

## **SUMMARY of the June 2019 RCMUC BUILDING SURVEY– to Council and Congregation, September 11, 2019**

A fuller report, including summaries of open-ended responses, is still be in the works, but here are the basics:

### **RESPONSE RATE**

**There were exactly 100 respondents to the Building survey.** Given that roughly 120 income tax receipts were issued last year, 100 respondents strikes us as a significant response. 65% of respondents were female, 67% age 65 or over, and 44% classified themselves as primarily active in the worship life of the congregation, rather than being active in worship & mission, or inactive.

### **RESPONDENTS ARE IN FAVOUR OF... EXPANDING THE HALL TO MAKE IT MORE ACCESSIBLE**

**More than three times as many respondents are in favour of the Gordon Hall concept plan, compared to those who oppose it:** 61 were in favour of expanding Gordon Hall, compared to 20 who opposed (61/20=3.1x more in favour than opposed). When comparing those who felt strongly one way or the other, the ratio is even higher; 28 “strongly supported” the concept plan while 8 “strongly opposed” it (28/8=3.5x more “strongly support” than “strongly oppose”)

80 respondents answered the question about “what **urgent renovations** will need to be done even if we do not proceed with the Concept Plan”. 65 (81.3%) said “**wheelchair accessibility**” and 57 (71.3%) said “**improved washroom facilities.**” Another 45 (56.3%) chose “improved kitchen facility.” Once implemented, the changes would also make the necessary work flow changes to the church office and minister’s study.

### **RESPONDENTS ARE AMBIVALENT ABOUT... CHANGING THE SANCTUARY**

While 64 respondents agreed that the seating capacity of the sanctuary was too small, compared to 26 who disagreed (64/26= 2.5x more agreed than disagreed), the support for the sanctuary concept plan was much less robust. 49 supported the plan, compared to 36 who did not support (49/36 = 1.4x more support than not support) but there was actually more strong opposition (20) than strong support (15)... so **the support for the sanctuary revisioning plan appears to be “soft” support.**

When presented with other non-construction options, **49 respondents said they would attend a second service on Sunday morning.** We have not investigated our capacity to offer a second service.

It should be noted that when asked about the **benefits of a reimagined sanctuary**, one response had by far the most support: “**room for people with disabilities**”, with 62 responses (68.1%).

### **RESPONDENTS ARE CONCERNED ABOUT... FUNDING A PROJECT**

**76 respondents – 82.6% of those responding to the question – were concerned about “how we will pay for the expansion”.** Two other “concerns” also hit the 50% mark: “there is a general trend away from mainline church attendance in younger generations” (54.4%) and “we may not have a guarantee of future income from current or future users of our meeting rooms.” (50.0%)

On the positive side, 44 respondents – 58.7% of those responding to the question – did feel that “The United Church of Canada has a very progressive approach to social issues and so do many groups in the Bow Valley which need meeting space” but no other “positive note” hit a 50% threshold.

If a project were undertaken, “**soliciting pledges** for the funds” was either the first or second choice of 68.7% of respondents. The clear second choice was “partial financing with the Ralph Connor Trustee funds” at 58.0%. One additional note: 26 stated that they had considered making a legacy gift to RCMUC; 51 had not.

When asked “if we choose to not proceed with the development of the full Concept plan, **what should be budgeted for necessary renovations**”, 49 respondents (out of 65 who responded to this question) were in support of a figure of **\$100,000 or higher.**

Respectfully submitted by the RCMUC Building/Heritage working group,

Ian Schofield, Dale Stanway, Mary Cranston, Karen Fraser, Paul Elfner, Greg Wooley.