up front in full as not all FF & E needs to be in place as new upon completion of the build. Furnishings can be relocated to the new building from the existing modulars. Technology can be moved.

WHAT ADDITIONAL STAFFING IS ANTICIPATED TO BE NEEDED? WHAT IS THE ASSOCIATED COST? WHY HAS THAT COST NOT PROVIDED TO THE VOTERS?

Phase 1 may require additional cleaning staff or method and educational staff will be considered each year as we have in years past based on enrollment numbers.

WHAT IS THE MOST COST EFFECTIVE SOLUTION THAT GETS OUR STUDENTS OUT OF THE TRAILERS AND PROVIDES A CLASSROOM SETTING FOR OUR TARGETED ENROLLMENT NUMBERS?

WHY WAS THE MOST COST EFFECTIVE SOLUTION THAT SOLVED THE PROBLEM NOT PRESENTED TO THE VOTERS?

We believe the most cost effective solution is the current proposed building plan

WE WERE TOLD THAT BEFORE A CONTRACT WOULD BE SIGNED OR GROUND BROKEN WE WOULD HAVE 50% OF THE MONEY NECESSARY FOR THE 1ST PHASE. WE ARE NOW BEING TOLD WE NEED 50% OF THE MONEY IN “PLEDGES”. THIS IS NOT THE SAME THING. WHICH IS IT? IF WE RAISE 50% OF THE 1ST PHASE, OK, FINE, WHAT ABOUT THE 50%? HOW DO WE PAY FOR IT?

This is already addressed in the FAQs

50% is cash in hand – the balance of money's not in hand will be financed with the LCEF

DO WE EXPECT THE CHURCH TO CONTINUE TO SUBSIDIZE NONMEMBER STUDENTS EVEN AFTER IT BECOMES APPARENT THAT THEIR PARENTS HAVE NO INTENTION OF JOINING THE CHURCH?

Membership in our congregation is not a requirement to attend SJLS – they sign a covenant stating that we will teach LCMS Doctrine in our classes.

INSTEAD OF SPENDING FIVE MILLION DOLLARS ON A BUILDING THAT RECENT HISTORY DEMONSTRATES WILL HAVE LITTLE IMPACT ON OUR CHURCH ENROLLMENT NUMBERS OR BRINGING CHILDREN TO CHRIST, LET'S RAISE THE SAME AMOUNT AND INSTEAD GIVE IT TO A MISSIONARY CAUSE WITH A PROVEN TRACK RECORD. IF THIS IS ALL ABOUT BRINGING CHILDREN TO CHRIST, WHY DON'T WE CONSIDER THAT?

As stated earlier, our SMP and voters decided that our school is our primary mission opportunity, as has been demonstrated since 1843. We also currently support missions with our 10% congregational tithe on our offerings as well as monthly school missions and special missions as they come up with Endowment funds from the elders and support of students both attending college and seminaries.