

August 2, 2015

REPORT OF THE SACRED HEART EXPLORATORY COMMITTEE

A goal of the Know, Love and Serve report is to assess the adequacy of Sacred Heart's facilities to serve the needs of Sacred Heart's ministry and its parishioners. In response, Father Jeff Core appointed the Exploratory Committee for Building and Grounds to investigate different options for ensuring that the Sacred Heart facilities are adequate, safe and accessible. The members of the Committee and their backgrounds are listed in Attachment A to this report.

The Committee has completed its work and submits the following report, analysis and recommendation:

I. Existing Facilities

Sacred Heart's existing facilities are the main church building which includes a sanctuary split between the main part with a seating capacity of approximately 210, and an annex separated from the main sanctuary that seats approximately 60. The building also has 5 classrooms in the basement, a small office and library space, a meeting room adjacent to the sanctuary annex, and a social hall that has a kitchen and seating for approximately 80 people. Separated from the main building is a house that serves as the office for our parish priest and church staff. The main church parking lot is across the street and can hold about 80 cars. The house that serves as the rectory for our parish priest is located about 2.5 miles from the church.

The main sanctuary and basement rooms were originally constructed in 1935. The annex was added in 1958, and the social hall was added in 1983. The house that serves as the office was built in 1915 and was purchased by Sacred Heart in 1979. Each part of the facilities was constructed in accordance with the building codes in force at the time of construction, but most of the facilities have not been upgraded since they were built. Some improvements were made several years ago to provide accessibility and bathroom space for people with disabilities, but it is still very difficult for mobility impaired persons to access many parts of the church.

II. Identified Deficiencies

The Committee identified many deficiencies in the existing facilities, including:

- The split sanctuary makes it difficult to have a cohesive Mass service, especially for the priest and the persons seated in the annex
- Even with both sanctuary sides being used, there is not enough space to accommodate all of the parishioners that want to attend some masses, such as major holy days. We have grown from 396 to 441 families in just the last year and a half.
- There is limited access for the disabled to and within the church. Some rooms in the church are not accessible, for example, the classrooms.

- The social hall is too small to accommodate many parish gatherings, funerals, and weddings.
- The kitchen and its equipment are inadequate and in need of major overhaul.
- The church buildings and office do not meet current fire code.
- The church buildings and office do not meet current electrical or plumbing codes.
- High maintenance costs.
- Considerable deferred maintenance.
- No cry room.
- The classrooms are not satisfactory.
- Offices are inadequate.
- The parking lot is not big enough to accommodate the number of people who need to park in it. Three deep parking on each side is necessary for many masses, and there is rarely any available on-street parking due to the density of the surrounding neighborhood. Sometimes at the 8:30 Mass, people drive around trying to find a parking spot, and when they can't, they leave.
- The parking lot has often been the repository of waste, including broken glass, from residents and visitors of surrounding housing, and unauthorized parking which often occurs creates difficulties for staff to monitor and enforce.
- The Church is surrounded by noisy student housing which at times interferes with services and access.
- The current location is not very inviting because of its setting.
- Our Priest does not live on site and his residence is far away.

III. Options Explored by the Committee

The Committee explored four options for addressing the identified deficiencies:

A. Option 1: Renovate existing facilities

The Committee identified improvements and upgrades that would be needed if the choice is made to keep the existing facilities, including:

- Enlarge the main sanctuary so that the whole congregation can be seated facing the altar and priest during mass, and so that it can accommodate the growth of our parish community. This would require major structural changes to the existing building.

- Add dedicated confessional space.
- Renovate and enlarge the sacristy, focused on security and storage.
- Add a cry room.
- Additional disability improvements and access, including changes to the front or to west side of the church to provide a ramp to allow the disabled to directly enter the main sanctuary.
- New kitchen facilities and equipment in the social hall.
- Enlarge the social hall to provide adequate seating capacity for parish gatherings, funerals, and weddings.
- Replace doors and furnishings in the classrooms.
- Fire code upgrades, including a suppression system, fire alarm system, fire corridor, fire wall, fire dampers, and secondary egress windows in the basement rooms.
- Plumbing upgrade.
- Sump pump and sewer line upgrade.
- Heating and cooling system upgrade.
- Electrical system upgrade.
- Energy efficiency upgrades.
- Buy adjacent property to provide additional parking in the form of a two level parking facility.
- Security and sound systems upgrades.
- Replace flooring throughout the facilities.
- Renovate or tear down and rebuild the Parish office building to bring it up to current building codes and make it more functional and accessible, or tear it down, move the offices to the enlarged social hall facility, and use the space for part of the additional parking lot.

The Committee was unable to determine the exact scope of the work that needs to be done behind the walls, such as electrical, plumbing, and structural issues. However, our consensus is that the work would be extensive and expensive given the age of the buildings, and problems with them that routinely manifest themselves and have to be fixed. For that reason, we could not develop a reasonable estimate of the cost of Option 1, although it would be substantial.

B. Option 2: Tear down and rebuild on the existing site

The Committee next explored the possibility of removing the existing facilities and rebuilding on the current site. We concluded, after reviewing potential layouts that this could physically be done in a manner that would satisfy many of the identified needs. The main sanctuary could be built large enough to handle our present parish membership and future growth, a new social hall could be built that is adequate in size, and an adjacent two story building could be constructed for classrooms, offices, and a rectory. As in Option 1, property adjacent to the church property would have to be purchased to accommodate construction of a two story parking facility.

