

SITE & BUILDING ASSESSMENT



PREPARED FOR:
**UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST
SOCIETY OF SACRAMENTO**
2425 SIERRA BOULEVARD
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

PREPARED BY:
JEFF GOLD & ASSOCIATES
POST OFFICE BOX 1226
NEVADA CITY, CALIFORNIA 95959
530-265-8032

DECEMBER 15, 2010

I. INTRODUCTION

This study is a part of the UUMP (Unitarian Universalist Master Planning) process that is developing a UUSS campus master plan for the next fifty-year period. Once completed, the master plan will provide an overall conceptual plan for the phased, full development of the campus as well as detailed recommendations for stewardship of the facilities. In addition to this assessment study, UUMP's current work includes dialog with the congregation, committees and staff in establishing the program and priorities that will guide the final plan.

The master planning process began with the 2002-2004 Long Range Planning Committee that articulated a vision for the UUSS facilities. The 'World Café Conversations', a congregational survey, and the work of subcommittees were a part of this initial phase that was summarized in the document called the *2004 Long Range Plan* (see Appendix).

In 2008-09 further steps were taken during congregational workshops (SFTF: 'Searching for the Future' and 'The Next Fifty Years', and 'On-site Housing'), and by the formation of a task force (VIA: Vision in Action). This resulted in the '*UUSS Campus Development Criteria*' and '*Building the Future – A Five Year Plan 2009-2013*', that were adopted by the Board and Congregation, and which provide overall guidelines for future changes to the campus. These workshops also led to the current UUMP process and its two committees for facilitation and oversight. The Building & Grounds Master Plan process during the 2002-2010 period is well documented on the UUSS website and in a strategy flowchart prepared in March 2010.

In the third quarter of 2010 the Facilitation Committee retained Jeff Gold & Associates to prepare this comprehensive Site & Building Assessment. In preparation, the Committee assembled all available documents and studies that had been completed to date. These included an abbreviated Site Assessment Report in 2009 prepared by members of the committee, and studies prepared by consultants that included an Energy Audit, an Arborist Evaluation, and a structural engineering assessment of the Social Hall. These studies as well as existing drawing documents are listed in the Appendix of this report.

The Committee directed this current assessment through a detailed outline for the work scope and methodology (see Appendix). Further discussions between the committee and consultant resulted in a more focused assessment that prioritized five areas for analysis. These are discussed in the executive summary.

The following report describe how existing conditions need to be factored into future development of the campus. As such, it is designed to provide information, analyses and recommendations that will help guide completion of the master plan and stewardship of the facility.

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATIONS

BACKGROUND:

This assessment study was prepared by a team of engineers and architects, and included: the review of all available documents, an on-site visual investigation, data analysis, meetings to review findings and draft reports, and communications with the UUSS facilitation committee. The site inspection was conducted on October 10, 2010. A draft of the assessment report was reviewed with the UUSS committee on November 1, 2010 and at a meeting on December 6, 2010. This final report is herein delivered for committee and Board review.

The main body of this report includes descriptive assessments by the electrical, mechanical and structural engineer, the project architect, and an accessibility/code compliance consultant. These assessments include detailed findings from the site inspection, and specific recommendations for remediation and future action. Digitized drawings have been prepared of the building floor plans and site plan, and are included in the Appendix. These plans reflect existing building conditions that are, in some areas, at variance to the original plans. These plans allow for accurate area calculations that are factors in determining building occupancy and certain items related to code compliance.

The UUSS facilitation committee identified the following areas as priorities to be addressed in this study. These are discussed in this summary and other sections.

- Code Compliance Issues; particularly ingress/egress requirements based on review of conditions with local fire marshal and City ordinances, and requirements for water and sewer services.
- Electrical Issues; load analysis of current service sizing and strategy for future building additions.
- Structural Issues; emphasis on existing roof and wall structure, and compliance with current code standards.
- Property Issues; County land use regulations, use permit status and future process.
- Accessibility Issues; descriptive summary of conditions and recommendations for change to reach code compliance.

There are three tiers of findings and recommendations that are referenced throughout the report, as follows:

Tier #1: Immediate fire/life/safety concerns that require immediate action or further investigation.

