

Project 31 - Development Sub-Committee Report

8 September 2020

To the members of the Project 31 Steering committee:

The Project 31 Development sub-committee is pleased to present this summary of our discussions of the Development activities of each Council, in line with our remit to identify related pros and cons to a potential merger.

The sub-committee met three times in August 2020, in addition to consultations among the co-chairs and professional advisors. Our discussions and assessment were reliant on the verbal representations by board members and professionals from each Council, supported by select reports and summaries prepared by professional staff of each Council. The timing of our review did not allow for any validation or substantiation of the information provided.

We are pleased to report that no major impediments to the Development activities of a combined Council were identified in our discussions and that select opportunities to strengthen Development, leveraging the combined strengths of each Council and a larger membership and geographic footprint, were identified and noted in more detail in this summary. **We recommend the Steering Committee continue the process of exploring a merger of the Councils.**

The co-chairs would like to thank the volunteers and professionals that participated in the process.

Yours in Scouting,

Daniel Zica (HVC BSA) and Tom Campanile (WPC BSA)

Project 31 Development Sub-Committee Co-Chairs

I. Executive Summary

Development is not (and should not be) a primary driver for any merger. As a not-for-profit, Development activities are undertaken to provide the necessary financial resources to fulfill the primary mission of supporting the delivery of the Scouting program. Impact on areas such as Membership, Program and Camps are more important to consider, with Development viewed as a means to support the mission, youth, volunteers and staff of a combined Council.

As such, our sub-committee set an assessment standard that merged Development activities should deliver on “one plus one equals at least two.” Synergies or opportunities would be viewed as a bonus, but not a requirement. While any impediments or areas where a merger would hurt the combined Council’s fundraising would need to be carefully considered.

Our overall assessment is that there are no major impediments that would hurt Development in a combined Council. All downside risks, threats and headwinds discussed would need to be navigated by the two Councils regardless of any merger. These risks include:

- the current economic environment and impact of COVID-19
- changes in charitable giving patterns for individuals, corporations and foundations
- the impact of the BSA National bankruptcy and the related press coverage and annual increases to National registration fees (we also note that the two Councils have different approaches to the Council Operations/Program fee which would need to be considered and harmonized in a merger)

Our view is that a combined Council, with the sum of the experience and talents of the respective Boards, volunteers and professionals, could be better positioned to navigate these risks. We believe Development would be positively impacted by:

- Demonstrating greater, measurable impact (total youth served)
- Larger geographic footprint within the mission areas of a greater number of foundations and corporations
- Minimal overlap of existing donors or special events
- Compatible Board cultures (views on Development priorities)
- Capital campaign opportunities at four very different Camps

Note: the subsequent pages of this report contain detailed information on grants and development work that is not appropriate for publication on the web. Council members wishing to see the remainder of the report may request it through their district executive or other Scouting professional as appropriate.