A conceptual plan for this option was produced for discussion purposes and also for estimating the potential cost. The cost of Option 2 based on this conceptual plan would be approximately \$10 million.

A concern for both Options 1 and 2 is whether the City of Pullman would allow an enlarged facility without substantially more parking made available than could be provided in these options. The existing parking lot is zoned differently than the church property so a zoning change would be necessary to do anything else with that property. It is also uncertain whether a new parking structure would be permitted under current zoning.

Another concern with Options 1 and 2 is that the current facilities would need to be shut down while the work is being done. Therefore, we would need to find and rent another facility elsewhere in Pullman out of which to operate in the interim.

C. Option 3: Build a new church at another location in Pullman

The third option the Committee explored was building new church facilities at another location in Pullman. The Committee developed an overall concept for this option that we believe is consistent with the values and aspirations of our Parish. This concept envisions the creation of a “faith village” that embraces and builds community through good architectural and environmental design. In our opinion, this option affords the most flexibility in design and features and would best enhance the service and mission of our Parish.

Ideally, we would need 10 to 15 acres of land. Because of the need to hook up to city water and sewer, this land should be within or near the city limits. It would also need to be convenient to access and have good visibility in the community.

Wherever the site, the conceptual plan we developed for this option would provide a large enough sanctuary and related worship rooms, classrooms, social hall, offices, rectory, and parking to accommodate our growing Parish.

We produced a conceptual plan for Option 3 for discussion purposes and also for estimating the potential cost.. The cost of Option 3 based on this conceptual plan would be approximately \$10 million.

A new site would also allow our Parish to explore partnering with Catholic Charities for an adjacent housing complex for low income seniors and disabled persons. This has been done in other locations in the Diocese and would have the added benefit of Catholic Charities sharing the cost to develop the infrastructure for the site.

D. Option 4: Do nothing

The last option we considered was to do nothing or to only do part of what is needed. The Committee unanimously opposed that option since it does not resolve the most of the deficiencies identified, and will not address the future needs of our growing Parish.

IV. Recommendation

The Exploratory Committee unanimously recommends Option 3; construction of a new church on a new site. Our recommended option has the advantages of:

- Facilities that remedy all of the identified deficiencies of the existing facilities.
- A more inviting and complete church complex that could include a chapel.
- Better visibility in the community.
- Easy access for disabled and mobility impaired persons.
- More eco-friendly and cost effective facilities, with opportunities for big savings in the cost of energy.
- The opportunity to partner with Catholic Charities to help low income seniors and the disabled.
- Sale of existing church facilities would help to fund the cost of the new facilities.
- No need to find and pay for temporary facilities for Mass and other church functions while demolition and construction are underway.

V. Summary

The charge to our Committee emanating from the Know, Love and Serve initiative was to investigate options for ensuring that the Sacred Heart facilities are adequate, safe and accessible. We did so by reviewing the existing facilities, identifying deficiencies, and considering what would need to be done to make the Parish facilities adequate, safe and accessible. We explored four options, and we recommend Option 3; develop new church facilities on a new site.

Sincerely,

Father Jeff Core, Steve Austin, Jason Baerlocher, David Gunderson, Rich Heath, Carmel Minogue, Keith Kincaid

Attachment A – Exploratory Committee Members

The members of the Exploratory Committee are Father Jeff Core, Steve Austin, Jason Baerlocher, David Gunderson, Keith Kincaid, Carmel Minogue and Rich Heath, as Chair. The members of the committee have a diverse set of skills and varying longevity with the Parish that have given us the ability to address our charge from multiple points of view and expertise.

Father Jeff guided us in our deliberations, providing perspective on the liturgical and physical needs of new, renovated, or remodeled facilities for Sacred Heart Parish.

Steve Austin is on the Landscape Architecture faculty at the School of Design and Construction at WSU. He has nearly 30 years of experience as a land planner and designer and nearly 20 years as a land use and development attorney. Steve has been involved with over \$2 billion in development projects.

Jason Baerlocher is a project manager in the WSU division of Capital Projects, which oversees new construction, and the renovation of all WSU buildings. He has 16 years of professional commercial construction experience. Prior to joining WSU, Jason worked as a project manager for a large commercial contractor where he oversaw the design, budgeting and construction of a wide variety of developments.

David Gunderson has been on the faculty of the School of Design and Construction at WSU for the past 9 years, teaching graduate and undergraduate courses in Construction Management. Prior to his position at WSU, he spent 30 years in the construction industry working for general contractors on commercial construction projects. The last 10 years in the industry he worked as a project manager and prior to that as a superintendent, project engineer, and foreman. During the past 10 years he has also worked as a consultant to general contractors and subcontractors. David has lead several capital improvement projects for our Parish.

Keith Kincaid is a licensed realtor and owns his own real estate company. He has many years of experience in real estate in the Pullman area.

Carmel Minogue is a certified public accountant with extensive and varied experience. In addition to running her own public accounting firm for the last 20 years, she has served as controller for a bio-tech manufacturing firm and a bio-tech services firm where she developed accounting systems, policies and procedures, and reporting systems to ensure timely delivery of financial information. She has also served as a former contract auditor and assistant state auditor, performing rigorous audit and review services for governmental, not-for-profit and for profit entities.

Rich is retired. In his working life, he was an attorney and later the senior associate vice president in the WSU Office of the Vice President for Business and Finance. His background as an attorney includes many years in construction and contract law, and as an administrator his experience included real estate, finance, contracts, and capital projects.