Tier #2: Recommended priorities for attention in the short-term (within the next 5 years) to address repairs, replacement or further investigations in order to enhance use and stewardship. This “tier” addresses the maintenance and remodel of the existing facility including replacement or repair of existing components.

Tier #3: Recommendations when considering the design of a substantive building addition, and when looking at the long-range full development of the campus.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS:

The following summary introduces the primary findings and recommendations discussed in each section of this report, and also addresses the primary areas of study requested by the UUSS committee. Additionally, this summary includes recommendations for the remainder of the master plan process and how this assessment study can be used to guide the next steps.

A. PLANNING:

Findings:

1. Communications with the Sacramento County Department of Planning and Community Development have determined that a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) would be required as part of any future building development of the campus. A copy of the County CUP application and applicable fees is included in the Appendix of this report. The County Land Use Code Sec. 201-04 requires Planning Commission review and approval of churches exceeding 150 person seating capacity.
2. Any remodel (without expansion of building area) of the existing facilities would be governed solely by the applicable building codes, and would not require a conditional use permit application. The current use is “grandfathered” as a development and occupancy that preceded adoption of the Use Permit process in the 1970s.

3. Any future new building addition will trigger the requirement to submit a Conditional Use Permit application.
4. The County Land Use Zoning Code, Title II, Table I indicates that “Church” is a compatible land use in the “RD20” – the residential zoning assigned to the neighborhood and to the Church property. It is likely that a conditional use permit would be granted to UUSS for appropriate, full development of the property in compliance with County development standards. The primary factor governing future development will be the off-site parking to support the building use.

Recommendations:

1. A part of the master planning process should include a pre-application meeting with the County Planning staff and Zoning Administrator (currently: Charlie Dyer; dycrc@saccounty.net).
2. The master planning process should include the preparation of reports and documents that will be required for the Conditional Use Permit application.
3. The Conditional Use Permit application review and approval process by the County will require a 3-6 month process (once submitted), and will be a prerequisite for obtaining a building permit for any substantive addition to the campus.

B. SITE DEVELOPMENT:

Findings:

1. Based on the Sacramento County 100 year floodplain map, the UUSS property is out of this flood plain governed by the Strong Ranch Slough, a tributary of the American River. However, the UUSS property is at the edge of influence of the high water mark of the American River in a 100-year storm event, established as 40.00 foot elevation. [The Social Hall building is at elevation 38.20 and the classroom building is at 39.50]. Future development of the property needs to include drainage facilities for the 100-year storm event. The State Water Resources Control Board requires the design of future development of the property to account for the 100-year storm event and to include the proper collection and detention of storm water. This will likely require the installation of sand/oil separator devices and a detention drain pipe system for the treatment of storm water gathered from the building roofs and impervious surfaces.
2. The existing parking lot appears to be adequate in size to support the existing buildings and some future building expansion. The County Development Standards governing off-street parking stipulate one parking space for every three seats within the main chapel or assembly room. (section 330-53). [when UUSS was being designed in the 1957-60, the

- parking accommodations were based on this general assumption and the vision of a 500 seat sanctuary]
3. The parking lot does not conform to the detailed requirements pertaining to: planters, landscaping, wheel stops, bumper curbs, fencing, lighting, stripping [size of parking stalls], loading zone, signage, trash enclosure and bike facilities. The existing parking lot is stripped for approximately 200 spaces. Re-stripping the parking lot to County regulations and complying with all other requirements (landscape areas for shading, etc.) would reduce the spaces to approximately 150-165.
 4. The existing parking lot is in poor condition, and its resurfacing has been identified by the UUSS property management committee as a high priority project.
 5. The property has two means of ingress, although the two driveways are not interlinked. The driveways are configured to provide appropriate access for emergency and fire-fighting apparatus (typically defined as access within 100 feet of any portion of the structure).

