

TO: UUCH Board of Trustees

20 Dec 2017

FROM: Next Steps Task Force

This is to convey our recommendations for proceeding on a Congregational decision on how to invest the remaining funds from the sale of the Governors Drive property.

As a reminder and to provide context for this report, we list the activities our task force led or performed over the past year:

- Assembly of various renovation options that were presented as part of a recommended resolution to the Annual Meeting last May. These had come from the following sources: recommendations from the original Renovation Committee; recommendations from the Accessibility Task Force; brainstorming sessions by the Council that had been communicated to us; and our own experience and judgment.
- Recommending to that meeting (through the Board) that the Congregation accept the recommendation of the Finance Committee to pay off the mortgage on our present facility with some of the funds, and to hire an architect to help us study renovation options using the remaining monies. (Projects of replacing the main water line and parking lot lights were also part of the proposal.) This resolution was passed.
- The architects (Bird and Kamback, with Greg Kamback being the lead) worked with us to consider various options for making the chancel and restrooms accessible, adding another gender-neutral accessible restroom, and expanding the fellowship hall. They also provided a preliminary design for new restrooms in the north wing.
- We received from Jeanne deFrance (representing the Accessibility Task Force) recommendations on revising the architects' chancel design (avoiding a "lift" recommendation that the architects had made), and we also received from her some contractor estimates that she had obtained for fixing the south wing entrance and ramp, and estimates for the restrooms that involved less construction (thus less expensive) than the proposals from the architects.
- At our request, the architects provided cost estimates for the chancel renovation (using ramps, no lift), fellowship hall expansion, RE restrooms reconfiguration, adding a crying room to the rear of the sanctuary, and constructing the new "family" restroom near the fellowship hall.
- Based on previous experience and on information provided from various contractors, we obtained cost estimates to prepare the north wing for a new nursery, and putting up a new sign near the street. We (Laurel) also obtained information on some options for replacing the sanctuary windows,
- We held an open town hall meeting in conjunction with the first Sunday potluck of December at which we obtained votes on the priorities from congregation members present among the choices.

The priority votes from the town hall meeting are given in the Appendix. The number of total dot votes (items selected within the individual's hypothetical budget of \$150K) for each project is given in bold type, and the numbers not in bold are the number of the actual dot votes for the options within that project. The "star" vote means that the member said that it was the one project that they would have chosen had there been enough money in the budget for it (above the \$150K allocated to each member). Note that expanding the fellowship hall garnered the most star votes, by far, and thus represents the best possibility for future renovation when additional funds are obtained. The top 5 dot vote-getters were:

1. Renovating the RE wing restrooms (or just one of them) to accommodate wheel chairs and be gender neutral.
2. Building a new ramp into the current (south) RE wing to fit the 1:12 ADA constraint.
- 3 (tie). Rebuilding the doorway into the south entrance to better accommodate wheel chairs.
- 3 (tie). Build a new restroom (or expand the current office restroom and build an access hall to it) that would be wheel-chair accessible and gender neutral.
5. Rebuild the chancel to accommodate wheel chair access.

The total cost of these projects, if the least expensive (highest number of votes) options are chosen for the restrooms, is estimated to be \$93,800.

The next highest vote-getter was to replace the sanctuary windows, which was a surprise to some of us. If we take the most popular option, the cost is \$15,000, bringing the subtotal to \$108,800. That leaves room for the next highest affordable option of beginning to renovate the north wing, to accommodate a new nursery or other use of the first room on the right. That would bring the cost to \$131,800, which is close enough (to within a 20% reserve) to the total funds available to stop there. The next two items, a safety railing next to the south entrance and a new sign, might be held in reserve, with the safety railing being most likely, since it is cheaper and was slightly more popular in this vote. Note that our architect recommended a 20% contingency be established for the renovations based on the rough magnitude of the estimates provided.

We should mention some work that is not recommended based on the dot votes and other considerations. First, building a crying room in the rear of the sanctuary was not supported by votes. A new sign is something that can be considered once we are confident of other costs, if funds are available. We received a few suggestions for additional work from a sheet left in the fellowship hall, and also that there are a few other projects that had been suggested by the Council in early brainstorming sessions. All of these suggestions have been considered but are believed to be more appropriate for future proposals, largely within the operating budget forming process (including being offered as possible ABD incentives). We will pass the suggestion sheet along to the Property Chair for that consideration. A fairly large item left off is a new projector that would be mounted in the balcony of the sanctuary, which would enhance worship services. Another large project not included in the list taken

to the town hall meeting was to reconstruct the main (sanctuary) entrance to make it accessible. We were advised by the Accessibility Task Force chair that that project had been considered in depth by them, and that they had determined that it was not a good value and had several problems with it. The advice was to work on making the south entrance smoothly accessible and to try that for an extended period of time, and later (maybe a couple of years down the road) reconsider the main entrance accessibility if deemed necessary at that time.

