

May 14, 2018

UUCP Facilities Taskforce: Mary DuPree, Chuck Harris, Diane Prorak

Report to the UUCP Board

The taskforce conducted four congregational meetings between March 15 and May 6: 73 people attended. There were 102 responses to the survey that presented twelve criteria for consideration and asked for a ranking of the four alternatives for future facilities that had been presented by the Facilities Taskforce. 19 of these surveys were unsigned.

CHOICE AMONG ALTERNATIVES

Both in the meetings and the surveys it was clear that the preference is for Alternative 3: keeping the current location and replacing the Yellow House. For 66 percent of respondents, this was the first choice, and for 88 percent, Alternative 3 was either their first or second choice. About 23 percent most preferred Alternative 2; 11 percent preferred Alternative 4, and 1 percent preferred Alternative 1.

Alternative 3 was preferred because of the importance of the history and aesthetics of the Sanctuary, the church's high visibility to the community at large and its central location. There did not seem to be a preference for another location from most Pullman respondents. At the same time, there was almost no attachment to the Yellow House, and a strong sense that we need more Religious Exploration space as well as meeting space in general.

There needs to be more capacity for seating in the Sanctuary in the future, although its not clear how much more, and how this would be impacted by city parking requirements. Suggestions included adding a balcony as well as expanding the Sanctuary into the current foyer and office and using the space in the northwest corner of the Sanctuary more efficiently. (There was little discussion of the nature of the expansion of the Friendship Hall, or of improved office space for UUCP staff.)

CONSIDERATIONS OF CRITERIA

MOBILITY ACCESS

Mobility access to and within the church buildings ranked as the single most important criterion, and comments indicated that addressing this issue is long overdue. One suggestion was to phase new construction so that the mobility access is prioritized.

PARKING

Parking was frequently mentioned, but there was not a consensus on its importance in people's decision making. Parking in the current location, especially in bad weather, is a problem for some; some feel that we can be creative about helping congregants get to church. Many comments indicated that we should "walk the talk" environmentally and not allow car parking to drive our decision. It seems like a good idea to reserve the spaces on the West side of the lot for the elderly and disabled. Parking under the new structure was suggested. s

HOW SHOULD THE UUCP GROW?

There is a variety of opinions expressed about how much the UUCP should grow and no clear consensus. Overall congregants acknowledge that we need some more Sanctuary space, but at the same time concern over potential loss of a sense of community if we grow too large. Should we plan for major growth? (Projections of annual population growth are less than 1 percent for Moscow and 1.5 percent for Pullman.) Should we be willing to only grow as large as is comfortable in the current location? How large a church can retain the sense of community we have now? Should a Pullman church split off at some point? What are the ways we can accommodate a significantly larger congregation and stay in our current location?

COST OF ALTERNATIVES

We framed our four discussions in a way that focused on congregational needs rather than on our capacity to pay for the alternatives. Some written comments, though, did express concerns about the financial burden our choices would impose.

OTHER THEMES

Several respondents ranked the use of **green technology** important, and central to the UUCP mission.

The **aesthetics** of a new addition are important to many, and one of the few positive attributes of the Yellow House was its “coziness.” Several people hoped that the Sanctuary windows on the West side, with their natural light, would not be blocked, and that some of the courtyard could be retained.

Safety was not an issue addressed in the criteria the taskforce presented, but safe egress in emergencies and provisions to deal with malicious intruders is an important to consider.