Recommendations:

1. The master plan should include a preliminary drainage analysis to determine the required devices and treatment of storm water. This analysis should include a discussion with the State Water Resources Control Board (WRCB) to confirm the treatment for the 100-year storm event.
2. The master plan process should include a discussion with the local fire marshal regarding the adequacy of the existing driveway configuration, widths and clearances, and the requirements for fire flow for future sprinkler system (sizing of new fire lines to provide the required gallons-per-minute flow rate and pressure in the public delivery system and where it is extended into the property) and fire hydrant locations to serve the campus.
3. Should the separate “duplex” residential parcel be sold or separately developed, the rear portion of this parcel (currently within the church fenced grounds) should be transferred to become a part of the main church parcel through a lot line adjustment procedure. This is deemed important for the outdoor space and landscape buffer adjacent to the main Social Hall. [the current UUSS campus development criteria refer to the need to “protect the potential for compatible infill housing (senior, low-income) – a reference to the duplex residential parcels]
4. Short-term (tier #2) remediation and improvements for the parking lot should be based on a detailed plan that takes into consideration all of the current County off-street development standards (see excerpt in appendix) and accessibility requirements. The repair and improvement plan for the parking lot should also take into consideration any plans for additional building(s) that might be developed in the master plan.

5. Short-term (tier #2) remediation and improvements for security fencing and gates, and perimeter lighting should be considered.

C. GENERAL BUILDING DEVELOPMENT:

Findings:

1. Most of the building interior and exterior finishes, fixtures and equipment are approximately 50 years old and evidence the original construction. The buildings reflect professional standards of construction. Some of the floor coverings (FAHS building), ceiling and wall finishes have been replaced or refinished. In general, the buildings are in serviceable condition, but reflect their use and wear.
2. The Social Hall building design and construction present some limitations to the appropriate sound separation of activities and the human circulation and flow between spaces with varying functions. There appears to be a conflict in the sight lines to the side foyer and bathroom area in relation to the stage.
3. There appears to be a lack of office space, visitor area, and related support/storage areas for the administration functions. There is an awkward circulation pattern between the Social Hall and the front offices.
4. The concrete wall construction and building shape provide unique qualities to the facilities, and present challenges for on-going maintenance (such as the replacement of the hexagonal glazing units).
5. There are no gutters at the roof perimeter; sheet flow and surface drainage occur on all sides of the building. This can result in a dry rot condition at the roof eave fascia.
6. The drop-down stairs “attic stairs” in the Social Hall provide access to the area above the perimeter soffit. This area is currently used for storage of props and seasonal items. This area is not designed to support “storage” loads and there is no safe walking surface installed over the framing.
7. The 2009 Site Assessment prepared by the UUSS Property Management Committee included an appendix of “new projects”, and classified them appropriately as: 1. Preservation, 2. Health & safety, 3. Operational improvements, or 4. Facility improvements. In most cases the projects could be placed into two or more of these categories. In aggregate, the list included close to one million dollars in estimated value, and each item has a compelling need. Most of the individual “projects” have an overlap or relationship to others, and as such require consideration as part of an overall plan and coordinated undertaking.

Recommendations:

1. A priority listing should be prepared for the phased repair, refinishing, replacement and upgrade to all building surfaces and architectural

- components. These include floor, wall and ceiling finishes, interior and exterior door systems, windows and glazing, millwork cabinetry and countertops, signage, and special equipment and fixtures (kitchen).
2. For effective and efficient planning, identify 'grouping' of items within the priority list that should accompany any larger renovation projects.
 3. For sustainability purposes, maintain the existing building fixtures and finishes, where practical. Where finishes and fixtures are replaced, consider the sustainable qualities of the components and their durability.
 4. Conduct a hazardous materials assessment survey and report to identify the items (such as floor tiles, drywall finish, paint finish, HVAC equipment) that will require special remediation in conjunction with future remodeling.
 5. Remodeling of the existing facility should take into consideration the programmatic needs that may effect the definition of spaces and their functions. The relocation of interior walls may provide needed space requirements for changing programs, or improvements to circulation.

D. STRUCTURAL:

Findings:

1. The buildings have the appearance of being structurally sound, and there are currently no visible signs of significant structural 'fatigue'; some localized dry rot (classroom posts) and deterioration of exposed framing members at the main building overhang were noted.
2. The Social Hall building was not constructed based on the drawings in the UUSS archive; no as-built drawings or engineering calculations were located that describe the substitution of wood and concrete structural elements for the steel frame as initially engineered and shown in the available documents. This is a significant impediment to comprehensive analysis of the existing structural building system. From a preliminary analysis, the building as constructed is not as strong as that which was designed. (Substitutions during construction were possibly made for cost-reduction purposes.)
3. The current building codes require significantly higher standards for structural design than what was in effect in the 1960s when the buildings were first constructed. These higher standards are due to improved analytical understanding about how buildings perform in earthquakes and because of increasing importance given to "factors of safety" for larger buildings occupied by the public such as the UUSS Social Hall and classrooms.
4. Notwithstanding the lack of as-built documentation and given a set of reasonable "assumptions" about the structures (where not visible), based on current code standards, there are a number of deficiencies in both the social hall and classroom buildings primarily in the capacity to resist large

lateral loads and at “point-load” connections. These issues are both tier #1 and #2 items.

