

## CRITERIA TO CONSIDER IN DECIDING ON FUTURE UUCP FACILITIES

<b>CRITERIA</b> (Please see other side for notes)	<b>RATING OF IMPORTANCE</b> (Circle One Number)				
	Not Important	Slightly Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important	Extremely important
1. Improved ADA access to and inside church buildings	1	2	3	4	5
2. Increased Sanctuary space	1	2	3	4	5
3. Increased/Improved Friendship Hall space	1	2	3	4	5
4. More space for Religious Exploration program	1	2	3	4	5
5. Improved technology capacity	1	2	3	4	5
6. Improved/increased staff space	1	2	3	4	5
7. Ambience and functionality of current Sanctuary	1	2	3	4	5
8. Location of the church	1	2	3	4	5
9. Parking	1	2	3	4	5
10. Potential for green technology	1	2	3	4	5
11. Cost: Capital expenditure (Alternatives 2-4)	1	2	3	4	5
12. Costs of maintaining current buildings in the near future	1	2	3	4	5

**Comments/Concerns? (Please refer to the number of the criterion you are addressing.)**

## NOTES ON THE CRITERIA

1. Indoor access between the floors of the church building is only via narrow stairs; the Yellow House does not have ADA access to the entrance or to the basement and second floor.
2. Attendance has averaged about 85 (high is 158) over the past 10 years. The official maximum is 218. Full capacity can discourage newcomers.
3. Friendship Hall serves the community as well as the church; kitchen doesn't meet current needs.
4. The RE program is growing rapidly (the average number of students per semester has grown from 19 to 27 in the last 5 years) and needs more and larger rooms. Currently we are renting space from the 1912 Center about 6 times a year for RE classes. RE class use (eg OWL) limits available meeting spaces for other groups.
5. Antiquated wiring in the Yellow House needs to be addressed. In the church building, up-to-date sound, digital and AV technology needs to be supported.
6. Would include an office for the Music Director and expanded space for existing offices.
7. Sanctuary aesthetics, identity with UUCP and its history, seating, sight lines.
8. Location issues include mode of transportation, convenience for congregants coming from outside of Moscow, Alternative 4 will need to be on the edge of town, urban in-fill vs. urban sprawl.
9. Alt's 1 and 2 don't expand current capacity; Alt. 3 adds a few spaces; Alt. 4 has unlimited parking.
10. Green building may be costlier; importance of environmental responsibility; lower energy bills.
11. There will be major maintenance issues within the next 10 years. Church building: replace siding on 2 exterior walls, replace south window, deal with basement floor/foundation problems, replace front steps. Yellow House: new deck. Cost estimated to be about \$135,000.
12. Estimated capital cost of Alt. 2 is \$0.45 million; Alt. 3 is \$1.62 million; Alt. 4 is \$2.14 million.

**Please rank the four proposed alternatives proposed for future UUCP facilities below:**

<u>ALTERNATIVES</u>	<u>RANK THE ALTERNATIVES: 1 IS YOUR MOST PREFERRED, 4 IS YOUR LEAST PREFERRED</u>
<b>Alternative 1:</b> Keep current facilities as they are.	
<b>Alternative 2:</b> Add a new stairwell and elevator to the church and fix ADA access for the Yellow House.	
<b>Alternative 3:</b> Replace Yellow House with a 2-story building that would also augment some church building facilities.	
<b>Alternative 4:</b> Build an entirely new facility at a new site.	

---

Your Name

Date