

**McLean Baptist Church**  
**FACILITY STRATEGY COMMITTEE**  
**INTRODUCTION TO STATUS REPORT**

At the recommendation of the Vision Task Force, the church appointed a group of members with an interest in the facility to study our options and make a recommendation to the church for moving forward. You can see the excerpts from the Vision Task Force report on the slide. Some of the committee members have significant experience in areas of planning, construction and development. Our focus was to explore options for the future of our church facility for the next 25 to 50 years that would best serve our needs. I have listed for you on the attached slide some of the areas we explored and some of the actions we took in our investigation.

It is evident that areas of the church are in varying states of disrepair, some more severe than others. The infrastructure is antiquated and inefficient and the building is not up to code. In addition, we have heard numerous complaints over the years regarding the visibility of the church and the difficulty of navigating through the facility, among other issues.

We have taken this investigation as far as we can without expending funds that we don't currently have to engage consultants, engineers, architects, lawyers, etc. We are going to present to you today our findings thus far on three options,

Repair,

Remodel and

Redevelopment.

We believe, however, that the church building is really the vessel that houses the vision and mission of McLean Baptist Church. Our ministerial leadership team has just gotten in place and has not had time to formulate or implement their plan for the future of our church. Once that plan has started to take shape, we believe that the committee will have a much better sense of the facility requirements and the church will be in a much better position to consider a significant action with regard to our facility. Given that, we believe that it is a bit premature for our committee to make a recommendation for the long term future of our facility. We would like to table a recommendation for 6 months to a year to allow the ministerial staff to get their work under way.

## **Repair**

That does not mean, however, that we aren't taking action. Regardless of what we ultimately choose to do, we will have to live in this current facility for the next 5 to 10 years at a minimum. We have presented the CLC with a long list of repairs that need to be done to the facility to keep the windows from falling out of their casings, the steeple from falling on our heads, and various parts of the building from leaking every time we get a heavy rain. CLC has approved the expenditure of \$136,000 over the next two years from reserve funds and the facility budget to make some of these much needed repairs.

Our list is far more extensive than what we have money to tackle however, and we would need to have a significant fund raising campaign to make further repairs. These are not the types of repairs that a group of people from the church can perform. It is our hope that by the time we have expended the allotted funds, we will be able to recommend to the church a course of action regarding the future of our facility.

Before we present to you our findings on these three options, I want to make it clear that none of them are without their own draw backs and potential unknown problems.

Howie Carpenter is now going to go through some of the details related to the repair of our facility both currently and with an eye to long term. (See attached slides for presentation.)

## **Remodeling**

There is only so much we can do in the "repair" department before we trigger the need to bring our building up to code. Indeed, at any point that we go to Fairfax County to obtain a permit to do a repair, they may reject our permit requiring that we bring the building up to code before they issue further permits. When we get to that point, we are talking about a monumental leap in costs because our building is significantly out of date with code requirements.

Timofey Dvogyuk has developed some preliminary remodeling plans for the purpose of coming up with a very rough estimate of what it would cost for us to take that next step beyond basic repair. He has provided his concept of what we could potentially do to address the visibility and the navigability issues that have been common themes in many discussions about the building. All of his plans have taken into consideration the county's restrictions on the floor area ratio (FAR) for our area. Currently we are maxed out on the amount of floor space we can have on this lot. In order to enclose the courtyard we would have to eliminate other existing floor space. His plan does not address all of the remodeling wish list items, and the lion's share of the estimated cost relates to things you can't see but would be required to bringing the building up to code such as a fire suppressant system. (See slide presentation.)

## **Redevelopment**

Another option that has been put on the table is the redevelopment of our property. In the end, this option would provide us with a totally new building that is the equivalent size of our current building in terms of usable square feet – or we could choose to reduce or expand the size depending on what we determine our needs to be. The new building would be up to code and would contain state of the art electronic and AV capabilities. The out of pocket ultimate cash outlay for the church would most likely be \$0 and could potentially net us some surplus cash. The building would be built on what is now our lower parking lot. The remainder of the land that we now own would be developed for other mixed uses by a developer. Mike Scott will provide you with further information on this option. (See slide presentation.)

## **Wrap-up**

We will be happy to talk with you further about any of these options or about the various avenues of inquiry we have made during our study of these options. I will reiterate:

1. CLC approved action to make some of the needed repairs over the next 2 years
2. Time being allowed for staff and leadership to develop programming, growth plan and associated facility requirements to implement vision
3. Provide time to allow congregation to consider our fund raising capacity
4. Reconvene committee in early 2017 to formulate a more concrete plan based on the input received
5. Regardless of what we do, the process will take a considerable amount of time measured in years

The following are the members of the Facility Strategy Committee:

Kathy Allen

Ron Kelley

Shirley Bass

Tonja Olson

Howie Carpenter

Mike Scott

Timofey Dovgalyuk

Betty Gardner – Alternate

John Jones - Alternate