Recommendations:

1. A comprehensive analysis of the existing buildings for structural safety should be conducted in the short term. This will include a variety of testing devices to verify the composition and detailing of the roof structure, wall structure, columns and specific connections. Following such testing, as-built documents depicting the structures should be prepared for future use in retrofit and remodeling projects. This analysis should also be designed to determine the specific remediation plan (where required) to strengthen the building to meet current code standards.
2. Any further possibilities to locate “as-built documents” should be pursued.
3. A cost-benefit analysis should be prepared to evaluate the cost of required retrofit to the existing social hall structure and to compare it to other options. Such an analysis should take into consideration the remediation cost for all systems. This analysis should be followed by the preparation of a structural retrofit project (if so chosen) coupled with other overall building upgrades; this is a recommendation for action to occur in the short-term period. This study has provided some initial findings, but also identified the lack of information from drawing documents to make definitive conclusions. Subject to these degrees of uncertainty, we would expect that the structural retrofit would be a lower cost compared to replacement of the structure.
4. A soils/geotechnical investigation and report should be prepared for the property, with particular emphasis on establishing soil types and structural soil properties in the vicinity of the existing buildings. This soils report will provide valuable information to support the other recommendations, and will be required for any future building additions.

E. MECHANICAL & ENERGY ENVELOPE:

Findings:

1. The Social Hall heating system is the original forced air ducted system installed with under-slab ducts. The equipment is not efficient to operate, and there is an inadequate fresh air make-up and return air supply system. There is no central air conditioning for this building, so the indoor air temperature and air circulation cannot be appropriately regulated. There is ineffective zoned regulation of temperatures for the offices, kitchen and library that have different requirements and occupancy patterns compared to the central social hall space.

2. The classroom buildings, FAHS Room and adjoining offices have conventional split systems with up flow furnaces and roof-mounted AC condensers. Inadequacies of the existing system include the lack of zoned controls, lack of even distribution of conditioned air, lack of controls for fresh air intake, air leaks in the system and inappropriate return air systems.
3. The existing building envelopes are inefficient. There is minimal insulation in the wall and ceiling assemblies, single glazing at all openings, a high ratio of glazing, and no weather stripping or gaskets at openings.
4. The plumbing fixtures are operable. The number of fixture units in the buildings meet current UPC minimum standards except for the number of drinking fountains.
5. The waste system piping and water piping appear to be adequately sized for the facility and could support building additions and the increase of fixture units. Based on the 2009 Assessment Report, the main water valves are faulty and service to the buildings can not be completely shut off.

Recommendations:

1. Connect the return air ducting under the stage area to the return registers; this should be considered a tier #1 project because the current open return air duct is a code violation and can be considered a fire hazard.
2. Connect the flue of the FAU#1 furnace (FAHS building) to the main flue assembly; this is a tier #1 item because the lack of proper connection is considered a fire hazard.
3. Replace existing heating system in the social hall with a system that provides appropriate, zoned heating and cooling.
4. Perform a duct test on the existing under-slab duct distribution system to determine whether the ducting meets acceptable performance standards (air tightness); this test will verify whether the existing ducts can be considered for use in the new system.
5. Undertake further investigation, design and cost benefit analysis to select the type of heating/cooling system for the social hall. Coordinate the heating system work with other components of the building remodel; these would include the structural retrofit, new roofing, and upgrade to roof and wall insulation assemblies.
6. Reconfigure and upgrade HVAC systems in the FAHS/Classroom buildings to increase performance and efficiency.
7. Upgrade the insulation of the roofs and walls where feasible and when other comprehensive remodeling is undertaken.
8. Develop the design and cost benefit analysis of alternative energy systems such as solar hot water and photovoltaic electrical generation system.