Our recommendation for action to proceed is, first, to task the Property Committee (or new renovation committee) to obtain competitive bids on the top 4 items. The committee should first obtain whatever details they can get from Jeanne on what she has already done, then obtain additional bids taking into consideration the available options and total funding, and finally make a recommendation. Results from this effort would instill a greater degree of confidence in the estimates (particularly for the restroom construction) and would therefore enable the church to know better how much funding would be left for the other items.

We note that a contractor replacing the south entrance door might recommend some kind of replacement to the present glass walkway, which could satisfy one of the concerns on the suggestion sheet (water leakage at the bottom of the glass wall). Such information would be valuable for consideration, and it may be that the Property Committee would recommend that work be done as well.

We further recommend that a new task force be recruited to work on the sanctuary renovation, including both the chancel area and windows. The windows task force might be a sub-committee with an additional member or two, since that work would be largely independent of the chancel and of a more creative or artistic composition. However, the windows and chancel together make the major part of the sanctuary aesthetics, and so ought to be coordinated. You might consider two co-chairs for the sanctuary task force, each of them chairing one aspect (chancel or windows), and each of them recruiting members for their sub-committee as needed. In addition, we recommend one additional person to serve on both sub-committees (but not necessarily chair either one). An option is to name this person the chair of the overall sanctuary effort. The chancel group should obtain quotes from at least two construction companies and shall work with the architects as deemed necessary. We recommend that the windows sub-committee develop an overall plan for the window replacements and should develop multiple options, including drawings, to bracket the cost range of approximately \$10,000 to \$21,000. (Note that Laurel has already gotten some cost estimates, but not selected specific designs, etc., for the full window replacement options.) There may be options of doing some aspect(s) of the window replacement now, within the current budget, and additional aspect(s) later as funds become more available (i.e. doing the larger, \$35,000 effort, but doing it in pieces). Such questions should be addressed in this effort.

The Property Committee should be also tasked with putting together the estimate for the north wing renovation in detail, but with lower priority than the first 4 items. (They can use the first bids we already got for the HVAC and plumbing as part of this process.) Whether this project will fit into the overall proposal to the Congregation in the spring depends on the final cost estimate of this and those of the other, higher priority, items.

Because access into the RE wing (door from the outside, and the ramp) are such high priority and of relatively low cost, it is recommended to pursue a way to approve this work to begin as soon as possible, within the constraints imposed by our Bylaws. However, we acknowledge that it may be preferable to present the total renovation project scope to the congregation for approval before implementing any of these tasks.

Regarding the safety rail along the front of the sanctuary, it seems to us that more than just a short piece between the existing ramp/rail and the hedges are needed. We recommend that the Accessibility Task Force (who provided the existing estimate) obtain an estimate for the whole length of the walkway, and then we all can consider what to do about that. Perhaps it would be advisable to install the short one now and the longer one later; or evaluate different types of rails that may be more cost effective

We believe that this completes the charter of the Next Steps Task Force, as the rest of the work needed is specific to property expertise and requires different personnel than those here. We stand ready to help as requested (do you need us to meet with the Board or Council to explain these recommendations?), but we intend to take no further action at this time. At your request, we would expect to speak to the decision-making process when the final proposal is presented to the Congregation for approval.

**Respectfully submitted by**

**Tim Miller (chair)**

**Lysie Lamitie**

**Brad Korb**

**APPENDIX**

		<b>Dot s</b>	<b>Star s</b>	<b>Cost</b>
RE wing restrooms	TOTAL	<b>34</b>		
	A	4		57000
	B	13		14000
	C	17	3	7000
RE wing ramp		<b>32</b>		3800
New restroom	TOTAL	<b>30</b>		
	A (\$5K)	25		5000
	B (\$18K)	5		18000
South entrance		<b>30</b>		10000
Chancel		<b>29</b>	12	68000
Windows	TOTAL	<b>26</b>		
	A	6		3300
	B	12		15000
	C	1		21000
	D	7	1	35000
Fellowship Hall expansion		<b>23</b>	20	123000
North wing		<b>20</b>	3	23000
Safety railing		<b>19</b>		1800
Sign		<b>17</b>	1	9000
Crying room		<b>7</b>	1	8000