F. ELECTRICAL & FIRE ALARM:

Findings:

1. The electrical service and distribution system consists of a 600 amp 120/208V three-phase switchboard located in the social hall building. This main panel feeds three 100 amp subpanels in the social hall building and one 100 amp subpanel in each of the three classroom buildings. The service appears to be adequate to support the existing buildings with some additional capacity to handle normal AC loads if added to the assembly building.
2. The building interior illumination systems provide minimal light levels, and some of the fixtures in the offices and classrooms are outdated T-12 fixtures that are inefficient and have noisy ballasts. The main social hall space has recently been retrofitted with a new lighting system with T-8 efficient, electronic ballast fixtures
3. The fire alarm system at the classroom building does not appear to be operational and does not comply with current code standards with regard to pull stations and smoke detectors. No fire alarm devices or system services the main building. NFPA 72 standards require a manual fire alarm system in all group "A" occupancy buildings having a load of 300 or more (category of the Social Hall). Discussion with Ed Bassett, Battalion Chief at Sacramento Fire Department, indicated that the social hall was built to standards applicable in the 1960s and therefore the absence of a fire alarm system is not an issue. If a substantial upgrade to the building were made (such as new air conditioning), then a fire alarm system would likely be required.
4. The Social Hall egress lighting consists of exit signs with combination unit battery equipment. This equipment does not appear to provide minimum light levels for emergency egress.

Recommendations:

1. Review compliance of Social Hall egress exit lighting, and remedy as required. This is a Tier #1 item.
2. Develop a comprehensive design for retrofit and upgrade to the interior and exterior lighting systems, light controls, power receptacles and low voltage wiring systems; integrate work with other remodeling/retrofit projects. This work can be undertaken incrementally.
3. Develop an exterior lighting system that incorporates occupancy sensors and time clock controls in order to provide enhanced site security.
4. Develop a plan that incorporates low-voltage, audio/video/data cabling and wireless technology infrastructure into future phased improvements;

- this can include network wiring for computer systems, wifi connectivity, audio/video broadcast, projection and recording.
5. Future significant building additions should anticipate the need for a new service from the utility provider. The new service may require the relocation of the existing meter and in turn, the power feed to the existing main switchboard to maintain current distribution to the existing buildings.

G. ACCESSIBILITY & CODE COMPLIANCE:

Findings:

1. There are accessibility issues related to the parking lot and the pathway from the parking lot to the building entrance.
2. Lack of compliance with current accessibility or egress standards includes: steps, railings, access to stage, drinking fountains, bathroom facilities in the main building and classroom buildings, entry doors to main building and classroom buildings, signage for path of travel, and exit signage, and parking lot accessibility stripping and signage.
3. There is currently no fire sprinkler system serving the buildings. Fire sprinkler systems were not required by the code at the time of initial construction.
4. The existing facilities constructed in the 1960s were subject to the codes prevailing at that time. The buildings were designed by a licensed architect and were built with a permit. The project components appear to be consistent with buildings of its period and appear well constructed for their day.
5. Since churches are exempt from the Americans with Disabilities Act, there is no affirmative duty to do upgrade work related to accessibility and code compliance, unless work for remodeling or building additions is undertaken for which a permit must be obtained. Such a new permit will necessitate compliance with the current building code and may trigger the requirement to make additional upgrades to bring pre-existing conditions into full compliance with current code standards.

Recommendations:

1. Accessibility and code-related upgrades are triggered only by permitted work. Future remodeling, renovation or building additions may necessitate upgrades in other portions of the facility.
2. If accessibility work is to be done, the non-accessible unisex toilet should be made accessible or the sign removed, and the accessible parking spaces should be repaved and restriped and code compliance signage provided.
3. Adjustments to exterior door sizes that provide means of egress should be considered as an independent alteration project in order to provide

- improvement to life safety. There is no requirement to make this adjustment unless remodeling work is done to impact the means of egress system.
4. The addition of a fire sprinkler system for the existing buildings should be considered as an independent alteration project for purposes of property protection and life safety. There is no requirement to install such a system. However, a substantial building addition, whether attached or detached, may trigger compliance to provide such a sprinkler system to both the new and existing structures.

SUMMMARY:

This assessment provides a significant list of items that require further study, repair, remediation or replacement. The list can appear daunting, and such questions arise as: where to begin? How to prioritize? How to phase the work? How do we design for the future? What are the financial and timing dimensions? These questions should be addressed during completion of the master plan.

There are two major building items in the tier #1 & #2 category that should be given high priority and considered together in a comprehensive renovation of the Social Hall building. These include:

- Structural retrofit/reinforcement
- Replacement of the HVAC system

Other building upgrades, modernization and reconfiguration of the interior space to serve current programs should also be evaluated as part of the Social Hall building renovation project. Renovation of the classroom buildings can be addressed as separate projects from the Social Hall if budgeting requires a phased approach. Similarly, site improvements and in particular renovation of the parking lot could be scheduled as a separate phase. Before embarking on the comprehensive renovation, it is very useful to complete the master plan for which UUSS is currently engaged because this plan will affect the design and sequencing of the work.

NEXT STEPS:

In the completion of the master plan, there are two aspects that need concurrent energy: one area includes the understanding of the scope of stewardship to renovate and maintain the existing buildings and grounds. The other, equally important aspect is the vision for the overall campus plan and how it serve the UUSS community, its programs, and future generations.

The area of 'stewardship' has been studied in technical detail by this current assessment and other previously completed reports. During the balance of the master plan, the following additional steps are recommended for this area of understanding:

1. Complete the structural assessment of the Social Hall building to confirm the nature of the reinforcement required to meet current standards.
2. Complete an assessment of the Social Hall under-floor ducting (test of air tightness of ducts) in order to confirm whether this ducting can be used in the new heating/cooling system.
3. Prepare a drainage study and geotechnical study to support a more complete understanding for site and building requirements.
4. Conduct a field meeting with the local fire marshal to confirm fire protection systems and measures for the existing facility.
5. Prepare an itemized construction cost estimate for the renovation of all aspects of the buildings and grounds that call for repair, remediation and replacement. The cost estimate should be prepared with the assistance of a general building contractor and specialty contractors familiar with the type of work, and should be organized by individual buildings and in incremental discrete projects in order to support a phased approach.
6. Evaluate the proposed renovation work projects for their time requirements for design, planning and construction, and their impact to on-going use of the facilities.
7. Prepare a master plan report that provides specific guidance for renovation and maintenance of facilities.

The second thread – the vision for the campus plan and its program, will include reflections on the prior visioning workshops and further discussions by the congregation, committees and staff about the relationship of the facilities to the programs. Each program, activity, reoccurring and special event needs to be evaluated for their building and site requirements. Forecasting potential new programs that may require facility considerations should also be a part of the discussion. Questions will arise on such subjects as:

- A future sanctuary separate from the Social Hall?
- What changes would enhance workshop services in the existing Social Hall?

- Additional meeting rooms, large and small?
- Changes and additions to offices/staff needs?
- Changes and additions to support the RE programs, music programs, study groups, intergenerational and outreach programs, resource center, welcoming & reception functions?
- Changes and additions for food preparation and support?
- The UUSS campus as a retreat center?
- Outdoor social and environmental events?
- How to incorporate the most sustainable practices?

During the balance of the master plan, the following additional steps are recommended to complete the overall campus plan:

1. Prepare accurate site plan and floor plan of existing conditions. This will incorporate information from existing documents and will require additional surveying. These are important “base plans” that future planning and design work will depend upon.
2. Conduct questionnaires, interviews, committee meetings and workshops to discuss the full range of program needs, and to establish priorities for phased implementation. The master plan may consider “alternative” concept plans, depending on how projects could be phased and the availability of funding. These discussions will include a review of prior planning efforts and consideration of the larger vision about sustainability and the campus as an environmental and aesthetic sanctuary.
3. Prepare a long-range campus plan and accompanying descriptive documents that summarize the programming and design work. Obtain Board and congregation approval of the plan.
4. Conduct a pre-application process with the County planning staff in order to confirm feasibility of the campus plan and to determine the regulatory requirements for future building additions and site development. [an actual use permit application process would follow completion of the master plan]
5. Prepare an itemized construction cost estimate for the whole campus development plan. Separate costs by phased projects, where possible.

Following completion of these two aspects of the master plan, a final step can include a detailed focus for the initial phased project. This can consist of additional design studies and documents to support a capital campaign and financing program.